LIBRARY OF CONGRESS
00013471277



Class _____

Book _____

PRESENTED BY

_____

AN

ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY,

ANCIENT AND MODERN;

FROM THE

BIRTH OF CHRIST TO THE BEGINNING OF THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY;

IN WHICH

THE RISE, PROGRESS, AND VARIATIONS OF CHURCH POWER, ARE CONSIDERED IN THEIR CONNEXION WITH THE STATE OF LEARNING AND PHILOSOPHY, AND THE POLITICAL HISTORY OF EUROPE DURING THAT PERIOD.

BY THE LATE LEARNED

JOHN LAURENCE MOSHEIM, D. D.

CHANCELLOR OF THE UNIVERSITY OF GOTTINGEN.

TRANSLATED FROM THE ORIGINAL LATIN,

AND ILLUSTRATED WITH NOTES, CHRONOLOGICAL TABLES, AND AN APPENDIX,

BY ARCHIBALD MACLAINE, D. D.

CONTINUED TO THE YEAR 1826,

BY CHARLES COOTE, L.L.D.

AND FURNISHED WITH A DISSERTATION ON THE STATE OF THE PRIMITIVE CHURCH,

BY THE RIGHT REVEREND DR. GEORGE GLEIG OF STIRLING.

CINCINNATI:

PUBLISHED BY APPLEGATE & CO.

NO. 43 MAIN STREET.

1858.

BR 145
.M8
1858

GIFT
MISS LETITIA THOMAS
AUG. 3, 1940

THE TRANSLATOR'S PREFACE.

I CANNOT persuade myself, that the complaints which we hear frequently of the frivolous nature of the public taste in matters of literature, are so far to be relied on, as to make me despair of a favourable reception of the following work. A History of the Christian Church, composed with judgment, taste, and candour, drawn with uncommon discernment and industry from the best sources, enriched with much useful learning and several important discoveries, and connected with the history of arts, philosophy, and civil government, is an object that will very probably attract the attention of many, and most undoubtedly excite the curiosity of the judicious and the wise. A work of this nature will be considered by the philosopher, as an important branch of the history of the human mind; and I need not mention a multitude of reasons that render it peculiarly interesting to the Christian. Besides, there has not hitherto appeared in English, any complete history of the church, that represents its revolutions, its divisions, and doctrines, with impartiality and truth, exposes the delusions of popish legends, breathes a spirit of moderation and freedom, and, keeping perpetually in the view of the reader the true nature and design of the Christian religion, points out those deviations from its beautiful simplicity, which have been too frequent among all orders of men and in all ages of the world.*

* * * * * * * * * * * * *

How far justice has been done to this excellent work, in the following translation, is a point that must be left to the decision of those who may think proper to peruse it with attention. I can say, with the strictest truth, that I have spared no pains to render it worthy of their gracious acceptance; and this consideration gives me some claim to their candour and indulgence, for any defects they may find in it. I have endeavoured to render my translation faithful, but never proposed to render it entirely literal. The style of the original is by no means a model to imitate, in a work designed for general use. Dr. Mosheim affected brevity, and laboured to crowd many things into few words; thus his diction, though pure and correct, became sententious and harsh, without that harmony which pleases the ear, or those transitions which make a narration flow with ease. This being the case, I have sometimes taken considerable liberties with my author, and followed the spirit of his narrative without adhering strictly to the letter. Where, indeed, the Latin phrase appeared to me elegant, expressive, and compatible with the English idiom, I have constantly followed it; but, in all other cases, I have departed from it, and have often added a few sentences, to render an observation more striking, a fact more clear, a portrait more finished. Had I been translating Cicero or Tacitus, I should not have thought such freedom pardonable. The translation of a classic author, like the copy of a capital picture, must exhibit not only the subject but also the manner of the original: this rule, however, is not applicable to the work now under consideration.

When I entered upon this undertaking, I proposed rendering the additional notes more numerous and ample, than the reader will find them. I soon perceived that the prosecution of my original plan would render this work too voluminous, and this induced me to alter my purpose. The notes I have given are not, however, inconsiderable in number; I wish I could say as much with respect to their merit and importance. I would only hope that some of them will be looked upon as not altogether unnecessary.

HAGUE, December 4, 1764.

---

* We omit the intervening part of Dr. Maclaine's Preface, because its insertion is rendered unnecessary by the biographical sketch which the Editor has given.

THE EDITOR'S PREFACE.

In every civilized country, the ministers of religion, from the nature of their education, may be expected to be conversant in literature: but in no country do they appear to be so fond of imparting their thoughts to the world, by the medium of the press, as in Germany. The greater part of their productions, indeed, pass silently into the gulf of oblivion, while some remain, and excite continued attention. To the latter class may be assigned the History of the Christian Church, written by Dr. John Laurence von Mosheim.

Academical honours and ecclesiastical dignities have frequently been obtained by persons who were born in the lowest sphere of life; and it may therefore be supposed that Mosheim might have obtained such honours and rewards by his abilities and erudition, even if he had been the son of an ordinary tradesman, of a low mechanic, or a rude peasant: but that was not his fate; for he was born (in the year 1695) of a family that boasted of high rank and noble blood. Lubeck was the place of his birth; but, in the short accounts of him which have fallen under our notice, the scene of his academical education is not mentioned. He gave early indications of a promising capacity, and of a strong desire of mental and literary improvement; and, when his parents proposed to him the choice of a profession, the church suggested itself to him as a proper department for the exercise of that zeal which disposed him to be useful to society.

Being ordained a minister of the Lutheran church, he soon distinguished himself as a preacher. His eloquence was impressive: he could wield with force the weapons of argumentation; and his language was neat, perspicuous, and accurate. He did not bewilder his auditors in the refinements of doctrine, or the profundities of speculation, but generally contented himself with stating the chief doctrinal points of Christianity, while he enforced the useful precepts of practical religion, recommending pious feelings, benevolent affections, an orderly demeanour, correct morals, and virtuous habits.

His reputation as a preacher, however high, was local and confined: but the fame of his literary ability diffused itself among all the nations of Christendom. The Danish court invited him to Copenhagen, and rewarded his merit by the grant of a professorship in the university of that capital. The duke of Brunswick Wolffenbuttel afterwards patronised him; and, having solicited his return to Germany, not only procured for him the theological chair at Helmstadt, but appointed him counsellor to the court in the affairs of the church, and invested him with authority over all the seminaries of learning in the dutchy. Even king George the Second, who, though a respectable prince, was not distinguished as an encourager of literary merit, entertained a high opinion of the character of Dr. Mosheim, and selected him for the dignified office of chancellor or president of the university of Göttingen. He discharged the duties of that station with zeal and propriety, and his conduct gave general satisfaction. His death, therefore, was sincerely lamented by all ranks of people, particularly as it did not occur in the extremity of age; for he had not completed his sixty-first year.

His literary labours were principally connected with his theological profession. He wrote, in the language of ancient Rome, an account of the affairs and state of the Christians before the reign of Constantine the Great;—a vindication of the early discipline of those votaries of true religion;—a narrative of the chief incidents of the life of the unfortunate Servetus, the martyr of Calvinistic bigotry;—dissertations on various subjects of a sacred nature;—and a translation of the celebrated work of Dr. Ralph Cudworth upon the intellectual system of the universe, accompanied with erudite remarks and judicious illustrations.

His history of the church was at first a small work, which appeared under the title of Institutiones Historiæ Christianæ, and passed through several editions. He was repeatedly urged by his learned friends to extend a work which they represented as too meagre for the importance of the subject. He acknowledged the applicability of the objection; but alleged various avocations, as an excuse for non-compliance. To the wish of the public he at length acceded; and, having employed two years in the augmentation and improvement of his history, he published it in the year 1755, with a dedication to Burchard Christian baron Behr, one of the counsellors of regency to his Britannic majesty for the electorate of Hanover. In the preface he solemnly thanked God for having given him strength and ability to finish a difficult and tedious work (*opus difficile, non unâ de causâ, et tædii plenum.*) He, at the same time, lamented that he was almost worn out with labours and cares. Thus did he seemingly predict his speedy dissolution; and, before the end of that year, his honourable and useful life was closed by the will of Providence.

Being desirous of procuring, for a work so replete with information, a more general perusal than its Latin dress would allow, Dr. Maclaine, a learned minister of the English church in Holland, undertook the task of translating it; and the attempt was by no means unsuccessful. For his translation there is a permanent demand; and a new edition is therefore prepared for the public eye, after that revision and correction which appeared to be necessary. A continuation is subjoined, that the reader might not regret the want of a religious and ecclesiastical history of recent times; and the translator's appendix has been enriched with a judicious essay, the offspring of the spontaneous zeal of a distinguished divine of the episcopal church in Scotland.

C. COOTE.

THE AUTHOR'S PREFACE.

THE different editions of my Elements of the Christian History met with such a favourable reception, and so great was the demand for them, that they were soon out of print. On this occasion, the worthy person, at whose expense they had been presented to the public, advised that a new edition should be given of the same work, improved and enlarged. The other occupations in which I was engaged, and a prudent consideration of the labour I must undergo in the correction and augmentation of a work in which I myself perceived so many imperfections, prevented my yielding, for a long time, to his earnest solicitations. But the importunities of my friends at length prevailed upon me to undertake the difficult task; and I have assiduously employed my hours of leisure, during two years, in bringing the work to as high a degree of perfection as I am capable of giving to it; so that now these Elements of Ecclesiastical History appear under a new form, and the changes they have undergone are certainly advantageous in every respect. I have still retained the division of the whole into certain periods; for, though a continued narration would have been more agreeable to my own taste, and had also several circumstances to recommend it, yet the counsels of some learned men who have experienced the great advantages of this division, engaged me to prefer the former to every other method; and indeed, when we examine this matter with due attention, we shall be disposed to allow, that the author, who proposes comprehending in one work all the observations and facts which are necessary to an acquaintance with the state of Christianity in the different ages of the church, will find it impossible to execute this design, without adopting certain general divisions of time, and others of a more particular kind, naturally pointed out by the variety of objects that demand a place in his history. And, as this was my design in the following work, I have left its primitive form entire, and made it my principal business to correct, improve, and augment it in such a manner, as to render it more instructive and entertaining to the reader.

My principal care has been employed in establishing upon the most solid foundations, and confirming by the most respectable authority, the credit of the facts related in this history. For this purpose, I have drawn from the fountain head, and have gone to those genuine sources from which pure and uncorrupted streams of evidence flow. I have consulted the best authors of every age, and chiefly those who were contemperary with the events which they record, or lived near the periods in which they happened; and I have endeavoured to report their contents with brevity, perspicuity, and precision. Abbreviators, generally speaking, do little more than reduce to a short and narrow compass those large bodies of history, which have been compiled from original authors. This method may be, in some measure, justified by several reasons, and therefore is not to be entirely disapproved: hence, nevertheless, it happens, that the errors, which almost always abound in large and voluminous productions, are propagated with facility, and, passing from one book into many, are unhappily handed down from age to age. This I had formerly observed in several abridgments; and I had lately the mortfiication to find some instances of this in my work, when I examined it by the pure lamps of antiquity, and compared it with those original records which are considered as the genuine

sources of sacred history. It was then that I perceived the danger of confiding implicitly even in those who are the most generally esteemed on account of their fidelity, penetration, and diligence; and it was then also that I became sensible of the necessity of adding, suppressing, changing, and correcting several things in the small work (already mentioned) which I formerly published. In the execution of this necessary task, I can affirm with truth, that I have not been deficient in perseverance, industry, or attention; and yet, with all these, it is exceedingly difficult to avoid mistakes of every kind, as those who are acquainted with the nature of historical researches abundantly know. How far I have approached to that inaccessible degree of exactness, which is chargeable with no error, must be left to the decision of those whose extensive knowledge of the Christian history entitles them to pronounce judgment in this matter. That such may judge with the greater facility, I have mentioned the authors who have been my guides; and, if I have in any respect misrepresented their accounts or their sentiments, I must confess that I am much more inexcusable than some other historians, who have met with and deserved the same reproach, since I have attentively perused and compared the various authors to whose testimony I appeal, having formed a resolution of trusting to no authority inferior to that of the original sources of historical truth. In order to execute, with some degree of success, the design I formed of rendering my abridgment more perfect, and of giving the history of the church as it stands in the most authentic records, and in the writings of those whose authority is most respectable, I found myself obliged to make many changes and additions. These will be visible through the whole of the following work, but more especially in the third book, which comprehends the history of the Christian, and particularly of the Latin or western church, from Charlemagne to the rise of Luther and the commencement of the Reformation. This period of history, though it abound with shining examples, though it be unspeakably useful as a key to the knowledge of the political as well as religious state of Europe, though it be singularly adapted to unfold the origin and explain the reasons of many modern transactions, has nevertheless been hitherto treated with less perspicuity, solidity, and elegance, than any other branch of the history of the church. Many writers have attempted to throw light upon this interesting period; but the barbarous style of one part of the number, the profound ignorance of some, and the partial and factious spirit of others, are such as render them by no means inviting; and the enormous bulk and excessive price of the productions of some of the best of these writers must necessarily make them scarce. It is farther to be observed, that some of the most valuable records that belong to the period now under consideration, remain yet in manuscript in the collections of the curious (or the opulent, who are willing to pass for such,) and are thus concealed from public view. Those who consider these circumstances will no longer be surprised, that, in this part of the subject, the most learned and laborious writers have omitted many things of consequence, and treated others without success. Among these, the annalists and other historians, so highly celebrated by the church of Rome, such as Baronius, Raynaldus, Bzovius, Manriques, and Wadding, though they were amply furnished with ancient manuscripts and records, have nevertheless committed more faults, and fallen into errors of greater consequence, than other writers, who were far inferior to them in learning and credit, and had much less access to original records than they were favoured with.

These considerations induce me to hope, that the work which I now present to the public will neither appear superfluous nor be found useless. For, as I have employed many years in the most laborious researches, in order to acquire a thorough acquaintance with the history of Christianity from the eighth century downwards, and as I flatter myself that, by the aid both of printed works and manuscripts too little consulted, I have arrived at a more certain and satisfactory knowledge of that period than is to be found in the generality of writers, I cannot but think that it will be doing real service to this branch of history to produce some of these discoveries, as this may encourage the learned and industrious to pursue the plan that I have thus begun, and to complete the history of the Latin church, by dispelling the darkness of what is called the Middle Age. And indeed I may venture to affirm, that I have brought to light several things hitherto unknown; corrected from records of undoubted authority accounts of other

things imperfectly known, and expressed with perplexity and confusion; and exposed the fabulous nature of many pretended events that deform the annals of sacred history. I here perhaps carry too far that self praise, which the candour and indulgence of the public are disposed either to overlook as the infirmity, or to regard as the privilege of old age. Those, however, who are curious to know how far this self applause is just and well grounded, have only to cast an eye on the illustrations I have given on the subject of Constantine's donation, as also with respect to the Cathari and Albigenses, the Beghards and Beguines, the Brethren and Sisters of the Free Spirit (whose pestilential fanaticism was a public nuisance to many countries in Europe during a period of four hundred years,) the Fratri celli or Little Brethren, the controversies between the Franciscans and the Roman pontiffs, the history of Berenger and the Lollards, and other matters. When my illustrations of these subjects and points of history are compared with what we find concerning them in other writers, it will perhaps appear, that my pretensions to the merit of some interesting discoveries are not entirely without foundation.

The accessions to ecclesiastical history could not be exhibited with the same brevity that I have observed in treating other subjects, which had been amply enlarged upon by others; for this would have been incompatible with the information of the curious, who would have received imperfect and confused notions of these subjects, and would have made me, perhaps, pass for a fabulous writer, who advanced novelties, without mentioning either my guides or my authorities. I have, therefore, not only explained all those points of history which carry with them an air of novelty, or recede considerably from the notions commonly received, but have also confirmed them by a sufficient number of observations and testimonies, so as to establish their credibility on a solid foundation. The illustrations and enlargements, which, generally speaking, have an appearance of disproportion and superfluity in an historical abridgment, were absolutely necessary in the present case.

These reasons engaged me to change the plan laid down in my former work, and one peculiar consideration induced me to render the present history more ample and voluminous. The Elements before mentioned, were principally intended for the use of those who are appointed to instruct the studious youth in the history and vicissitudes of the Christian church, and who stand in need of a compendious text to give a certain order and method to their prelections. In this view I treated each subject with the utmost brevity, and left, as was natural and fitting, much to the learning and abilities of those who might think proper to make use of these Elements in their course of instruction. But, in reviewing this compendious work with an intention of presenting it anew to the public, I imagined it might be rendered more acceptable to many, by such improvements and enlargements as might adapt it not only to the use of those who teach others, but also of those who are desirous of acquiring, by their own application, a general knowledge of ecclesiastical history. It was with this view that I made considerable additions to my former work, illustrated many things that had been there obscurely expressed for the sake of brevity, and reduced to a regular and perspicuous order a variety of facts, the recital of which had been more or less attended with perplexity and confusion. Hence it is, that, in the following work, the history of the calamities, in which the Christians of the first ages were nvolved, and the origin and progress of the sects and heresies which troubled the church, are exhibited with an uncommon degree of accuracy and precision.

Hence the various forms of religion, which have sprung from the excessive love of novelty, are represented without prejudice or partiality, and with all possible perspicuity and truth. It is also in consequence of this change of my original design, that I have taken the utmost pains to state more clearly religious controversies, to estimate their respective moment and importance, and to exhibit the arguments alleged on both sides; nor must I omit mentioning the care and labour I have employed in giving an exact narration of the transactions, wars, and enterprising measures, of the Roman pontiffs, from the reign of Charlemagne to the present time.

Those, therefore, who are prevented from applying themselves to a regular study of ecclesiastical history through

want of leisure, or by not having at hand the sources of instruction, and are nevertheless desirous of acquiring a distinct knowledge of certain events, doctrines, or ceremonies, may consult the following work, in which they will find the information they want; and those who are inclined to push their inquiries still farther, will see the course they must pursue, and find the authors mentioned whom it will be proper for them to consult.

It would betray an unpardonable presumption in me to imagine, that in a work, whose plan is so extensive, and whose contents are so various, I have never fallen into any mistakes. But, as I am conscious to myself of having conducted this undertaking with the most upright intentions, and of having employed all those means which are generally looked upon as the best preservatives against the seductions of error, I would hope that the mistakes I may have committed are neither so frequent nor so momentous as to be productive of any pernicious effects.

I might add more; but nothing more is necessary to enable those to judge of this work, who judge with knowledge, impartiality, and candour. I therefore conclude, by offering the just tribute of my gratitude to Almighty God, who, amidst the infirmities of my advanced years and other pressures under which I have laboured, has supplied me with strength to bring this difficult work to a conclusion.

Gottingen, March 23, 1755.

INTRODUCTION.

I. THE Ecclesiastical History of the New Testament is a clear and faithful narration of the transactions, revolutions, and events, that relate to that large community, which bears the name of JESUS CHRIST, and is commonly known under the denomination of the Church. It comprehends both the EXTERNAL and INTERNAL condition of this community, and so connects each event with the causes from which it proceeds, and the instruments which have been concerned in its production, that the attentive reader may be led to observe the displays of providential wisdom and goodness in the preservation of the church, and thus find his piety improved, as well as his knowledge.

II. The church, founded by the ministry and death of Christ, cannot be represented with greater perspicuity and propriety than under the notion of a society subjected to a lawful dominion, and governed by certain laws and institutions, mostly of a moral and spiritual tendency. To such a society many external events must happen, which will advance or oppose its interests, and accelerate or retard its progress toward perfection, in consequence of its unavoidable connexion with the course and revolutions of human affairs. Moreover, as nothing is stable and uniform where the imperfections of humanity take place, this religious society, besides the vicissitudes to which it must be exposed from the influence of external events, must be liable to various changes in its internal constitution. In this view of things, then, it appears, that the history of the church, like that of the state, may be divided with propriety into two general branches, which we may call its EXTERNAL and INTERNAL History.

III. The EXTERNAL HISTORY of the church comprehends all the changes, vicissitudes, and events, that have diversified the external state and condition of this sacred community. And as all public societies have their periods of lustre and decay, and are exposed to revolutions both of a happy and calamitous nature, so this first branch of Ecclesiastical History may be subdivided into two, comprehending, respectively, the PROSPEROUS and CALAMITOUS events that have happened to the church.

IV. The PROSPEROUS events that have contributed to extend the limits, or to augment the influence, of the Christian church, have proceeded either from its rulers and leaders, or from the subordinate members of this great community. Under the former class, we rank its PUBLIC rulers, such as princes, magistrates, and pontiffs, who, by their authority and laws, their liberality, and even their arms, have maintained its cause and extended its borders; as also, its more PRIVATE leaders, its learned and pious doctors, whose wise counsels, pious exploits, eminent examples, and distinguished abilities, have contributed most to promote its TRUE prosperity and lustre. Under the latter class, we may comprehend the advantages which the cause of Christianity has derived from the active faith, the invincible constancy, the fervent piety, and extensive charity, of its genuine professors, who, by the attractive lustre of these amiable virtues, have led many into the way of truth, and engaged them to submit themselves to the empire of the Messiah.

V. Under the CALAMITOUS events that have happened to the church, may be comprehended the injuries it has received from the vices and passions of its friends, and the bitter opposition and insidious stratagems of its enemies. The professors of Christianity, and more especially the doctors and rulers of the church, have done unspeakable detriment to the cause of religion, by their ignorance and sloth, their luxury and ambition, their uncharitable zeal, animosities and contentions, of which many shocking examples will be exhibited in the course of this history. Christianity had PUBLIC enemies to encounter, even princes and magistrates, who opposed its progress by penal laws, and blood-thirsty persecution; it had also private and inveterate adversaries in a certain set of philosophers, or rather sophists, who, enslaved by superstition, or abandoned to atheism, endeavoured to blast the rising church by their perfidious accusations, and their virulent writings.

VI. Such then are the events that are exhibited to our view in the external history of the church. Its INTERNAL HISTORY comprehends the changes and vicissitudes that have happened in its inward constitution, in that system of discipline and doctrine by which it stands distinguished from all other religious societies. This branch may be properly termed the HISTORY OF THE CHRISTIAN RELIGION. The causes of these internal changes are to be sought principally in the conduct and measures of those who have presided and borne rule in the church. It has been too frequently their practice to interpret the truths and precepts of religion in a manner accommodated to their particular systems, or even to their private interests; and, while they have found, in some, implicit obedience, they have met with warm opposition from others. Hence have proceeded theological broils and civil commotions, in which the cause of religion has often been defended at the expense both of justice and humanity. All these things must be observed with the strictest attention by an ecclesiastical historian.

VII. The first thing, therefore, that should be naturally treated in the INTERNAL HISTORY of the church, is the history of its ministers, rulers, and form of government. When we look back to the commencement of the Christian church, we find its government administered jointly by the pastors and the people. But, in process of time, the scene changes, and we see these pastors affecting an air of pre-eminence and superiority, trampling upon the rights and privileges of the community, and assuming to themselves a supreme authority, both in civil and religious matters. This invasion of the rights of the people was at length carried to such a height, that a single man administered, or at least claimed a right to administer, the affairs of the whole church with an unlimited sway. Among the doctors of these early times, there were some who acquired, by their learned labours, a shining reputation and a universal influence; they were regarded as oracles; their decisions were handed down to posterity as sacred rules of faith and practice; and they thus deserve to be mentioned, with particular distinction, among the governors of the church, though no part of its public administration was actually in their hands.[a]

VIII. After giving an account of the rulers and doctors of the church, the ecclesiastical historian proceeds to exhibit a view of the LAWS that are peculiar to this sacred community, which form, as it were, its centre of union, and distinguish it from all other religious societies. These LAWS are of two kinds. The first are properly called DIVINE, because they are immediately enacted by God himself, and are contained in those sacred books, which carry the most striking marks of a divine origin. They consist of those DOCTRINES that are the objects of faith and reason, and those PRECEPTS which are addressed to the heart and the affections. To the second kind belong those LAWS which are merely of human institution, and derive their authority only from the injunctions of the rulers of the church.

IX. In that part of the sacred history which relates to the doctrines of Christianity, it is necessary, above all things, to inquire particularly into the degree of authority that has been attributed to the sacred writings in the different

---

☞ [a] By these our author means the *Fathers*, whose writings form still a rule of faith in the Romish church, while, in the Protestant churches, their authority diminishes from day to day.

periods of the church, and also into the manner in which the divine doctrines they contain, have been explained and illustrated. For the true state of religion in every age can only be learned from the point of view in which these celestial oracles were considered, and from the manner in which they were expounded to the people. As long as they were the only rule of faith, religion preserved its native purity; and, in proportion as their decisions were either neglected or postponed to the inventions of men, it degenerated from its primitive and divine simplicity. It is farther necessary to show, under this head, what was the fate of the pure laws and doctrines of Christianity—how they were interpreted and explained—how they were defended against the enemies of the Gospel—how they were corrupted and adulterated by the ignorance and licentiousness of men. And, finally, it will be proper to inquire here, how far the lives and manners of Christians have been conformable to the dictates of these sacred laws, and to the influence that these sublime doctrines ought to have upon the hearts of men; as also to examine the rules of discipline prescribed by the spiritual governors of the church, in order to correct and restrain the vices and irregularities of its members.

X. The HUMAN LAWS, that constitute a part of ecclesiastical government, consist in precepts concerning the external worship of the Deity, and in certain rites, either confirmed by custom, or introduced by positive and express authority. RITES and CEREMONIES regard religion either DIRECTLY or INDIRECTLY; by the former, we understand those which are used in the immediate worship of the Supreme Being, whether in public or in private; by the latter, such pious and decent institutions as, beside direct acts of worship, have prevailed in the church. This part of sacred history is of a vast extent, both on account of the great diversity of these ceremonies, and the frequent changes and modifications through which they have passed. This consideration will justify our treating them with brevity, in a work which is only intended for a compendious view of ecclesiastical history.

XI. As bodies politic are sometimes distracted with wars and seditions, so has the Christian church, though designed to be the mansion of charity and concord, been unhappily perplexed by intestine divisions, occasioned sometimes by points of doctrine, at others by a variety of sentiments about certain rites and ceremonies. The principal authors of these divisions have been stigmatized with the title of HERETICS, and their peculiar opinions of consequence distinguished by the appellation of HERESIES.* The nature therefore and progress of these intestine divisions or HERESIES are to be carefully unfolded; and, if this be done with judgment and impartiality, it must prove useful and interesting in the highest degree, though at the same time it must be observed, that no branch of ecclesiastical history is so painful and difficult, on account of the sagacity, candour, and application that it requires, in order to its being treated in a satisfactory manner. The difficulty of arriving at the truth, in researches of this nature, is extreme, on account of the injurious treatment that has been shown to the heads of religious sects, and the unfair representations that have been made of their tenets and opinions; and this difficulty has been considerably augmented by this particular circumstance, that the greatest part of the writings of those who were branded with the name of heretics have not reached our times. It is therefore the duty of a candid historian to avoid attaching to this term the invidious sense in which it is too often used, since it is the invective of all contending parties, and is employed against truth as frequently as against error. The wisest method is to take the word HERETIC in its general signification, as denoting a person, who, either directly or indirectly, has been the occasion of exciting divisions and dissentions among Christians.

XII. After thus considering what constitutes the MATTER of Ecclesiastical History, it will be more proper to bestow a few thoughts on the MANNER of treating it, as this is a point of too much importance not to deserve some attention. And here we may observe, that, in order to render both the External and Internal History of the Church truly inte-

☞ * A term innocent in its primitive signification, though become odious by the enormity of some errors to which it has been applied, and also by the use that has been made of it to give vent to the malignity of enthusiasts and bigots.

resting and useful, it is absolutely necessary to trace effects to their causes, and to connect events with the circumstances, views, principles, and instruments that have contributed to their existence. A bare recital or facts can at best but enrich the MEMORY, and furnish a certain degree of amusement; but the historian who enters into the secret springs that direct the course of outward events, and views things in their various relations, connexions, and tendencies, gives thus a proper exercise to the JUDGMENT of the reader, and administers, on many occasions, the most useful lessons of wisdom and prudence. It is true, a high degree of caution is to be observed here, lest, in discussing the secret springs of public events, we substitute imaginary causes in the place of real, and attribute the actions of men to principles they never professed.

XIII. In order to discover the secret causes of public events, some general succours are to be derived from the HISTORY OF THE TIMES in which they happened, and the TESTIMONIES OF THE AUTHORS by whom they are recorded. But, beside these, a considerable ACQUAINTANCE WITH HUMAN NATURE, founded on long observation and experience, is extremely useful in researches of this kind. The historian, who has acquired a competent knowledge of the views that occupy the generality of men, who has studied a great variety of characters, and attentively observed the force and violence of human passions, together with the infirmities and contradictions they produce in the conduct of life, will find, in this knowledge, a key to the secret reasons and motives which gave rise to many of the most important events of ancient times. An acquaintance also with the MANNERS and OPINIONS of the persons concerned in the events that are related, will contribute much to lead us to the true origin of things.

XIV. There are, however, beside these general views, particular considerations, which will assist us still farther in tracing up to their true causes the various events of sacred history. We must, for example, in the external history of the church, attend carefully to two things; FIRST, to the political state of those kingdoms and nations in which the Christian religion has been embraced or rejected; and, SECONDLY, to their religious state, *i. e.* the opinions they have entertained concerning the divine nature, and the worship that is to be addressed to God. For we shall then perceive, with greater certainty and less difficulty, the reasons of the different reception Christianity has met with in different nations, when we are acquainted with the respective forms of civil government, the political maxims, and the public forms of religion that prevailed in those countries and at those periods in which the Gospel received encouragement, or met with opposition.

XV. With respect to the INTERNAL HISTORY OF THE CHURCH, nothing is more adapted to lay open to view the hidden springs of its various changes, than an acquaintance with the HISTORY OF LEARNING AND PHILOSOPHY in ancient times. For it is certain, that human learning and philosophy have, in all times, pretended to modify the doctrines of Christianity; and that these pretensions have extended farther than belongs to the province of philosophy on the one hand, or is consistent with the purity and simplicity of the Gospel on the other. It may also be observed, that a knowledge of the forms of civil government, and of the superstitious rites and institutions of ancient times, is not only useful, as we remarked above, to illustrate several things in the EXTERNAL history of the church, but also to render a satisfactory account of its INTERNAL variations, both in point of doctrine and worship. For the genius of human laws, and the maxims of civil rulers, have undoubtedly had a great influence in forming the constitution of the church; and even its spiritual leaders have, in too many instances, from an ill-judged prudence modelled its discipline and worship after the ancient superstitions.

XVI. We cannot be at any loss to know the sources from which this important knowledge is to be derived. The best writers of every age, who make mention of ecclesiastical affairs, and particularly those who were contemporary with the events they relate, are to be carefully consulted, since it is from credible testimonies and respectable authorities that history derives a solid and permanent foundation. Our esteem for those writers, who may be considered as the sources of historical knowledge, ought not however to lead us to treat with neglect the historians

and annalists, who have already made use of these original records, since it betrays a foolish sort of vanity to reject the advantages that may be derived from the succours and labours of those who have preceded us in their endeavours to cast light upon points that have been for many ages covered with obscurity.[a]

XVII. From all this we shall easily discern the qualifications that are essential to a good writer of ecclesiastical history. His knowledge of human affairs must be considerable, and his learning extensive. He must be endowed with a spirit of observation and sagacity; a habit of reasoning with evidence and facility; a faithful memory; and a judgment matured by experience, and strengthened by exercise. Such are the intellectual endowments that are required in the character of a good historian; and the moral qualities necessary to complete it, are, a persevering and inflexible attachment to truth and virtue, a freedom from the servitude of prejudice and passion, and a laborious and patient turn of mind.

XVIII. Those who undertake to write the history of the Christian church are exposed to the reception of a bias from three different sources; from TIMES, PERSONS, and OPINIONS. The TIMES, in which we live, have often so great an influence on our manner of judging, as to make us consider the events which happen in our days, as a rule by which we are to estimate the probability or evidence of those that are recorded in the history of past ages. The PERSONS, on whose testimonies we think we have reason to depend, acquire an imperceptible authority over our sentiments, that too frequently seduces us to adopt their errors, especially if these persons have been distinguished by eminent degrees of sanctity and virtue. And an attachment to favourite OPINIONS, leads authors sometimes to pervert, or, at least, to modify, facts in favour of those who have embraced these opinions, or to the disadvantage of such as have opposed them. These kinds of seduction are so much the more dangerous, as those whom they deceive are, in innumerable cases, insensible of their delusion, and of the false representations of things to which it leads them. It is not necessary to observe the solemn obligations that bind an historian to guard against these three sources of error with the most delicate circumspection, and the most scrupulous attention.

XIX. It is well known, nevertheless, how far ecclesiastical historians, in all ages, have departed from these rules, and from others of equal evidence and importance. For, not to mention those who lay claim to a high rank among the writers of history in consequence of a happy memory, loaded with an ample heap of materials, or those whose pens are rather guided by sordid views of interest than by a generous love of truth, it is too evident, how few in number the unprejudiced and impartial historians are, whom neither the influence of the sect to which they belong, nor the venerable and imposing names of antiquity, nor the spirit of the times and the torrent of prevailing OPINION, can turn aside from the rigid pursuit of truth ALONE. In the present age, more especially, the spirit of the times, and the influence of predominant opinions, have gained with many an incredible ascendancy. Hence we find frequently in the writings, even of learned men, such wretched arguments as these: *Such an opinion is true; therefore it must of necessity have been adopted by the primitive Christians.—Christ has commanded us to live in such a manner; therefore it is undoubtedly certain, that the Christians of ancient times lived so.—A certain custom does not take place now; therefore it did not prevail in former times.*

XX. If those who apply themselves to the composition of Ecclesiastical History be careful to avoid the sources of error mentioned above, their labours will be eminently useful to mankind, and more especially to those who are called to the important office of instructing others in the sacred truths and duties of Christianity. The history of the church presents to our view a variety of objects that are every way adapted to confirm our faith. When we contemplate here the discouraging obstacles, united efforts of kingdoms and empires, and the dreadful calamities which Christianity, in its very infancy, was obliged to encounter, and over which it gained an immortal victory, this will be suf

[a] The various writers of ecclesiastical history are enumerated by Sever. Walt. Sluterus, in his Propylæum Historiæ Christianæ, published at Lunenburg in 4to. in the year 1696; by Casp. Sagittarius, in his Introductio ad Historiam Ecclesiasticam, singulasque ejus partes.

ficient to fortify its true and zealous professors against all the threats, cavils, and stratagems, of profane and impious men. The great and shining examples also, which display their lustre, more or less, in every period of the Christian history, must have an admirable tendency to inflame our piety, and to excite, even in the coldest and most insensible hearts, the love of God and virtue. Those amazing revolutions and events that distinguished every age of the church, and often seemed to arise from small beginnings, and causes of little consequence, proclaim, with a solemn and respectable voice, the empire of Providence, and also the inconstancy and vanity of human affairs. And, among the many advantages that arise from the study of Ecclesiastical History, it is none of the least, that we shall see therein the origin and occasions of those ridiculous rites, absurd opinions, foolish superstitions, and pernicious errors, with which Christianity is yet disfigured in too many parts of the world. This knowledge will naturally lead us to a view of the truth in its beautiful simplicity, will engage us to love it, and render us zealous in its defence; not to mention the pleasure and satisfaction that we must feel in researches and discoveries of such an interesting kind.

XXI. They, more especially, who are appointed to instruct the youth in the public universities, and also such as are professionally devoted to the service of the church, will derive from this study the most useful lessons of wisdom and prudence, to direct them in the discharge of their respective offices. On the one hand, the inconsiderate zeal and temerity of others, and the pernicious consequences with which they have been attended, will teach circumspection; and in the mistakes into which even men of eminent merit and abilities have fallen, they will often see the things they are obliged to avoid, and the sacrifices it will be prudent to make, in order to maintain peace and concord in the church. On the other hand, illustrious examples and salutary measures will hold forth to them a rule of conduct, a lamp to show them the paths they must pursue. It may be farther observed, that, if we except the arms which Scripture and reason furnish against superstition and error, there is nothing that will enable us to combat them with more efficacy than the view of their deplorable effects, as they are represented to us in the history of the church. It would be endless to enumerate all the advantages that result from the study of Ecclesiastical History; experience alone can display these in all their extent; nor shall we mention the benefits that may be derived from it by those who have turned their views to other sciences than that of theology, and its more peculiar utility to such as are engaged in the study of the civil law. All this would lead us too far from our present design.

XXII. As the history of the church is EXTERNAL or INTERNAL, so the manner of treating it must be suited to that division. As to the first, when the narration is long, and the thread of the history runs through a great number of ages, it is proper to divide it into certain periods, which will give the reader time to breathe, assist memory, and also introduce a certain method and order into the work. In the following history the usual division into centuries is adopted in preference to all others, because most generally approved, though it may be attended with difficulties and inconveniences.

XXIII. A considerable part of these inconveniences will be however removed, if, beside this smaller division into centuries, we adopt a larger one, and divide the space of time that elapsed between the birth of Christ and our days into certain grand periods, which were distinguished by signal revolutions or remarkable events. It is on this account that we have judged it expedient to comprehend the following History in Four Books, which will embrace four remarkable periods. The First will be employed in exhibiting the state and vicissitudes of the Christian church, from its commencement to the time of Constantine the Great. The Second will comprehend the period that extends from the reign of Constantine to that of Charlemagne, which produced such a remarkable change in the face of Europe. The Third will contain the History of the Church, from the time of Charlemagne to the memorable period when Luther arose in Germany, to oppose the tyranny of Rome, and to deliver divine truth from the darkness that covered it. And the Fourth will carry down the same history, from the rise of Luther to the present times.

XXIV. We have seen above, that the sphere of Ecclesiastical History is extensive, that it comprehends a great

variety of objects, and embraces political as well as religious matters, so far as the former are related to the latter, either as causes or effects. But, however great the diversity of these objects may be, they are closely connected ; and it is the particular business of an ecclesiastical historian to observe a method that will show this connexion in the most conspicuous point of view, and form into one regular WHOLE a variety of parts that seem heterogeneous and discordant. Different writers on this subject have followed different methods, according to the diversity of their views and their peculiar manner of thinking. The order I have observed will be seen above in that part of this INTRODUCTION, which treats of the subject-matter of Ecclesiastical History ; the mention of it is therefore omitted here, to avoid unnecessary repetition.

AN

ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY.

BOOK I.

CONTAINING THE HISTORY OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH, FROM ITS ORIGIN, TO THE TIME OF CONSTANTINE THE GREAT.

PART I.

COMPREHENDING THE EXTERNAL HISTORY OF THE CHURCH.

CHAPTER I.

Concerning the Civil and Religious State of the World at the Birth of CHRIST.

I. A GREAT part of the world was subject to the Roman empire, when JESUS CHRIST made his appearance upon earth. The remoter nations which had submitted to the yoke of this mighty empire, were ruled either by Roman governors invested with temporary commissions, or by their own princes and laws, in subordination to the republic, whose sovereignty was to be acknowledged, and from which the conquered kings, who were continued in their dominions, derived their borrowed majesty. At the same time, the Roman people and their venerable senate, though they had not lost all shadow of liberty, were in reality reduced to a state of servile submission to Augustus Cæsar, who, by artifice, perfidy, and blood shed, had acquired an enormous degree of power, and united in his own person the pompous titles of emperor, sovereign pontiff, censor, tribune of the people, proconsul; in a word, all the great offices of the state.[a]

II. The Roman government, considered both with respect to its form and its laws, was certainly mild and equitable.[b] But the injustice and avarice of the prætors and proconsuls, and the ambitious lust of conquest and dominion, which was the predominant passion of the Roman people, together with the rapacious proceedings of the publicans, by whom the taxes of the empire were levied, were the occasions of perpetual tumults and insupportable grievances; and among the many evils which thence arose we may justly reckon the formidable armies, that were necessary to support these extortions in the provinces, and the civil wars which frequently broke out between the oppressed nations and their haughty conquerors.

III. It must, at the same time, be acknowledged, that this supreme dominion of one people, or rather of one man, over so many kingdoms, was attended with many considerable advantages to mankind in general, and to the propagation and advancement of Christianity in particular; for, by the means of this almost universal empire, many nations, different in their languages and their manners, were more intimately united in social intercourse. Hence a passage was opened to the remotest countries, by the communications which the Romans formed between the conquered provinces.[c] Hence also the nations, whose manners were savage and barbarous, were civilized by the laws and commerce of the Romans. And by this, in short, the benign influence of letters and philosophy was spread abroad in countries which had lain before under the darkest ignorance. All this contributed, no doubt, in a singular manner, to facilitate the progress of the Gospel, and to crown the labours of its first ministers and heralds with success.[d]

IV. The Roman empire, at the birth of Christ, was less agitated by wars and tumults, than it had been for many years before; for, though I cannot assent to the opinion of those who, following the account of Orosius, maintain that the temple of Janus was then shut, and that wars and discords absolutely ceased throughout the world,[e] yet it is certain, that the period, in which our Saviour descended upon earth, may be justly styled the *Pacific Age*, if we compare it with the preceding times; and indeed the tranquillity that then reigned, was necessary to enable the ministers of Christ to execute, with success, their sublime commission to the human race.

V. The want of ancient records renders it impossible to say any thing satisfactory or certain concerning the state of those nations, who did not receive the Roman yoke; nor, indeed, is their history essential to our present purpose. It is sufficient to observe, with respect to them, that those who inhabited the eastern regions were strangers to the sweets of liberty, and groaned under the burthen of an oppressive yoke. Their softness and effeminacy, both in point of manners and bodily constitution,

[a] See for this purpose the learned work of Augustin Campianus, entitled, De Officio et Potestate Magistratuum Romanorum et Jurisdictione, lib. i. cap. i. p. 3, 4, &c. Genevæ, 1725.

[b] See Moyle's Essay on the Constitution of the Roman Government, in the posthumous works of that author, vol. i. as also Scip. Maffei Verona illustrata, lib. ii.

[c] See, for an illustration of this point, Histoire des grands Chemins de l'Empire Romain, par Nicol. Bergier, printed in the year 1728. See also the very learned Everard Otto, De tutela Viarum publicarum, part ii.

[d] Origen, among others, makes particular mention of this, in the second book of his answer to Celsus.

[e] See Jo. Massoni Templum Jani, Christo nascente, reseratum, Roterodami, 1706.

contributed to make them support their slavery with an unmanly patience; and even the religion they professed riveted their chains. On the contrary, the northern nations enjoyed, in their frozen dwellings, the blessings of sacred freedom, which their government, their religion, a robust and vigorous frame of body and spirit, derived from the inclemency and severity of their climate, all united to preserve and maintain.[a]

VI. All these nations lived in the practice of the most abominable superstitions; for, though the notion of one Supreme Being was not entirely effaced in the human mind, but showed itself frequently, even through the darkness of the grossest idolatry; yet all nations, except that of the Jews, acknowledged a number of governing powers, whom they called gods, and one or more of which they supposed to preside over each particular province or people. They worshipped these fictitious deities with various rites; they considered them as widely different from each other in sex and power, in their nature, and also in their respective offices; and they appeased them by a multiplicity of ceremonies and offerings, in order to obtain their protection and favour; so that, however different the degrees of enormity might be, with which this absurd and impious theology appeared in different countries, yet there was no nation, whose sacred rites and religious worship did not discover a manifest abuse of reason, and very striking marks of extravagance and folly.

VII. Every nation then had its respective gods, over which presided one more excellent than the rest, yet in such a manner that this supreme deity was himself controlled by the rigid empire of the fates, or what the philosphers called *Eternal Necessity*. The gods of the East were different from those of the Gauls, the Germans, and other northern nations. The Grecian divinities differed widely from those of the Egyptians, who deified plants, animals, and a great variety of the productions both of nature and art.[b] Each people also had a particular manner of worshipping and appeasing their respective deities, entirely different from the sacred rites of other countries. In process of time, however, the Greeks and Romans became as ambitious in their religious pretensions, as in their political claims. They maintained that *their* gods, though under different names, were the objects of religious worship in all nations, and therefore they gave the names of their deities to those of other countries.[c] This pretension, whether supported by ignorance or other means, introduced inexpressible darkness and perplexity into the history of the ancient superstitions, and has been also the occasion of innumerable errors in the writings of the learned.

VIII. One thing, indeed, which, at first sight, appears very remarkable, is, that this variety of religions and of gods neither produced wars nor dissensions among the different nations, the Egyptians excepted.[d] Nor is it, perhaps, necessary to except even them, since their wars undertaken for their gods cannot, with propriety, be considered as wholly of a religious nature.[e] Each nation suffered its neighbours to follow their own method of worship, to adore their own gods, to enjoy their own rites and ceremonies; and discovered no displeasure at their diversity of sentiments in religious matters. There is, however, little wonderful in this spirit of mutual toleration, when we consider, that they all looked upon the world as one great empire, divided into various provinces, over every one of which a certain order of divinities presided; and that, therefore, none could behold with contempt the gods of other nations, or force strangers to pay homage to theirs. The Romans exercised this toleration in the amplest manner; for, though they would not allow any changes to be made in the religions that were publicly professed in the empire, nor any new form of worship to be openly introduced, yet they granted to their citizens a full liberty of observing, in private, the sacred rites of other nations, and of honouring foreign deities (whose worship contained nothing inconsistent with the interests and laws of the republic) with feasts, temples, consecrated groves, and the like testimonies of homage and respect.[f]

IX. The deities of almost all nations were either ancient heroes, renowned for noble exploits and beneficent deeds, or kings and generals who had founded empires, or women rendered illustrious by remarkable actions or useful inventions. The merit of these distinguished and eminent persons, contemplated by their posterity with an enthusiastic gratitude, was the reason of their being exalted to celestial honours. The natural world furnished another kind of deities, who were added to these by some nations; and as the sun, moon, and stars, shine forth with a lustre superior to that of all other material beings, so it is certain, that they particularly attracted the attention of mankind, and received religious homage from almost all the nations of the world.[g] From these beings of a nobler kind, idolatry descended into an enormous multiplication of inferior powers; so that, in many countries, mountains,

[a] "Fere itaque imperia (says Seneca) penes eos fuere populos, qui mitiore cœlo utuntur: in frigora septemtrionemque vergentibus immansueta ingenia sunt, ut ait poeta, suoque simillima cœlo." Seneca de Irâ, lib. ii. cap. xvi.

[b] See the discourse of Athanasius, entitled, Oratio contra Gentes, in the first volume of his works.

[c] This fact affords a satisfactory account of the vast number of gods who bore the name of Jupiter, and the multitudes that passed under those of Mercury, Venus, Hercules, Juno, &c. The Greeks, when they found, in other countries, deities that resembled their own, persuaded the worshippers of these foreign gods, that their deities were the same with those who were honoured in Greece, and were, indeed, themselves convinced that this was the case. In consequence of this, they gave the names of their gods to those of other nations, and the Romans in this followed their example. Hence we find the names of Jupiter, Mars, Mercury, Venus, &c. frequently mentioned in the more recent monuments and inscriptions which have been found among the Gauls and Germans, though the ancient inhabitants of those countries worshipped no gods under such denominations. I cannot think that this method of the Greeks and Romans has introduced so much confusion into mythology as Dr. Mosheim here imagines. If indeed there had been no resemblance between the Greek and Roman deities, and those of other nations, and if the names of the deities of the former had been given to those of the latter in an arbitrary and undistinguishing manner, the reflection of our historian would be undeniably true. But it has been alledged by many learned men, with a high degree of probability, that the principal deities of all nations resembled each other extremely in their essential characters; and if so, their receiving the same names could not introduce much confusion into mythology, since they were probably derived from one common source. If the Thor of the ancient Celts was the same in dignity, character, and attributes, with the Jupiter of the Grecks and Romans, where was the impropriety of giving the same name?

[d] Ingenious observations are to be found upon this head in the Expositio Mensæ Isiacæ of Pignorius.

[e] The religious wars of the Egyptians were not undertaken to compe. others to adopt their worship, but to avenge the slaughter that was made of their gods, such as crocodiles, &c., by the neighbouring nations. They were not offended at their neighbours for serving other divinities, but could not bear that they should put theirs to death.

[f] See concerning this interesting subject, a very curious and learned treatise of the famous Bynkershoek, entitled, Dissertatio de cultu peregrinæ religionis apud Romanos. This dissertation is to be found in the Opuscula of that excellent author, which were published at Leyden in the year 1719.

[g] The ingenious editor of the Ruins of Balbec has given us, in the preface to that noble work, a very curious account of the origin of the rei-

trees, and rivers, the earth, the sea, and the winds, and even virtues, vices, and diseases, had their shrines attended by devout and zealous worshippers.[a]

X. These deities were honoured with rites and sacrifices of various kinds, according to their respective nature and offices.[b] The rites used in their worship were absurd and ridiculous, and frequently cruel and obscene. Most nations offered animals, and some proceeded to the enormity of human sacrifices. As to their prayers, they were void of piety and sense, both with respect to their matter and their form.[c] Pontiffs, priests, and ministers, distributed into several classes, presided in this strange worship, and were appointed to prevent disorder in the performance of the sacred rites; but, pretending to be distinguished by an immediate intercourse and friendship with the gods, they abused their authority in the basest manner, to deceive an ignorant and wretched people.

XI. The religious worship we have now been considering, was confined to stated times and places. The statues and other representations of the gods were placed in the temples,[d] and supposed to be animated in an incomprehensible manner; for the votaries of these fictitious deities, however destitute they might be of reason in other respects, avoided carefully the imputation of worshipping inanimate beings, such as brass, wood, and stone, and therefore pretended that the divinity, represented by the statue, was really present in it, if the dedication was duly and properly made.[e]

XII. But, besides the public worship of the gods, to which all without exception were admitted, certain rites were practised in secret by the Greeks and several eastern nations, to which a very small number had access. These were commonly called *mysteries;* and the persons who desired to be initiated therein, were obliged previously to exhibit satisfactory proofs of their fidelity and patience, by passing through various trials and ceremonies of the most disagreeable kind. These secrets were kept in the strictest manner, as the initiated could not reveal any thing that passed on those occasions, without exposing their lives to the most imminent danger;[f] and that is the reason why, at this time, we are so little acquainted with the true nature, and the real design of these hidden rites. It is, however, well known, that in some of those *mysteries*, many things were transacted which were contrary both to real modesty and outward decency. And, indeed, from the whole of the pagan rites, the intelligent few might easily learn, that the divinities generally worshipped were rather men famous for their vices, than distinguished by virtuous and worthy deeds.[g]

XIII. It is, at least, certain, that this religion had not the least influence towards exciting or nourishing solid and true virtue in the minds of men. For the gods and goddesses, to whom public homage was paid, exhibited to their worshippers rather examples of egregious crimes, than of useful and illustrious virtues.[h] The gods, moreover, were esteemed superior to men in power and immortality; but, in every thing else, they were considered as their equals.—The priests were little solicitous to animate the people to a virtuous conduct, either by their precepts or their example. They plainly enough declared, that whatever was essential to the true worship of the gods, was contained only in the rites and institutions which the people had received by tradition from their ancestors.[i] And as to what regarded the rewards of virtue and the punishment of vice after the present life, the general notions were partly uncertain, partly licentious, and often more calculated to administer indulgence to vice, than encouragement to virtue Hence, the wiser part of mankind, about the time of Christ's birth, looked upon this whole system of religion as a just object of ridicule and contempt.

XIV. The consequences of this wretched theology were a universal corruption and depravity of manners, which appeared in the impunity of the most flagitious crimes.[k] Juvenal and Persius among the Latins, and Lucian among the Greeks, bear testimony to the justice of this heavy accusation. It is also well known, that no public law prohibited the sports of the gladiators, the exercise of unnatural lusts, the licentiousness of divorce, the custom of exposing infants, and of procuring abortions, or the frontless atrocity of publicly consecrating stews and brothels to certain divinities.[l]

XV. Such as were not sunk in an unaccountable and brutish stupidity, perceived the deformity of these religious systems. To these, the crafty priests addressed two considerations, to prevent their incredulity, and to dispel their doubts. The first was drawn from the miracles and prodigies which they pretended were daily wrought in the temples, before the statues of the gods and heroes

gious worship that was offered to the heavenly bodies by the Syrians and Arabians. In those uncomfortable deserts, where the *day* presents nothing to the view, but the uniform, tedious, and melancholy prospect of barren sands, the *night* discloses a most delightful and magnificent spectacle, and appears arrayed with charms of the most attractive kind; for the most part unclouded and serene, it exhibits to the wondering eye the host of heaven, in all their amazing variety and glory. In the view of this stupendous scene, the transition from admiration to idolatry was too easy to uninstructed minds; and a people, whose climate offered no beauties to contemplate but those of the firmament, would naturally be disposed to look thither for the objects of their worship. The form of idolatry, in Greece, was different from that of the Syrians; and Mr. Wood ingeniously attributes this to that smiling and variegated scene of mountains, valleys, rivers, groves, woods, and fountains, which the transported imagination, in the midst of its pleasing astonishment, supposed to be the seats of invisible deities. See a farther account of this matter in the elegant work above mentioned.

[a] See the learned work of J. G. Vossius, de idololatria.

[b] See J. Saubertus, de sacrificiis veterum. Lug. Bat. 1699.

[c] See M. Brouerius à Niedeck, de adorationibus veterum Populorum, printed at Utrecht in 1711.

[d] Some nations were without temples, such as the Persians, Gauls, Germans, and Britons, who performed their religious worship in the open air, or in the shadowy retreats of consecrated groves.

[e] See Arnobius adv, Gentes, lib. vi.—Augustin de civitate Dei, lib.vii. cap. xxxiii. and the Misopogon of the Emperor Julian.

[f] See Clarkson on the Liturgies, sect. iv. and Meursius de Mysteriis Eleusiniis.

[g] See Cicero, Disput. Tusculan. lib. ii. cap. xiii.

[h] There is a very remarkable passage to this purpose in the Tristia of Ovid, lib. ii.

"Quis locus est templis augustior? hæc quoque vitet,
In culpam si quæ est ingeniosa suam.
Cum steterit Jovis æde, Jovis succurret in æde,
Quam multas matres fecerit ille Deus.
Proxima adoranti Junonia templa subibit,
Pellicibus multis hanc doluisse Deam.
Pallade conspectâ, natum de crimine virgo
Sustulerit quare quæret Erichthonium."

[i] See Barbeyrac's Preface to his French translation of Puffendorf's System of the Law of Nature and Nations, sect. vi.

[k] The corrupt manners of those who then lay in the darkness of idolatry are described in an ample and affecting manner, in the first of Cyprian's epistles. See also, on this subject, Cornel. Adami Exercitatio de malis Romanorum ante prædicationem Evangelii moribus. This is the fifth discourse of a collection published by that learned writer at Groningen, in 1712.

[l] See Dr. John Leland's excellent account of the religious sentiments, moral conduct, and future prospects of the pagans, in his large work entitled, The Advantage and Necessity of the Christian Revelation.

that were placed there; and the second was deduced from oracles and divination, by which they maintained, that the secrets of futurity were unfolded through the interposition of the gods. In both these points the cunning of the priests imposed miserably upon the ignorance of the people; and, if the discerning few saw the cheat, they were obliged, from a regard to their own safety, to laugh with caution, since the priests were ever ready to accuse, before a raging and superstitious multitude, those who discovered their religious frauds, as rebels against the majesty of the immortal gods.

XVI. At the time of Christ's appearance upon earth, the religion of the Romans, as well as their arms, had extended itself over a great part of the world. This religion must be known to those who are acquainted with the Grecian superstitions.[a] In some things, indeed, it differs from them; for the Romans, beside the institutions which Numa and others had invented with political views, added several Italian fictions to the Grecian fables, and gave also to the Egyptian deities a place among their own.[b]

XVII. In the provinces subjected to the Roman government, there arose a new kind of religion, formed by a mixture of the ancient rites of the conquered nations with those of the Romans. These nations, who, before their subjection, had their own gods, and their own particular religious institutions, were persuaded, by degrees, to admit into their worship a great number of the sacred rites and customs of their conquerors. The view of the Romans, in this change, was not only to confirm their authority by the powerful aid of religion, but also to abolish the inhuman rites which were performed by many of the barbarous nations who had received their yoke; and this change was effected partly by the prudence of the victors, partly by the levity of the vanquished, and by their ambition to please their new masters.

XVIII. When, from the sacred rites of the ancient Romans, we pass to a review of the other religions that prevailed in the world, we shall find, that the most remarkable may be properly divided into two classes. One of these will comprehend the religious systems that owed their existence to *political* views; and the other, those which seem to have been formed for *military* purposes.—In the former class may be ranked the religions of most of the eastern nations, especially of the Persians, Egyptians, and Indians, which appear to have been solely calculated for the preservation of the state, the support of the royal authority and grandeur, the maintenance of public peace, and the advancement of civil virtues. Under the military class may be comprehended the religious system of the northern nations, since all the traditions that we find among the Germans, the Britons, the Celts, and the Goths, concerning their divinities, have a manifest tendency to excite and nourish fortitude and ferocity, an insensibility of danger, and a contempt of life. An attentive inquiry into the religions of these respective nations, will abundantly verify what is here asserted.

XIX. None of these nations, indeed, ever arrived at such a universal excess of barbarism and ignorance, as not to have some discerning men among them, who were sensible of the extravagance of all these religions. But, of these sagacious observers, some were destitute of the weight and authority that were necessary to remedy those overgrown evils; and others wanted the will to exert themselves in such a glorious cause. And the truth is, none of them had wisdom equal to such a solemn and arduous enterprise. This appears manifestly from the laborious but useless efforts of some of the Greek and Roman philosophers against the vulgar superstitions. These venerable sages delivered, in their writings, many sublime things concerning the nature of God, and the duties incumbent upon men; they disputed with sagacity against the popular religion; but to all this they added such chimerical notions and such absurd subtilties of their own, as may serve to convince us that it belongs to God alone, and not to man to reveal the truth without any mixture of impurity or error.

XX. About the time of Christ's appearance upon earth, there were two kinds of philosophy which prevailed among the civilized nations. One was the philosophy of the Greeks, adopted also by the Romans; and the other, that of the orientals, which had a great number of votaries in Persia, Syria, Chaldea, Egypt, and even among the Jews. The former was distinguished by the simple title of *philosophy*. The latter was honoured with the more pompous appellation of *science* or *knowledge*,[c] since those who embraced the latter sect pretended to be the restorers of the knowledge of God, which was lost in the world.[d] The followers of both these systems, in consequence of vehement disputes and dissentions about several points, subdivided themselves into a variety of sects. It is, however, to be observed, that all the sects of the oriental philosophy deduced their various tenets from one fundamental principle, which they held in common; whereas the Greeks were much divided even about the first principles of science.

As we shall have occasion hereafter to speak of the oriental philosophy, we shall confine ourselves here to the doctrines taught by the Grecian sages, and shall give some account of the various sects into which they were divided.

XXI. Of the Grecian sects, some declared openly against all religion; and others, though they acknowledged a deity, and admitted a religion, yet cast a cloud over the truth, instead of exhibiting it in its genuine beauty and lustre.

Of the former kind were the Epicureans and Academics. The Epicureans maintained, "That the world arose from chance; that the gods (whose existence they did not dare to deny) neither did nor could extend their providential care to human affairs; that the soul was mortal; that *pleasure*[e] was to be regarded as the ultimate end of man; and that *virtue* was neither worthy of esteem nor of choice, but with a view to its attainment." The Academics asserted the impossibility of arriving at truth, and held it uncertain, "whether the gods existed or not; whether the soul was mortal or immortal; whether virtue ought to be preferred to vice, or vice to virtue." These two sects, though they struck at the foundations of

[a] See Dionysius Halicarn. Antiq. Rom. lib. vii. cap. lxxii.

[b] See Petit ad leges Atticas, lib. i. tit. i.

[c] Γνῶσις (*gnosis*) in the Greek signifies *science* or *knowledge*; and hence came the title of Gnostics, which this presumptuous sect claimed as due to their superior light and penetration in divine *things*.

[d] St. Paul mentions and condemns both these kinds of philosophy; the Greek, in the Epistle to the Colossians, ii. 8., and the Oriental, or Gnosis, in the First Epistle to Timothy, vi. 20.

[e] The ambiguity of this word has produced many disputes in the explication of the Epicurean system. If by *pleasure* be understood only sensual gratifications, the tenet here advanced is indisputably monstrous. But if it be taken in a larger sense, and extended to intellectual and moral objects, in what does the scheme of Epicurus, with respect to virtue, differ from the opinions of those Christian philosophers, who maintain that self-love is the *only* spring of all human affections and actions?

all religion, were the most numerous of all at the birth of Christ, and were particularly encouraged by the liberality of the rich, and the protection of those who were in power.[a]

XXII. We observed in the preceding section, that there was another kind of philosophy, in which religion was admitted, but which was, at the same time, deficient by the obscurity it cast upon truth. Under the philosophers of this class, may be reckoned the Platonists, the Stoics, and the followers of Aristotle, whose subtile disputations concerning God, religion, and the social duties, were of little solid use to mankind. The nature of God, as it is explained by Aristotle, resembles the principle that gives motion to a machine; it is a nature happy in the contemplation of itself, and entirely regardless of human affairs; and such a divinity, who differs but little from the god of Epicurus, cannot reasonably be the object either of love or fear. With respect to the doctrine of this philosopher concerning the human soul, it is uncertain, to say no more, whether he believed its immortality or not.[b] What then could be expected from such a philosophy? could any thing solid and satisfactory, in favour of piety and virtue, be hoped for from a system which excluded from the universe a divine Providence, and insinuated the mortality of the human soul?

XXIII. The god of the Stoics has somewhat more majesty than the divinity of Aristotle; nor is he represented by those philosophers as sitting above the starry heavens in a supine indolence, and a perfect inattention to the affairs of the universe. Yet he is described as a corporeal being, united to matter by a necessary connexion, and subject to the determinations of an immutable *fate*, so that neither rewards nor punishments can properly proceed from him.[c] The learned also know that, in the philosophy of this sect, the existence of the soul was confined to a certain period. Now it is manifest, that these tenets remove, at once, the strongest motives to virtue, and the most powerful restraints upon vice; and, therefore, the Stoical system may be considered as a body of specious and pompous doctrine, but, at the same time, as a body without nerves, or any principles of consistency and vigour.

XXIV. Plato is generally looked upon as superior to all the other philosophers in wisdom; and this eminent rank does not seem to have been undeservedly conferred upon him. He taught that the universe was governed by a Being, glorious in power and wisdom, and possessing perfect liberty and independence. He extended also the views of mortals beyond the grave, and showed them, in futurity, prospects adapted to excite their hopes, and to work upon their fears. His doctrine, however, besides the weakness of the foundations on which it rests, and the obscurity with which it is often expressed, has other considerable defects. It represents the Supreme Creator of the world as destitute of many perfections,[d] and confined to a certain determinate portion of space. Its decisions, with respect to the soul and dæmons, seem calculated to beget and nourish superstition. Nor will the moral philosophy of Plato appear worthy of such a high degree of admiration, if we attentively examine and compare its various parts, and reduce them to their principles.[e]

XXV. As then, by these different sects, there were many things maintained that were highly unreasonable and absurd, and as a contentious spirit of opposition and dispute prevailed among them all, some men of true discernment, and of moderate characters, were of opinion, that none of these sects ought to be adhered to in all points, but that it was rather wise to choose and extract out of each of them such tenets and doctrines as were good and reasonable, and to abandon and reject the rest. This gave rise to a new form of philosophy in Egypt, and principally at Alexandria, which was called the *Eclectic*, whose founder, according to some, was Potamon, an Alexandrian, though this opinion is not without its difficulties. It manifestly appears from the testimony of Philo, the Jew, who was himself one of this sect, that this philosophy was in a flourishing state at Alexandria, when our Saviour was upon the earth. The Eclectics held Plato in the highest esteem, though they made no scruple to join, with his doctrines, whatever they thought conformable to reason in the tenets and opinions of the other philosophers.[f]

XXVI. The attentive reader will easily conclude, from the short view which we have here given of the miserable state of the world at the birth of Christ, that mankind, in this period of darkness and corruption, stood highly in need of some divine teacher to convey to the mind *true and certain principles* of religion and wisdom, and to recall wandering mortals to the sublime paths of piety and virtue. The consideration of this wretched condition of mankind will be also singularly useful to those who are not sufficiently acquainted with the advantages, the comforts, and the support which the sublime doctrines of Christianity are so proper to administer in every state, relation, and circumstance of life. A set of miserable and unthinking creatures treat with negligence, and sometimes with contempt, the religion of Jesus, not considering that they are indebted to it for all the good things which they so ungratefully enjoy.

---

[a] The Epicurean sect was, however, the more numerous of the two, as appears from the testimony of Cicero de Finibus, &c. lib. i. cap. vii. lib. ii. cap. xiv. Disput. Tusculan. lib. v. cap. x. Hence the complaint which Juvenal makes in his xiiith Satire, of the atheism that prevailed at Rome, in those excellent words:

"Sunt in fortunæ qui casibus omnia ponant,
Et nullo credant mundum rectore moveri,
Naturâ volvente vices et lucis et anni;
Atque ideo intrepidi quæcunque altaria tangunt."

[b] See the Notes upon Cudworth's Intellectual System of the Universe, which Dr. Mosheim subjoined to his Latin translation of that learned work, vol. i. p. 66, 500; vol. ii. p. 1171. See also, upon the same subject, Mourgue's Plan Theologique du Pythagorisme, tom. i.

[c] Thus is the Stoical doctrine of *fate* generally represented, but not more generally than unjustly. Their *fatum*, when carefully and attentively examined, seems to have signified no more in the intention of the wisest of that sect, than the plan of government formed originally in the divine mind, a plan all-wise and perfect, and from which, of consequence, the Supreme Being, morally speaking, can never depart; so that, when Jupiter is said by the Stoics to be subject to immutable *fate*, this means no more than that he is subject to the wisdom of his own counsels, and ever acts in conformity with his supreme perfections. The following remarkable passage of Seneca, drawn from the 5th chapter of his book de Providentiâ, is sufficient to confirm the explication we have here given of the *Stoical fate*. "Ille ipse omnium conditor et rector scripsit quidem fata, sed sequitur. Semper paret, semel jussit."

[d] This accusation seems to be carried too far by Dr. Mosheim. It is not strictly true, that the doctrine of Plato represents the Supreme Being as destitute of *many* perfections. On the contrary, *all* the divine perfections are frequently acknowledged by that philosopher. What probably gave occasion to this animadversion of our learned author, was the erroneous notion of Plato, concerning the *invincible malignity* and corruption of *matter*, which the divine power had not been sufficient to reduce entirely to order. Though this notion is, indeed, injurious to the omnipotence of God, it is not sufficient to justify the censure now under consideration.

[e] There is an ample account of the defects of the Platonic philosophy in a work entitled Defense des Peres accusés de Platonisme, par Franc. Baltus; but there is more learning than accuracy in that performance.

[f] See Godof. Olearius de Philosophia Eclectica, Jac. Brucker, and others.

CHAPTER II.

Concerning the Civil and Religious State of the Jewish Nation at the Birth of Christ.

I. The state of the Jews was not much better than that of the other nations at the time of Christ's appearance in the world. They were governed by Herod, who was himself a tributary to the Roman people. This prince was surnamed the Great, surely from no other circumstance than the greatness of his vices; and his government was a yoke of the most vexatious and oppressive kind. By a cruel, suspicious, and overbearing temper, he drew upon himself the aversion of all, not excepting those who lived upon his bounty. By a mad luxury and an affectation of magnificence far above his fortune, together with the most profuse and immoderate largesses, he exhausted the treasures of that miserable nation. Under his administration, and by his means, the Roman luxury was received in Palestine, accompanied with the worst vices of that licentious people.[a] In a word, Judea, governed by Herod, groaned under all that corruption, which might be expected from the authority and the example of a prince, who, though a Jew in outward profession, was in point of morals and practice, a contemner of all laws, divine and human.

II. After the death of this tyrant, the Romans divided the government of Palestine among his sons. In this division, one half of Judea was given to Archelaus, with the title of exarch; and the other was divided between his brothers, Antipas and Philip. Archelaus was a corrupt and wicked prince, and followed the example of his father's crimes in such a manner, that the Jews, weary of his iniquitous administration, laid their complaints and grievances before Augustus, who delivered them from their oppressor, by banishing him from his dominions, about ten years after the death of Herod the Great. The kingdom of this dethroned prince was reduced to the form of a province, and added to the jurisdiction of the governor of Syria, to the great detriment of the Jews, whose heaviest calamities arose from this change, and whose final destruction was its undoubted effect in the appointment of Providence.

III. However severe was the authority which the Romans exercised over the Jews, it did not extend to the entire suppression of their civil and religious privileges.—The Jews were, in some measure, governed by their own laws; and they were tolerated in the enjoyment of the religion they had received from the glorious founder of their church and state. The administration of religious ceremonies was committed, as before, to the high priest, and to the sanhedrim, to the former of whom the priests and Levites were in the usual subordination; and the form of outward worship, except in a very few points, had suffered no visible change. But, on the other hand, it is impossible to express the inquietude and disgust, the calamities and vexations, which this unhappy nation suffered from the presence of the Romans, whom their religion obliged them to look upon as a polluted and idolatrous people, and in a more particular manner, from the avarice and cruelty of the prætors and the frauds and extortions of the publicans; so that, all things considered, the condition of those who lived under the government of the other sons of Herod, was much more supportable than the state of those who were immediately subject to the Roman jurisdiction.

IV. It was not, however, from the Romans alone, that the calamities of this miserable people proceeded. Their own rulers multiplied their vexations, and hindered them from enjoying any little comforts that were left to them by the Roman magistrates. The leaders of the people, and the chief priests, were, according to the account of Josephus, profligate wretches, who had purchased their places by bribes, or by acts of iniquity, and who maintained their ill acquired authority by the most flagitious and abominable crimes. The subordinate and inferior members were infected with the corruption of the head; the priests, and those who possessed any shadow of authority, were dissolute and abandoned to the highest degree; while the people, seduced by these corrupt examples, ran headlong into every sort of iniquity, and by their endless seditions, robberies, and extortions, armed against them both the justice of God and the vengeance of men.

V. Two religions flourished at this time in Palestine, *viz.* the Jewish and the Samaritan, whose respective followers beheld those of the opposite sect with the utmost aversion. The Jewish religion stands exposed to our view in the books of the Old Testament; but, at the time of Christ's appearance, it had lost much of its original nature and of its primitive aspect. Errors of a very pernicious kind had infected the whole body of the people, and the more learned part of the nation were divided upon points of the highest consequence. All looked for a deliverer, but not for such a one as God had promised. Instead of a meek and spiritual Saviour, they expected a formidable and warlike prince, to break off their chains, and set them at liberty from the Roman yoke. All regarded the whole of religion, as consisting in the rites appointed by Moses, and in the performance of some external acts of duty towards the Gentiles. They were all horribly unanimous in excluding from the hopes of eternal life all the other nations of the world; and, as a consequence of this odious system, they treated them with the utmost rigour and inhumanity, when any occasion was offered. And, besides these corrupt and vicious principles, there prevailed among them several absurd and superstitious notions concerning the divine nature, invisible powers, magic, &c. which they had partly brought with them from the Babylonian captivity, and partly derived from the Egyptians, Syrians, and Arabians, who lived in their neighbourhood.

VI. Religion had not a better fate among the learned than among the multitude. The supercilious doctors, who vaunted their profound knowledge of the law, and their deep science in spiritual and divine things, were constantly showing their fallibility and their ignorance by their religious differences, and were divided into a great variety of sects. Of these sects, three in a great measure eclipsed the rest, both by the number of their adherents, and also by the weight and authority which they acquired. These were the Pharisees, the Sadducees, and the Essenes.[b]

[a] See, on this subject, Christ. Noldii Historia Idumæa, which is annexed to Havercamp's edition of Josephus, vol. ii. p. 333. See also Basnage, Histoire Des Juifs, tom. i. part. i.—Noris, Cenotaph. Pisan.—Prideaux, History of the Jews.—Cellarius, Historia Herodum, in the first part of his Academical Dissertations, and, above all, Josephus the Jewish historian.

[b] Besides these more illustrious sects, there were several of inferior note, which prevailed among the Jews at the time of Christ's appearance. The Herodians are mentioned by the sacred writers, the Gaulonites by Josephus, and others by Epiphanius and Hegesippus in Eusebius: and we cannot reasonably look upon all these sects as fictitious.

There is frequent mention made of the two former in the sacred writings; but the knowledge of the rites and doctrines of the last, is to be derived from Josephus, Philo, and other historians. These three illustrious sects agreed in the fundamental principles of the Jewish religion, and, at the same time, were involved in endless disputes upon points of the highest importance, and about matters in which the salvation of mankind was directly concerned; and their controversies could not but be highly detrimental to the rude and illiterate multitude, as every one must easily perceive.

VII. It may not be improper to mention here some of the principal matters that were debated among these famous sects. A main point of controversy was, whether the *written law* alone was of divine authority. The Pharisees added to this law another, which had been received by oral tradition. This the Sadducees and Essenes rejected as of no authority, and adhered to the written law as the only divine rule of obedience. They differed also in their opinions concerning the true sense of the law. For, while the Pharisees attributed to the sacred text a double sense, one of which was obvious, regarding only the *words*, and another mysterious, relating to the intimate nature of the *things* expressed; and while the Sadducees maintained that nothing farther was delivered by the law, than that which was contained in the signification of the words; the Essenes, at least the greatest part of that sect, entertained an opinion different from both of these. They asserted, in their jargon, that the words of the law were absolutely void of all power, and that the things expressed by them, were the images of holy and celestial objects. These litigious subtilties and unintelligible wranglings, about the nature and sense of the divine word, were succeeded by a controversy of the greatest moment, concerning the rewards and punishments of the law, particularly with respect to their extent. The Pharisees were of opinion, that these rewards and punishments extended both to the soul and body, and that their duration was prolonged beyond the limits of this transitory state. The Sadducees assigned to them the same period that concludes this mortal life. The Essenes differed from both, and maintained that future rewards and punishments extended to the soul alone, and not to the body, which they considered as a mass of malignant matter, and as the prison of the immortal spirit.

VIII. These differences, in matters of such high importance, among the three famous sects above mentioned, produced none of those injurious and malignant effects which are too often seen to arise from religious controversies.—But such as have any acquaintance with the history of these times, will not be so far deceived by this specious appearance of moderation, as to attribute it to noble or generous principles. They will look through the fair outside, and see that mutual fears were the latent cause of this apparent charity and reciprocal forbearance. The Sadducees enjoyed the favour and protection of the great: the Pharisees, on the other hand, were exceedingly high in the esteem of the multitude; and hence they were both secured against the attempts of each other, and lived in peace, notwithstanding the diversity of their religious sentiments. The government of the Romans contributed also to the maintenance of this mutual toleration and tranquillity, as they were ever ready to suppress and punish whatever had the appearance of tumult and sedition. We may add to all this, that the Sadducean principles rendered that sect naturally averse to altercation and tumult. Libertinism has for its objects ease and pleasure, and chooses rather to slumber in the arms of a fallacious security, than to expose itself to the painful activity, which is required both in the search and in the defence of truth.

IX. The Essenes had little occasion to quarrel with the other sects, as they dwelt generally in a rural solitude, far removed from the view and commerce of men.—This singular sect, which was spread abroad through Syria, Egypt, and the neighbouring countries, maintained, that religion consisted wholly in contemplation and silence.—By a rigorous abstinence also, and a variety of penitential exercises and mortifications, which they seem to have borrowed from the Egyptians,[a] they endeavoured to arrive at still higher degrees of excellence in virtue. There prevailed, however, among the members of this sect, a considerable difference both in point of opinion and discipline.—Some passed their lives in a state of celibacy, and employed their time in educating the children of others. Some embraced the state of matrimony, which they considered as lawful; when contracted with the sole view of propagating the species, and not to satisfy the demands of lust. Those of the Essenes who dwelt in Syria, held the possibility of appeasing the Deity by sacrifices, though in a manner quite different from that of the Jews; by which, however, it appears that they had not utterly rejected the literal sense of the Mosaic law. But those who wandered in the deserts of Egypt were of very different sentiments; they maintained, that no offering was acceptable to God but that of a serene and composed mind, intent on the contemplation of divine things; and hence it is manifest that they looked upon the law of Moses as an allegorical system of spiritual and mysterious truths, and renounced in its explication all regard to the outward letter.[b]

X. The Therapeutæ, of whom Philo the Jew makes particular mention in his treatise concerning contemplative life, are supposed to have been a branch of this sect. From this notion arose the division of the Essenes into *theoretical* and *practical*. The former of these were wholly devoted to contemplation, and are the same with the Therapeutæ, while the latter employed a part of their time in the performance of the duties of active life. Whether this division be accurate or not, is a point which I will not pretend to determine. But I see nothing in the laws or manners of the Therapeutæ, that should lead us to consider them as a branch of the Essenes; nor, indeed, has Philo asserted any such thing. There may have been, surely, many other fanatical tribes among the Jews, besides that of the Essenes; nor should a resemblance of principles always induce us to make a coalition of sects. It is, however, certain, that the Therapeutæ were neither Christians nor Egyptians, as some have erroneously imagined. They were undoubtedly Jews: they gloried in that title, and styled themselves, with particular affectation, the true disciples of Moses, though their manner of life was equally repugnant to the institutions of that great lawgiver and to the dictates of right reason, and showed them to

[a] See the Annotations of Holstenius upon Porphyry's Life of Pythagoras, p. 11. of Kuster's edition.

[b] See Mosheim's observations on a small treatise, written by the learned Cudworth, concerning the true notion of the Lord's Supper.

be a tribe of melancholy and wrong-headed enthusiasts.[a]

XI. None of these sects, indeed, seemed to have the interests of real and true piety at heart; nor were their principles and discipline at all adapted to the advancement of pure and substantial virtue. The Pharisees courted popular applause by a vain ostentation of pretended sanctity, and an austere method of living, while, in reality, they were strangers to true holiness, and were inwardly defiled with the most criminal dispositions, with which our Saviour frequently reproaches them. They also treated with greater veneration the commandments and traditions of men, than the sacred precepts and laws of God.[b] The Sadducees, by denying a future state of rewards and punishments, removed, at once, the most powerful incentives to virtue, and the most effectual restraints upon vice, and thus gave new vigour to every sinful passion, and a full encouragement to the indulgence of every irregular desire. As to the Essenes, they were a fanatical and superstitious tribe, who placed religion in a certain sort of seraphic indolence, and looking upon piety to God as incompatible with any social attachment to men, dissolved, by this pernicious doctrine, all the great bonds of human society.

XII. While such darkness, such errors and dissensions, prevailed among those who assumed the character and authority of persons distinguished by their superior sanctity and wisdom, it will not be difficult to imagine, how totally corrupt the religion and morals of the multitude must have been. They were, accordingly, sunk in the most deplorable ignorance of God and of divine things, and had no notion of any other way of rendering themselves acceptable o the Supreme Being, than by sacrifices, ablutions, and the other external ceremonies of the Mosiac law. Hence proceeded that laxity of manners, and that profligate wickedness, which prevailed among the Jews during Christ's ministry upon earth; and hence the Divine Saviour compares that people to a flock of sheep which wandered without a shepherd, and their doctors to men who, though deprived of sight, yet pretended to show the way to others.[c]

XIII. To all these corruptions, both in point of doctrine and practice, which reigned among the Jews at the time of Christ's coming, we may add the attachment which many of them discovered to the tenets of the oriental philosophy concerning the origin of the world, and to the doctrine of the Cabbala, which was undoubtedly derived from that system. That considerable numbers of the Jews had imbibed the errors of this fantastic theory, evidently appears both from the books of the New Testament, and from the ancient history of the Christian church,[d] and it is also certain, that many of the Gnostic sects were founded by Jews. Those among that degenerate people, who adopted this chimerical philosophy, must have widely differed from the rest in their opinions concerning the God of the Old Testament, the orgin of the world, the character and doctrine of Moses, and the nature and ministry of the Messiah, since they maintained that the creator of this world was a being different from the Supreme God, and that his dominion over the human race was to be destroyed by the Messiah. Every one must see that this enormous system was fruitful of errors, destructive of the very foundations of Judaism.

XIV. If any part of the Jewish religion was less disfigured and corrupted than the rest, it was, certainly, the form of external worship, which was established by the law of Moses. And yet many learned men have observed, that a great variety of rites were introduced into the service of the temple, of which no traces are to be found in the sacred writings. These additional ceremonies manifestly proceeded from those changes and revolutions which rendered the Jews more conversant with the neighbouring nations, than they had formerly been; for, when they saw the sacred rites of the Greeks and Romans, they were pleased with several of the ceremonies that were used in the worship of the heathen deities, and did not hesitate to adopt them in the service of the true God, and add them as ornaments to the rites which they had received by divine appointment.[e]

XV. But whence arose such enormous degrees of corruption in that very nation which God had, in a peculiar manner, separated from an idolatrous world to be the depository of divine truth? Various causes may be assigned, in order to give a satisfactory account of this matter. In the first place, it is certain, that the ancestors of those Jews, who lived in the time of our Saviour, had brought, from Chaldea and the neighbouring countries, many extravagant and idle fancies, which were utterly unknown to the original founders of the nation.[f] The conquest of Asia by Alexander the Great, was also an event from which we may date a new accession of errors to the Jewish system, since, in consequence of that revolution, the manners and opinions of the Greeks began to spread themselves among the Persians, Syrians, Arabians, and likewise among the Jews, who before that period, were entirely unacquainted with letters and philosophy. We may, farther, rank among the causes that contributed to corrupt the religion and manners of the Jews, their voyages into the adjacent countries, especially Egypt and Phœnicia, in pursuit of wealth; for, with the treasures of those corrupt and superstitious nations, they brought home also their pernicious errors, and their idle fictions, which were imperceptibly blended with their religious system. Nor ought we to omit, in this enumeration, the pestilential influence of the wicked reigns of Herod and his sons, and the enormous instances of idolatry, error, and licentiousness, which this unhappy people had constantly before their eyes in the religion and manners of the Roman governors and soldiers, which, no doubt, contributed much to the progress of their national superstition and corruption of manners. We might add here many other facts and circumstances, to illustrate more fully the matter under consideration; but these will be readily suggested to such as have the least acquaintance with the Jewish history from the time of the Maccabees.

XVI. It is indeed worthy of observation, that, corrupted as the Jews were with the errors and superstitions of the

[a] The principal writers, who have given accounts of the Therapeutæ, are mentioned by Jo. Albert Fabricius, in the fourth chapter of his Lux Salutaris Evangelii toto orbe exoriens.

[b] Matt. xxiii. 13—30.

[c] Matt. x. 6; xv. 24. John ix. 39.

[d] See Joh. Chr. Wolf. Biblioth. Ebraica, vol. ii. lib. vii. cap. i. sect. ix.

[e] See the learned work of Spencer, De Legibus Hebræorum, in the fourth book of which he treats expressly of those Hebrew rites which were borrowed from the Gentile worship.

[f] See Gale's observations on Jamblichus, de Mysteriis Ægyptiorum, p. 206. Josephus acknowledges the same thing in his Jewish Antiquities, book iii. chap. vii. sect. 2.

neighbouring nations, they still preserved a zealous attachment to the law of Moses, and were exceedingly careful that it should not suffer any diminution of its credit, or lose the least degree of the veneration due to its divine authority. Hence synagogues were erected throughout the province of Judea, in which the people assembled for the purposes of divine worship, and to hear their doctors interpret and explain the holy scriptures. There were besides, in the more populous towns, public schools, in which learned men were appointed to instruct the youth in the knowledge of divine things, and also in other branches of science.[a] And it is beyond all doubt, that these institutions contributed to maintain the law in its primitive authority, and to stem the torrent of abounding iniquity.

XVII. The Samaritans, who celebrated divine worship in the temple that was built on mount Gerizim, lay under the burthen of the same evils that oppressed the Jews, with whom they lived in the bitterest enmity, and were also, like them, highly instrumental in increasing their own calamities. We learn from the most authentic histories of those times, that the Samaritans suffered as much as the Jews, from troubles and divisions fomented by the intrigues of factious spirits, though their religious sects were yet less numerous than those of the latter. Their religion, also, was much more corrupted than that of the Jews, as Christ himself declares in his conversation with the woman of Samaria, though it appears, at the same time, that their notions concerning the offices and ministry of the Messiah, were much more just and conformable to truth, than those which were entertained at Jerusalem.[b] Upon the whole, it is certain that the Samaritans mixed the profane errors of the Gentiles with the sacred doctrines of the Jews, and were excessively corrupted by the idolatrous customs of the pagan nations.[c]

XVIII. The Jews multiplied so prodigiously, that the narrow bounds of Palestine were no longer sufficient to contain them. They poured, therefore, their increasing numbers into the neighbouring countries with such rapidity, that, at the time of Christ's birth, there was scarcely a province in the empire, where they were not found carrying on commerce and exercising other lucrative arts. They were maintained, in foreign countries, against injurious treatment and violence, by the special edicts and protection of the magistrates;[d] and this, indeed, was absolutely necessary, since, in most places, the remarkable difference in their religion and manners, from those of the other nations, exposed them to the hatred and indignation of the ignorant and bigoted multitude. All this appears to have been most singularly and wisely directed by the adorable hand of an interposing Providence, to the end that this people, which was the sole depository of the true religion, and of the knowledge of one Supreme God, being spread abroad through the whole earth, might be every where, by the force of example, a reproach to superstition, might contribute in some measure to check it, and thus prepare the way for that yet fuller discovery of divine truth, which was to shine upon the world from the ministry and Gospel of the Son of God.

CHAPTER III.

Concerning the Life and Actions of JESUS CHRIST.

I. THE errors and disorders that we have now been considering, required something far above human wisdom and power to dispel and remove them, and to deliver mankind from the miserable state to which they were reduced by them. Therefore, towards the conclusion of the reign of Herod the Great, the Son of God descended upon earth, and, assuming the human nature, appeared to men under the sublime characters of an infallible teacher, an all-sufficient mediator, and a spiritual and immortal king. The place of his birth was Bethlehem, in Palestine. The year in which it happened, has not hitherto been ascertained, notwithstanding the deep and laborious researches of the learned. There is nothing surprising in this, when we consider that the first Christians laboured under the same difficulties, and were divided in their opinions concerning the time of Christ's birth.[e] That which appears most probable, is, that it happened about a year and six months before the death of Herod, in the year of Rome 748 or 749.[f] The uncertainty, however, of this point, is of no great consequence. We know that the Sun of Righteousness has shined upon the world; and though we cannot fix the precise period in which he arose, this will not preclude us from enjoying the direction and influence of his vital and salutary beams.

II. Four inspired writers, who have transmitted to us an account of the life and actions of Jesus Christ, mention particularly his birth, lineage, family, and parents; but they say very little respecting his infancy and his early youth. Not long after his birth, he was conducted by his parents into Egypt, that he might be out of the reach of Herod's cruelty.[g] At the age of twelve years, he disputed in the temple, with the most learned of the Jewish doctors, concerning the sublime truths of religion; and the rest of his life, until the thirtieth year of his age, was spent in the obscurity of a private condition, and consecrated to the duties of filial obedience.[h] This is all that the wisdom of God hath permitted us to know, with certainty, of Christ, before he entered upon his public ministry; nor is the story of his having followed the trade of his adoptive father Joseph built upon any sure foundation.

[a] See Camp. Vitringa. de Synagoga vetere, lib. iii. cap. v. and lib. i. cap. v. vii.

[b] Christ insinuates, on the contrary, in the strongest manner, the superiority of the Jewish worship to that of the Samaritans, John iv. 22. See also, on this head, 2 Kings xvii. 29. The passage to which Dr. Mosheim refers, as a proof that the Samaritans had juster notions of the Messiah than the Jews, is the 25th verse of the chapter of St. John already cited, where the woman of Samaria says to Jesus, "I know that Messiah cometh, which is called Christ; when he is come, he will tell us all things." But this passage seems much too vague to justify the conclusion of our learned historian. Besides, the confession of one person who may possibly have had some singular and extraordinary advantages, is not a proof that the nation in general entertained the same sentiments, especially since we know that the Samaritans had corrupted the service of God by a profane mixture of the grossest idolatries.

[c] Those who desire an exact account of the principal authors who have written concerning the Samaritans, will find it in the learned work of Jo. Gottlob Carpzovius, entitled, Critica S. Vet. Testam. part ii. cap. iv.

[d] See the account published at Leyden, in 1712, by James Gronovius, of the Roman and Asiatic edicts in favour of the Jews, allowing them the free and secure exercise of their religion in all the cities of Asia Minor.

[e] The learned John Albert Fabricius has collected all the opinions of the learned, concerning the year of Christ's birth, in his Bibliograph. Antiquar. cap. vii. sect. x.

[f] Matt. iii. 2, &c. John i. 22, &c.

[g] Matt. ii. 13.

[h] Luke ii. 51, 52.

There have been, indeed, several writers, who, either through the levity of a wanton imagination, or with a view of exciting the admiration of the multitude, have invented a series of the most extravagant and ridiculous fables, in order to give an account of this obscure part of the Saviour's life.[a]

III. Jesus began his public ministry in the thirtieth year of his age; and, to render it more solemn and affecting to the Jews, a man, whose name was John, the Son of a Jewish priest, a person of great gravity also, and much respected on account of the austere dignity of his life and manners, was commanded by God to proclaim to the people the coming of the long promised Messiah, of whom this extraordinary man called himself the forerunner. Filled with a holy zeal and a divine fervour, he cried aloud to the Jews, exhorting them to depart from their transgressions, and to purify their hearts, that they might thus partake of the blessings which the Son of God was now come to offer to the world. The exhortations of this respectable messenger were not without effect; and those who, moved by his solemn admonitions, had formed the resolution of correcting their evil dispositions, and amending their lives, were initiated into the kingdom of the Redeemer by the ceremony of immersion, or baptism.[b] Christ himself, before he began his ministry, desired to be solemnly baptized by John in the waters of Jordan, that he might not, in any point, neglect to answer the demands of the Jewish law.

IV. It is not necessary to enter here into a detail of the life and actions of Jesus Christ. All Christians must be perfectly acquainted with them. They must know, that, during the space of three years, and amidst the deepest trials of affliction and distress, he instructed the Jewish nation in the will and counsels of the Most High, and omitted nothing in the course of his ministry, that could contribute either to gain the multitude or to charm the wise. Every one knows, that his life was a continued scene of perfect sanctity, of the purest and most active virtue; not only without spot, but also beyond the reach of suspicion; and it is also well known, that by miracles of the most stupendous kind, and not more stupendous than salutary and beneficent, he displayed to the universe the truth of that religion which he brought with him from above, and demonstrated in the most illustrious manner the reality of his divine commission.

V. As this system of religion was to be propagated to the extremities of the earth, it was necessary that Christ should choose a certain number of persons to accompany him constantly through the whole course of his ministry; that thus they might be faithful and respectable witnesses of the sanctity of his life, and the grandeur of his miracles, to the remotest nations; and also transmit to the latest posterity a genuine account of his sublime doctrines, and of the nature and end of the Gospel dispensation. Therefore Jesus chose, out of the multitude that attended his discourses, twelve persons whom he separated from the rest by the name of *Apostles*. These men were illiterate, poor and of mean extraction; and such alone were truly proper to answer his views. He avoided making use of the ministry of persons endowed with the advantages of fortune and birth, or enriched with the treasures of eloquence and learning, lest the fruits of this embassy, and the progress of the Gospel, should be attributed to human and natural causes.[c] These apostles were sent but once to preach to the Jews during the life of Christ.[d] He chose to keep them about his own person, that they might be thoroughly instructed in the affairs of his kingdom. That the multitude, however, might not be destitute of teachers to enlighten them with the knowledge of the truth, Christ appointed seventy disciples to preach the glad tidings of eternal life throughout the whole province of Judea.[e]

VI. The researches of the learned have been employed to find out the reason of Christ's fixing the number of the apostles to twelve, and that of the disciples to seventy; and various conjectures have been applied to the solution of this question. But since it is manifest from his own words,[f] that he intended the number of the twelve apostles as an allusion to that of the tribes of Israel, it can scarcely be doubted, that he was willing to insinuate by this appointment that he was the supreme lord and high-priest of the twelve tribes into which the Jewish nation was divided; and, as the number of disciples answers evidently to that of the senators, of whom the council of the people (or the sanhedrim) was composed, there is a high degree of probability in the conjecture of those, who think that Christ, by the choice of the seventy, designed to admonish the Jews that the authority of their sanhedrim was now at an end, and that all power, with respect to religious matters, was vested in him alone.

VII. The ministry of Jesus was confined to the Jews; nor, while he remained upon earth, did he permit his apostles or disciples to extend their labours beyond this distinguished nation.[g] At the same time, if we consider the illustrious acts of mercy and omnipotence that were performed by Christ, it will be natural to conclude that his fame must have been very soon spread abroad in other countries. We learn from writers of nó small note, that Abgarus, king of Edessa, being seized with a severe and dangerous illness, wrote to our blessed Lord to implore his assistance; and that Jesus not only sent him a gracious answer, but also accompanied it with his picture, as a mark of his esteem for that pious prince.[h] These letters, it is said, are still extant. But they are justly looked upon as fictitious by most writers, who also go yet farther, and treat the whole story of Abgarus as entirely fabulous, and unworthy of credit.[i] I will not pretend to assert the genuineness of these letters; but I see no reason of sufficient weight to destroy the credibility of that story which is supposed to have given occasion to them.[k]

VIII. A great number of the Jews, influenced by those illustrious marks of a divine authority and power, which shone forth in the ministry and actions of Christ, regarded

[a] See the account which the above mentioned Albert Fabricius has given of these romantic triflers, in his Codex Apocryphus Novi Testamenti, tom. i.

[b] Matt. iii. 6. John i. 22.

[c] 1 Cor. i. 21. [d] Matt. x. 7. [e] Luke x. i.

[f] Matt. xix. 28. Luke xxii. 30.

[g] Matt. x. 5, 6; xv. 24.

[h] Euseb. Hist. Eccl. lib. i. xiii.—Jo. Albert Fabric. Codex Apocryphus N. T. tom. i. p. 317.

[i] See Basnage, Histoire des Juifs, vol. i. cap. xviii.—also Theoph. Sigef. Bayerus, Historia Edessena et Osroena, lib. iii.—Jos. Simon Assemanus, Biblioth. Oriental. Clement. Vatican. tom. i.

[k] There is no author who has discussed this question (concerning the authenticity of the letters of Christ and Abgarus, and the truth of the whole story) with such learning and judgment, as the late Mr. Jones, in the second volume of his excellent work, entitled, A New and Full Method of settling the Canonical Authority of the New Testament. Notwithstanding the opinions of such celebrated names, as Parker, Cave,

nim as the Son of God, the true Messiah. The rulers of the people, and more especially the chief priests and Pharisees, whose licentiousness and hypocrisy he censured with a noble and generous freedom, laboured with success, by the help of their passions, to extinguish in their breasts the conviction of his celestial mission; or at least, to suppress the effects it was adapted to produce upon their conduct. Fearing also that his ministry might tend to diminish their credit, and to deprive them of the advantages they derived from the impious abuse of their authority in religious matters, they laid snares for his life, which, for a considerable time, were without effect. They succeeded, at length, by the infernal treason of an apostate disciple, by the treachery of Judas, who discovering the retreat which his divine master had chosen for the purposes of meditation and repose, delivered him into the merciless hands of a brutal soldiery.

IX. In consequence of this, Jesus was produced as a criminal before the Jewish high-priest and sanhedrim, being accused of having violated the law, and blasphemed the majesty of God. Dragged thence to the tribunal of Pilate the Roman prætor, he was charged with seditious enterprises, and with treason against Cæsar. Both these accusations were so evidently false, and destitute even of every appearance of truth, that they must have been rejected by any judge, who acted upon the principles of common equity. But the clamours of an enraged populace, inflamed by the impious instigations of their priests and rulers, intimidated Pilate, and engaged him, though with the utmost reluctance, and in opposition to the dictates of his conscience, to pronounce a capital sentence against Christ. The Redeemer of mankind behaved with inexpressible dignity under this heavy trial. As the end of his mission was to make expiation for the sins of men, so when all things were ready, and when he had finished the work of his glorious ministry, he placidly submitted to the death of the cross, and, with a serene and voluntary resignation, committed his spirit into the hands of the Father.

X. After Jesus had remained three days in the sepulchre, he resumed that life which he had voluntarily laid down; and, rising from the dead, declared to the universe, by that triumphant act, that the divine justice was satisfied, and the paths of salvation and immortality were rendered accessible to the human race. He conversed with his disciples during forty days after his resurrection, and employed that time in instructing them more fully with regard to the nature of his kingdom. Many wise and important reasons prevented his showing himself publicly at Jerusalem, to confound the malignity and unbelief of his enemies. He contented himself with manifesting the certainty of his glorious resurrection to a sufficient number of faithful and credible witnesses, being aware that, if he should appear in public, those malicious unbelievers, who had formerly attributed his miracles to the power of magic, would represent his resurrection as a phantom, or vision, produced by the influence of infernal powers. After having remained upon earth during the space of time above mentioned, and given to his disciples a divine commission to preach the glad tidings of salvation and immortality to the human race, he ascended into heaven, in their presence, and resumed the enjoyment of that glory which he had possessed before the worlds were created.

CHAPTER IV.

Concerning the prosperous Events that happened to the Church during this Century.

I. JESUS, having ascended into heaven, soon showed the afflicted disciples, that, though invisible to mortal eyes, he was still their omnipotent protector, and their benevolent guide. About fifty days after his departure from them he gave them the first proof of that majesty and power to which he was exalted, by the effusion of the Holy Ghost upon them according to his promise.[a] The consequences of this grand event were surprising and glorious, infinitely honourable to the Christian religion, and the divine mission of its triumphant author. For no sooner had the apostles received this precious gift, this celestial guide, than their ignorance was turned into light, their doubts into certainty, their fears into a firm and invincible fortitude, and their former backwardness into an ardent and inextinguishable zeal, which led them to undertake their sacred office with the utmost intrepidity and alacrity of mind. This marvellous event was attended with a variety of gifts; particularly the gift of tongues, so indispensably necessary to qualify the apostles to preach the Gospel to the different nations. These holy apostles were also filled with a perfect persuasion, founded on Christ's express promise, that the Divine presence would perpetually accompany them, and show itself by miraculous interpositions, as often as the state of their ministry should render this necessary.

II. Relying upon these celestial succours, the apostles began their glorious ministry, by preaching the Gospel, according to Christ's positive command, first to the Jews, and by endeavouring to bring that deluded people to the knowledge of the truth.[b] Nor were their labours unsuccessful, since, in a very short time, many thousands were converted, by the influence of their ministry, to the Christian faith.[c] From the Jews, they passed to the Samaritans, to whom they preached with such efficacy, that great numbers of that nation acknowledged the Messiah.[d] And, when they had exercised their ministry, during several years, at Jerusalem, and brought to a sufficient degree of consistence and maturity the Christian churches which were founded in Palestine and the adjacent countries, they extended their views, carried the divine lamp of the Gospel to all the nations of the world, and saw their labours crowned almost every where, with the most abundant fruits.

III. No sooner was Christ exalted in the heavens, than

and Grabe, in favour of these letters, and the history to which they relate, Mr. Jones has offered reasons to prove the whole fictitious, which seem unanswerable, independent of the authorities of Rivet, Chemnitius, Walther, Simon, Du-Pin, Wake, Spanheim, Fabricius, and Le Clerc, which he opposes to the three above mentioned. It is remarkable that the story is not mentioned by any writer before Eusebius; that it is little noticed by succeeding authors; that the whole affair was unknown to Christ's apostles, and to the Christians, their contemporaries, as is manifest from the early disputes about the method of receiving Gentile converts into the church, which this story, had it been true must have entirely decided. As to the letters, no doubt can be made of their spuriousness, since, if Christ had written a letter to Abgarus, it would have been a part of sacred Scripture, and would have been placed at the head of all the books of the New Testament. See Lardner's Collection of Ancient Jewish and Heathen Testimonies, vol. i. p. 297, &c. It must be observed in behalf of Eusebius, that he relates this story as drawn from the archives of Edessa.

[a] Acts ii. 1, &c.
[b] Luke xxiv. 47. Acts i. 8; xiii. 46.
[c] Acts ii. 41; iv. 4. [d] Acts i. 8; viii. 14.

the apostles determined to render their number complete, as it had been fixed by their divine Master, and accordingly to choose in the place of Judas, who had desperately perished by his own hands, a man endowed with such degrees of sanctity and wisdom, as were necessary in a station of such high importance. When therefore they had assembled the Christians who were then at Jerusalem, two men remarkable for their piety and faith, were proposed as the most worthy to stand candidates for this sacred office. These men were Matthias and Barnabas, the former of whom was, either by lot, (which is the most general opinion,) or by a plurality of voices of the assembly there present, chosen to the dignity of an apostle.[a]

IV. All these apostles were men without education, and absolutely ignorant of letters and philosophy; and yet in the infancy of the Christian church, it was necessary that there should be at least, some one defender of the Gospel, who, versed in the learned arts, might be able to combat the Jewish doctors and the pagan philosophers with their own arms. For this purpose, Jesus himself, by an extraordinary voice from heaven, called to his service a thirteenth apostle, whose name was Saul (afterwards Paul,) and whose acquaintance both with Jewish and Grecian learning was very considerable.[b] This extraordinary man, who had been one of the most virulent enemies of the Christians, became their most glorious and triumphant defender. Independently of the miraculous gifts with which he was enriched, he possessed an invincible courage, an amazing force of genius, and a spirit of patience, which no fatigue could overcome, and which no sufferings or trials could exhaust. To these the cause of the Gospel, under the divine appointment, owed a considerable part of its rapid progress and surprising success, as the Acts of the Apostles, and the Epistles of St. Paul, abundantly testify.

V. The first Christian church, founded by the apostles, was that of Jerusalem, the model of all those which were afterwards erected during the first century. This church was, indeed, governed by the apostles themselves, to whom both the elders, and those who were entrusted with the care of the poor, even the deacons, were subject. The people, though they had not abandoned the Jewish worship, held, however, separate assemblies, in which they were instructed by the apostles and elders, prayed together, celebrated the holy Supper in remembrance of Christ, of his death and sufferings, and the salvation offered to mankind through him; and at the conclusion of these meetings, they testified their mutual love, partly by their liberality to the poor, and partly by sober and friendly repasts,[c] which thence were called *feasts of charity*. Among the virtues which distinguished the rising church in this its infancy, that of charity to the poor and needy shone in the first rank, and with the brightest lustre. The rich supplied the wants of their indigent brethren with such liberality and readiness, that, as St. Luke tells us, among the primitive disciples of Christ, all things were *in common*.[d] This expression has, however, been greatly abused, and has been made to signify a *community of rights, goods, or possessions*, than which interpretation nothing is more groundless or more false; for, from a multitude of reasons, as well as from the express words of St. Peter,[e] it is abundantly manifest that the community, which is implied in mutual *use* and mutual liberality, is the only thing intended in this passage.[f]

VI. The apostles, having finished their work at Jerusalem, went to diffuse their labours among other nations, visited with that intent a great part of the known world, and in a short time planted a vast number of churches among the Gentiles. Several of these are mentioned in the sacred writings, particularly in the *Acts of the Apostles*;[g] though these are, undoubtedly, only a small part of the churches which were founded, either by the apostles themselves, or by their disciples under their immediate direction. The distance of time, and the want of records, leave us at a loss with respect to many interesting circumstances of the peregrinations of the apostles; nor have we any certain or precise accounts of the limits of their voyages, of the particular countries where they sojourned, or of the times and places in which they finished their glorious course. The stories that are told concerning their arrival and exploits among the Gauls, Britons, Spaniards, Germans, Americans, Chinese, Indians, and Russians, are too romantic in their nature, and of too recent a date, to be received by an impartial inquirer after truth. The greatest part of these fables were forged after the time of Charlemagne, when most of the Christian churches contended about the antiquity of their origin with as much vehemence as the Arcadians, Egyptians, Greeks, and other nations, disputed formerly about their seniority and precedence.

VII. At the same time, the beauty and excellence of the Christian religion excited the admiration of the reflecting part of mankind, wherever the apostles directed their course. Many, who were not willing to adopt the whole of its doctrines, were, nevertheless, as appears from undoubted records, so struck with the account of Christ's life and actions, and so charmed with the sublime purity of his precepts, that they ranked him in the number of the greatest heroes, or even among the gods themselves. Great numbers kept with the utmost care, in their houses, pictures or images of the divine Redeemer and his apostles, which they treated with the highest marks of veneration and respect.[h] And so illustrious was the fame of his power after his resurrection, and of the miraculous gifts shed upon his apostles, that the emperor Tiberius is said to have proposed his being enrolled among the gods of Rome, which the opposition of the senate prevented from taking effect. Many have doubted of the truth of this story: there are, however, several authors of the first note who have declared, that the reasons allèged for its truth are such as have removed their doubts, and appeared to them satisfactory and conclusive.[i]

---

[a] Acts i. 26. [b] Acts ix. 1. [c] Acts ii. 42. [d] Acts ii. 44; iv. 32.
[e] Acts v. 4.

[f] This is proved with the strongest evidence by Dr. Mosheim, in a dissertation concerning the true nature of that community of goods, which is said to have taken place in the church of Jerusalem. This learned discourse is to be found in the second volume of our author's incomparable work, entitled, Dissertationes ad Historiam Ecclesiasticam pertinentes.

[g] The names of the churches planted by the apostles in different countries, are specified in a work of Phil. James Hartman, de rebus gestis Christianorum sub Apostolis, cap. vii. and also in that of F. Albert Fabricius, entitled, Lux Evangelii toti orbi exoriens, cap. v.

[h] This is particularly mentioned by Eusebius, Hist. Eccl. lib. vii. cap. xviii. and by Irenæus, lib. i. c. xxv.

[i] See Theod. Hasæus, de decreto Tiberii, quo Christum referre voluit in numerum Deorum; as also a very learned letter, written in defence of the truth of this fact, by the celebrated Christopher Ielius, and published in the Bibliotheque Germanique, tom. xxxii. [We may add to this note of Dr. Mosheim, that the late learned professor Altmann published at Bern, in 1755, an ingenious pamphlet on this subject, enti-

VIII. When we consider the rapid progress of Christianity among the Gentile nations, and the poor and feeble instruments by which this great and amazing event was immediately effected, we must naturally have recourse to an omnipotent and invisible hand, as its true and proper cause. For, unless we suppose here a divine interposition, how was it possible that men, destitute of all human aid, without credit or riches, learning or eloquence, could, in so short a time, persuade a considerable part of mankind to abandon the religion of their ancestors? How was it possible, that a handful of apostles, who, as fishermen and publicans, must have been contemned by their own nation, and as Jews, must have been odious to all others, could engage the learned and the mighty, as well as the simple and those of low degree, to forsake their favourite prejudices, and to embrace a new religion which was an enemy to their corrupt passions? And, indeed, there were undoubted marks of a celestial power perpetually attending their ministry. Their very language possessed an incredible energy, an amazing power of sending light into the understanding and conviction into the heart. To this were added, the commanding influence of stupendous miracles, the foretelling of future events, the power of discerning the secret thoughts and intentions of the heart, a magnanimity superior to all difficulties, a contempt of riches and honours, a serene tranquillity in the face of death, and an invincible patience under torments still more dreadful than death itself; and all this accompanied with lives free from stain, and adorned with the constant practice of sublime virtue. Thus were the messengers of Christ, the heralds of his spiritual and immortal kingdom, furnished for their glorious work, as the unanimous voice of ancient history so loudly testifies. The event sufficiently declares this; for, without these remarkable and extraordinary circumstances no rational account can be given of the rapid propagation of the Gospel throughout the world.

IX. What indeed contributed still farther to this glorious event, was the power vested in the apostles of transmitting to their disciples these miraculous gifts; for many of the first Christians were no sooner baptized according to Christ's appointment, and dedicated to the service of God by solemn prayer and the imposition of hands, than they spoke languages which they had never known or learned before, foretold future events, healed the sick by pronouncing the name of Jesus, restored the dead to life, and performed many things above the reach of human power.[a] And it is no wonder if men, who had the power of communicating to others these marvellous gifts, appeared great and respectable, wherever they exercised their glorious ministry.

X. Such then were the true causes of that amazing rapidity with which the Christian religion spread itself upon the earth; and those who pretend to assign other reasons of this surprising event, indulge themselves in idle fictions, which must disgust every attentive observer of men and things. In vain, therefore, have some imagined, that the extraordinary liberality of the Christians to their poor, was a temptation to the more indolent and corrupt part of the multitude to embrace the Gospel. Such malignant and superficial reasoners do not consider, that those who embraced this divine religion exposed their lives to great danger; nor have they attention enough to recollect, that neither lazy nor vicious members were suffered to remain in the society of Christians. Equally vain is the fancy of those, who imagine, that the profligate lives of the Heathen priests occasioned the conversion of many to Christianity; for, though this might indeed give them a disgust to the religion of those unworthy ministers, yet it could not, alone, attach them to that of Jesus, which offered them from the world no other prospects than those of poverty, infamy, and death. The person who could embrace the Gospel, solely from the motive now mentioned, must have reasoned in this senseless and extravagant manner: "The ministers of that religion which I have professed from my infancy, lead profligate lives: therefore, I will become a Christian, join myself to that body of men who are condemned by the laws of the state, and thus expose my life and fortune to the most imminent danger."

CHAPTER V.

Concerning the calamitous Events that happened to the Church.

I. THE innocence and virtue that distinguished so eminently the lives of Christ's servants, and the spotless purity of the doctrine they taught, were not sufficient to defend them against the virulence and malignity of the Jews. The priests and rulers of that abandoned people, not only loaded with injuries and reproaches the apostles of Jesus, and their disciples, but condemned as many of them as they could to death, and executed in the most irregular and barbarous manner their sanguinary decrees. The murder of Stephen, of James the Son of Zebedee, and of James, surnamed the Just, bishop of Jerusalem, furnish dreadful examples of the truth of what we here advance.[b] This odious malignity of the Jewish doctors, against the heralds of the Gospel, undoubtedly orginated in a secret apprehension that the progress of Christianity would destroy the credit of Judaism, and lead to the abolition of their pompous ceremonies.

II. The Jews who lived out of Palestine, in the Roman provinces, did not yield to those of Jerusalem in point of cruelty to the innocent disciples of Christ. We learn from the history of the Acts of the Apostles, and other records of unquestionable authority, that they spared no labour, but zealously seized every occasion of animating the magistrates against the Christians, and instigating the multitude to demand their destruction. The high priest of the nation, and the Jews who dwelt in Palestine, were instru-

tled, Disquisito Historico-critica de Epistola Pontii Pilati ad Tiberium, qua Christi Miracula, Mors, et Resurrectio, recensebantur. This author makes it appear, that though the letter, which some have attributed to Pilate, and which is extant in several authors, be manifestly spurious, yet it is no less certain, that Pilate sent to Tiberius an account of the death and resurrection of Christ. See the Biblioth. des Sciences et des beaux Arts, published at the Hague, tome vi. This matter has been examined with his usual diligence and accuracy by the learned Dr. Lardner, in the third volume of his Collection of Jewish and Heathen Testimonies to the truth of the Christian Religion. He thinks that the testimonies of Justin Martyr and Tertullian, who, in apologies for Christianity, presented or at least addressed to the emperor and senate of Rome, or to magistrates of high authority in the empire, affirm, that Pilate sent to Tiberius an account of the death and resurrection of Christ, deserve some regard; though some writers, and particularly Orosius, have made such alterations and additions in the original narration of Tertullian, as tend to diminish the credibility of the whole.]

[a] See Pfanner's learned treatise, De Charismatibus sive Donis miraculosis antiquæ Ecclesiæ, published at Francfort, 1683.

[b] The martyrdom of Stephen is recorded in the Acts of the Apostles,

mental in exciting the rage of these foreign Jews against the infant church, by sending messengers to exhort them, not only to avoid all intercourse with the Christians, but also to persecute them in the most vehement manner.[a] For this inhuman order, they endeavoured to find out the most plausible pretexts; and, therefore, they gave out, that the Christians were enemies to the Roman emperor, since they acknowledged the authority of a certain person whose name was Jesus, whom Pilate had punished capitally as a malefactor by a most righteous sentence, and on whom, nevertheless, they conferred the royal dignity. These perfidious insinuations had the intended effect, and the rage of the Jews against the Christians was conveyed from father to son, from age to age; so that the church of Christ had, in no period, more bitter and desperate enemies than the very people, to whom the immortal Saviour was more especially sent.

III. The Supreme Judge of the world did not suffer the barbarous conduct of this perfidious nation to go unpunished. The most signal marks of divine justice pursued them; and the cruelties which they had exercised upon Christ and his disciples, were dreadfully avenged. The God, who had for so many ages protected the Jews with an outstretched arm, withdrew his aid. He permitted Jerusalem, with its famous temple, to be destroyed by Vespasian and his son Titus, an innumerable multitude of this devoted people to perish by the sword, and the greatest part of those that remained to groan under the yoke of a severe bondage. Nothing can be more affecting than the account of this terrible event, and the circumstantial description of the tremendous calamities which attended it, as they are given by Josephus, himself a Jew, and also a spectator of this horrid scene. From this period the Jews experienced, in every place, the hatred and contempt of the Gentile nations, still more than they had formerly done; and in these their calamities, the predictions of Christ were amply fulfilled, and his divine mission farther illustrated.

IV. However virulent the Jews were against the Christians, yet, on many occasions, they wanted power to execute their cruel purposes. This was not the case with the heathen nations; and, therefore, from them the Christians suffered the severest calamities. The Romans are said to have pursued the Christians with the utmost violence in ten persecutions;[b] but this number is not verified by the ancient history of the church; for if, by these persecutions, such only are meant as were extremely severe and universal throughout the empire, then it is certain, that these amount not to the number above mentioned; and, if we take the provincial and less remarkable persecutions into the account, they far exceed it. In the fifth century, certain Christians were led by some passages of the Scriptures, and by one especially in the Revelations,[c] to imagine that the church was to suffer ten calamities of a most grievous nature. To this notion, therefore, they endeavoured, though not all in the same way, to accommodate the language of history, even against the testimony of those ancient records, from which alone history can speak with authority.[d]

V. Nero was the first emperor who enacted laws against the Christians. In this he was followed by Domitian Marcus Antoninus the philosopher, Severus, and the other emperors who indulged the prejudices they had imbibed against the disciples of Jesus. All the edicts of these different princes were not, however, equally unjust, nor framed with the same views, or for the same reasons. Were they now extant as they were collected by the celebrated lawyer Domitius, in his book concerning the duty of a proconsul, they would undoubtedly cast a great light upon the history of the church, under the persecuting emperors.[e] At present, we must, in many cases, be satisfied with probable conjectures, for want of certain evidence.

VI. Before we proceed in this part of our history, a very natural curiosity calls us to inquire, how it happened that the Romans, who were troublesome to no nation on account of its religion, and who suffered even the Jews to live under their own laws, and follow their own method of worship, treated the Christians alone with such severity. This important question seems still more difficult to be solved, when we consider, that the excellent nature of the Christian religion, and its admirable tendency to promote both the public welfare of the state, and the private felicity of the individual, entitled it, in a singular manner, to the favour and protection of the reigning powers. A principal reason of the severity with which the Romans persecuted the Christians, notwithstanding these considerations, seems to have been the abhorrence and contempt felt by the latter for the religion of the empire, which was so intimately connected with the form, and indeed, with the very essence of its political constitution; for, though the Romans gave an unlimited toleration to all religions which had nothing in their tenets dangerous to the commonwealth, yet they would not permit that of their ancestors, which was established by the laws of the state, to be turned into derision, nor the people to be drawn away from their attachment to it. These, however, were the two things which the Christians were charged with, and that justly, though to their honour. They dared to ridicule the absurdities of the pagan superstition, and they were ardent and assiduous in gaining proselytes to the truth. Nor did they only attack the religion of Rome, but also all the different shapes and forms under which superstition appeared in the various countries where they exercised their ministry. Hence the Romans concluded, that the Christian sect was not only insupportably daring and arrogant, but, moreover, an enemy to the public tranquillity, and ever ready to excite civil wars and commotions in the empire. It is probably on this account, that Tacitus reproaches them with the odious character of *haters of mankind*,[f] and styles the religion of Jesus a *destructive superstition;* and that Suetonius speaks of the Christians, and their doctrine, in terms of the same kind.[g]

vii. 55; and that of James the son of Zebedee, Acts xii. 1, 2; that of James the Just is mentioned by Josephus in his Jewish Antiquities, book xx. chap. viii. and by Eusebius, in his Eccles. History, book ii. chap. xxiii.

[a] See the Dialogue of Justin Martyr, with Trypho the Jew.

[b] The learned J. Albert Fabricius has given us a list of the authors who have written concerning these persecutions, in his Lux Evangelii toti Orbi exoriens, cap. vii.

[c] Rev. xvii. 14.

[d] See Sulpitius Severus, book ii. ch. xxxiii. as also Augustin, de Civitate Dei, book xviii. ch. lii.

[e] The collection of the imperial edicts against the Christians, made by Domitius, and now lost, is mentioned by Lactantius, in his Divine Institutes, book v. chap. xi. Such of these edicts as have escaped the ruins of time, are learnedly illustrated by Franc. Balduinus, in his Comment. ad Edicta veterum Principum Romanorum de Christianis

[f] Annal. lib. xv. cap. xliv.

[g] In Nerone, cap. xvi. These odious epithets, which Tacitus gives to the Christians and their religion, as likewise the language of Suetonius, who calls Christianity a *poisonous or malignant superstition* (*male-*

VII. Another circumstance that irritated the Romans against the Christians, was the simplicity of their worship, which resembled in nothing the sacred rites of any other people. They had no sacrifices, temples, images, oracles, or sacerdotal orders; and this was sufficient to bring upon them the reproaches of an ignorant multitude, who imagined that there could be no religion without these. Thus they were looked upon as a sort of atheists; and, by the Roman laws, those who were chargeable with atheism were declared the pests of human society. But this was not all: the sordid interests of a multitude of lazy and selfish priests were immediately connected with the ruin and oppression of the Christian cause. The public worship of such an immense number of deities was a source of subsistence, and even of riches, to the whole rabble of priests and augurs, and also to a multitude of merchants and artists. And, as the progress of the gospel threatened the ruin of that religious traffic, this consideration raised up new enemies to the Christians, and armed the rage of mercenary superstition against their lives and their cause.[a]

VIII. To accomplish more speedily the ruin of the Christians, all those persons whose interests were incompatible with the progress of the gospel, loaded them with the most opprobrious calumnies, which were too easily received as truth, by the credulous and unthinking multitude, among whom they were dispersed with the utmost industry. We find a sufficient account of these perfidious and ill-grounded reproaches in the writings of the first defenders of the Christian cause.[b] And these, indeed, were the only arms the assailants had to oppose the truth, since the excellence of the Gospel, and the virtue of its ministers and followers, left to its enemies no resources but calumny and persecution. Nothing can be imagined, in point of virulence and fury, that they did not employ for the ruin of the Christians. They even went so far as to persuade the multitude, that all the calamities, wars, tempests, and diseases that afflicted mankind, were judgments sent down by the angry gods, because the Christians, who contemned their authority, were suffered in the empire.[c]

IX. The various kinds of punishment, both capital and corrective, which were employed against the Christians, are particularly described by learned men who have written professedly on that subject.[d] The forms of proceeding, used in their condemnation, may be seen in the *Acts of the Martyrs*, in the letters of Pliny and Trajan, and other ancient monuments.[e] These judicial forms were very different at different times, and changed, naturally, according to the mildness or severity of the laws enacted by the different emperors against the Christians. Thus, at one time, we observe appearances of the most diligent search after the followers of Christ; at another, we find all perquisition suspended, and positive accusation and information only allowed. Under one reign we see them, on their being proved Christians, or their confessing themselves such, immediately dragged away to execution, unless they prevent their punishment by apostacy; under another, we see inhuman magistrates endeavouring to compel them, by all sorts of tortures, to renounce their religious profession.

X. All who, in the perilous times of the church, fell by the hand of bloody persecution, and expired in the cause of the divine Saviour, were called *martyrs;* a term borrowed from the sacred writings, signifying *witnesses*, and thus expressing the glorious testimony which these magnanimous believers bore to the truth. The title of *confessor* was given to such, as, in the face of death, and at the expense of honours, fortune, and all the other advantages of the world, had confessed with fortitude, before the Roman tribunals, their firm attachment to the religion of Jesus. Great was the veneration that was paid both to martyrs and confessors; and there was, no doubt, as much wisdom as justice in treating with profound respect these Christian heroes, since nothing was more adapted to encourage others to suffer with cheerfulness in the cause of Christ. But, as the best and wisest institutions are generally perverted, by the weakness or corruption of men, from their original purposes, so the authority and privileges granted, in the beginning, to martyrs and confessors, became in process of time, a support to superstition, an incentive to enthusiasm, and a source of innumerable evils and abuses.

XI. The first three or four ages of the church were stained with the blood of martyrs, who suffered for the name of Jesus. The greatness of their number is acknowledged by all who have a competent acquaintance with ancient history, and who have examined that matter with any degree of impartiality. It is true, the learned Dodwell has endeavoured to invalidate this unanimous decision of the ancient historians,[f] and to diminish considerably the number of those who suffered death for the gospel; and, after him, several writers have maintained his opinion, and asserted, that whatever may have been the calamities which the Christians, in general, suffered for their attachment to the Gospel, very few were put to death on that account. This hypothesis has been warmly opposed, as derogating from that divine power which enabled Christians to be faithful even unto death, and a contrary one embraced, which augments prodigiously the number of these heroic sufferers. It will be wise to avoid both these extremes, and to hold the middle path, which certainly leads nearest to the truth. The martyrs were less in number than several of the ancient modern writers have supposed them to be, but much more numerous than Dodwell and his followers are willing to believe; and this medium will be easily admitted by such as have learned from the ancient writers, that, in the darkest and most calamitious times of the church, all Christians were not equally or promiscuously disturbed, or called before the public tribunals. Those who were of the lowest rank of the people, escaped the best; their obscurity, in some measure, screened them from the fury of persecution. The learned and eloquent, the doctors and ministers, and chiefly the rich, for the confiscation of

fica superstitio,) are founded upon the same reasons. A sect, which could not endure, and even laboured to abolish, the religious practices of the Romans, and also those of all the other nations of the universe, appeared to the short-sighted and superficial observers of religious matters, as the determined enemies of mankind.

[a] This observation is verified by the story of Demetrius the silversmith, Acts xix. 25, and by the following passage in the 97th letter of the xth book of Pliny's epistles: "The temples, which were *almost deserted*, begin to be frequented again; and the sacred rites, which have been long neglected, are again performed. The victims, which have had hitherto *few purchasers*, begin to come again to the market," &c.

[b] See the laborious work of Christ. Kortholt, entitled, Paganus Obtrectator, seu de Calumniis Gentilium in Christianos; to which may be added, Jo. Jac. Huldricus, de Calumniis Gentilium in Christianos, published at Zurich in 1744.

[c] See Arnobius contra Gentes.

[d] See for this purpose Ant. Gallonius and Gasp. Sagittarius, de Cruciatibus Martyrum.

[e] See Bohmer, Juris Eccles. Protestant. tom. iv. lib. v. Decretal. tit. 1. sec. 32.

[f] See Dodwell's Dissertation, de Paucitate Martyrum, in his Dissertationes Cyprianicæ.

whose fortunes the rapacious magistrates were perpetually gaping, were the persons most exposed to the dangers of the times.

XII. The actions and sayings of these holy martyrs, from the moment of their imprisonment to their last gasp, were carefully recorded, in order to be read on certain days, and thus proposed as models to future ages. Few, however, of these ancient acts have reached our times;[a] the greatest part of them having been destroyed during that dreadful persecution which Diocletian carried on ten years with such fury against the Christians: for a most diligent search was then made after all their books and papers; and all of them that were found were committed to the flames. From the eighth century downwards, several Greek and Latin writers endeavoured to make up this loss, by compiling, with vast labour, accounts of the lives and actions of the ancient martyrs. But most of them have given us scarcely any thing more than a series of fables, adorned with a profusion of rhetorical flowers and striking images, as the wiser, even among the Romish doctors, frankly acknowledge. Nor are those records, which pass under the name of *martyrology*, worthy of superior credit, since they bear the most evident marks both of ignorance and falsehood; so that, upon the whole, this part of ecclesiastical history, for want of ancient and authentic monuments, is extremely imperfect, and necessarily attended with much obscurity.

XIII. It would have been surprising, if, under such a monster of cruelty as Nero, the Christians had enjoyed the sweets of tranquillity and freedom. This, indeed, was far from being the case; for the perfidious tyrant accused them of having set fire to the city of Rome, that horrid crime which he himself had committed with a barbarous pleasure. In avenging this crime upon the innocent Christians, he ordered matters so, that the punishment should bear some resemblance to the offence. He therefore wrapped up some of them in combustible garments, and ordered fire to be set to them when the darkness came on, that thus, like torches, they might dispel the obscurity of the night: while others were fastened to crosses, or torn to pieces by wild beasts, or put to death in some such dreadful manner. This horrid persecution was set on foot in the month of November,[b] in the 64th year of Christ: and in it, according to some ancient accounts, St. Paul and St. Peter suffered martyrdom, though the latter assertion is contested by many, as being absolutely irreconcilable with chronology.[c] The death of Nero, who perished miserably in the year 68, put an end to the calamities of this first persecution, under which, during the space of four years, the Christians suffered every sort of torment and affliction, which the ingenious cruelty of their enemies could invent.

XIV. Learned men are not entirely agreed with regard to the extent of this persecution under Nero. Some confine it to the city of Rome, while others represent it as having raged through the whole empire. The latter opinion, which is also the more ancient,[d] is undoubtedly to be preferred, as it is certain, that the laws enacted against the Christians were enacted against the whole body, and not against particular churches, and were consequently in force in the remotest provinces. The authority of Tertullian confirms this, who tells us, that Nero and Domitian had enacted laws against the Christians, of which Trajan had, in part, taken away the force, and rendered them, in some measure, without effect.[e] We shall not have recourse for a confirmation of this opinion, to that famous Portuguese or Spanish inscription, in which Nero is praised for having purged that province from the new superstition; since that inscription is justly suspected to be a mere forgery, and the best Spanish authors consider it as such.[f] We may, however, make one observation, which will tend to illustrate the point in question, namely, that since the Christians were condemned by Nero, *not* so much on account of their religion, as for the falsely-imputed crime of burning the city,[g] it is scarcely to be imagined, that he would leave unmolested, even beyond the bounds of Rome, a sect whose members were accused of such an abominable deed.

XV. Though, immediately after the death of Nero, the rage of this first persecution against the Christians ceased, yet the flame broke out anew in the year 93 or 94, under Domitian, a prince little inferior to Nero in wickedness.[h] This persecution was occasioned, if we may give credit to Hegesippus, by Domitian's fear of losing the empire;[i] for he had been informed, that, among the relatives of Christ, a man should arise, who, possessing a turbulent and ambitious spirit, was to excite commotions in the state, and aim at supreme dominion. However that may have been, the persecution renewed by this unworthy prince was extremely violent, though his untimely death soon put a stop to it. Flavius Clemens, a man of consular dignity, and Flavia Domitilla, his niece, or, as some say, his wife, were the principal martyrs that suffered in this persecution, in which also the apostle John was banished to the isle of Patmos. Tertullian and other writers inform us, that, before his banishment, he was thrown into a caldron of boiling oil, from which he came forth, not only living, but even unhurt. This story, however, is not attested in such a manner as to preclude all doubt.[k]

[a] Such of those acts as are worthy of credit have been collected by the learned Ruinart, into one volume in folio, of a moderate size, entitled, Selecta et sincera Martyrum Acta, Amstelod. 1713. The hypothesis of Dodwell is amply refuted in the author's preface.

[b] See for a farther illustration of this point of chronology, two French Dissertations of the very learned Alphonse de Vignoles, concerning the cause and the commencement of the persecution under Nero, which are printed in Masson's Histoire critique de la Republique des Lettres, tom. viii. p. 74—117; tom. ix. p. 172—186. See also Toinard, ad Lactantium de Mortibus Persequut. p. 398.

[c] See Tillemont, Histoire des Empereurs, tom. i. p. 504.—Baratier, de Successione Romanor. Pontif. cap. v.

[d] This opinion was first defended by Franc. Balduin, in his Comm. ad Edicta Imperatorum. Christianos. After him Launoy maintained the same opinion in his Dissert. quâ Sulpitii Severi locus de primâ Martyrum Galliæ Epochâ vindicatur, sect. i. p. 139, 140; tom. ii. part i. oper. This opinion is still more acutely and learnedly defended by Dodwell, in the xith of his Dissertationes Cyprianicæ.

[e] Apologet. cap. iv.

[f] This celebrated inscription is published by the learned Gruter, in the first volume of his Inscriptions. It must, however, be observed, that the best Spanish writers do not venture to defend the genuineness and authority of this inscription, as it was never seen by any of them, and was first produced by Cyriac of Ancona, a person universally known to be utterly unworthy of the least credit. We shall add here the judgment which the excellent historian of Spain, Jo. de Ferreras, has given of this inscription; "Je ne puis m'empêcher (says he) d'observer que Cyriac d'Ancone fut le premier qui publia cette inscription, et que c'est de lui que les autres l'ont tirée; mais comme la foi de cet ecrivain est suspecte au jugement de tous les sçavans, que d'ailleurs il n'y a ni vestige ni souvenir de cette inscription dans les places où l'on dit qu'elle s'est trouvée, et qu'on ne sçait où la prendre à present, chacun peut en porter le jugement qu'il voudra."

[g] See Theod. Ruinart, Præf. ad Acta Martyrum sincera et selecta, f. 31, &c.

[h] Præf. ad Acta Martyrum, &c. f. 33—Thom. Ittigii Select. Histor. Eccl. Capit. sæc. i. cap. vi. sect. 11.

[i] Euseb. Hist. Eccl. lib. iii. cap. xix. xx.

[k] See Mosheim's Syntagma Dissert. ad Historiam Eccles. pertinentium, p. 497—546.

PART II.

THE INTERNAL HISTORY OF THE CHURCH.

CHAPTER I.

Containing an Account of the State of Learning and Philosophy.

I. If we had any certain or satisfactory account of the doctrines which were received among the wiser of the eastern nations, when the light of the Gospel first rose upon the world, this would contribute to illustrate many important points in the ancient history of the church. But the case is quite otherwise: the fragments of the ancient oriental philosophy that have come down to us, are, as every one knows, few in number, and, such as they are, they yet require the diligence, erudition, and sagacity of some learned man, to collect them into a body, arrange them with method, and explain them with perspicuity.[a]

II. The doctrine of the *magi*, who believed the universe to be governed by *two principles*, the one good, and the other evil, flourished in Persia. Their followers, however, did not all agree with respect to the nature of these principles;[b] but this did not prevent the propagation of the main doctrine, which was received throughout a considerable part of Asia and Africa, especially among the Chaldeans, Assyrians, Syrians, and Egyptians, though with different modifications, and had even infected the Jews themselves.[c] The Arabians at that time, and even afterwards, were more remarkable for strength and courage, than for genius and sagacity; nor do they seem, according to their own confession,[d] to have acquired any great reputation for wisdom and philosophy before the time of Mohammed.

III. From the earliest times, the Indians were distinguished by their taste for sublime knowledge and wisdom. We might, perhaps, be able to form a judgment of their philosophical tenets, if that most ancient book, which they deemed particularly sacred, and which they called *veda*, or the law, should be brought to light, and translated into some known language. But the accounts which are given of this remarkable book, by those who have been in the Indies, are so various and irreconcilable with each other, that we must yet wait for satisfaction on this head.[e] As to the Egyptians, they were divided, as every one knows, into a multitude of sects and opinions.[f] Fruitless, therefore, are the labours of those who endeavour to reduce the philosophy of this people to one system.

IV. But of all the systems of philosophy that were received in Asia and Africa about the time of our Saviour, no one was so detrimental to the Christian religion, as that which was styled gnosis, or science, i. e. the way to the true knowledge of the Deity, and which we have above called the oriental doctrine, in order to distinguish it from the Grecian philosophy. It was from the bosom of this pretended oriental wisdom, that the chiefs of those sects, which, in the three first centuries perplexed and afflicted the Christian church originally issued. These supercilious doctors, endeavouring to accommodate to the tenets of their fantastic philosophy, the pure, simple, and sublime doctrines of the Son of God, brought forth, as the result of this jarring composition, a multitude of idle dreams and fictions, and imposed upon their followers a system of opinions which were partly ludicrous and partly perplexed with intricate subtilties, and covered with impenetrable obscurity. The ancient doctors, both Greek and Latin, who opposed these sects, considered them as so many branches that derived their origin from the Platonic philosophy. But this was mere illusion. An apparent resemblance between certain opinions of Plato, and some of the tenets of the eastern schools, deceived these good men, who had no knowledge but of the Grecian philosophy, and were absolutely ignorant of the oriental doctrines. Whoever compares the Platonic with the Gnostic philosophy, will easily perceive the wide difference that exists between them.

V. The first principles of the oriental philosophy seem to be perfectly consistent with the dictates of reason; for its founder must undoubtedly have argued in the following manner: "There are many evils in this world, and men seem impelled by a natural instinct to the practice of those things which reason condemns; but that eternal mind, from which all spirits derive their existence, must be inaccessible to all kinds of evil, and also of a most perfect and beneficent nature; therefore the origin of those evils, with which the universe abounds, must be sought somewhere else than in the Deity. It cannot reside in him who is all perfection; and therefore it must be *without* him. Now, there is nothing *without* or *beyond* the Deity, but *matter;* therefore *matter* is the centre and source of all evil, of all vice." Having taken for granted these principles, they proceeded to affirm that matter was eternal, and derived its present form, not from the will of the Supreme God, but from the creating power of some inferior intelligence, to whom the world and its inhabitants owed their existence. As a proof of this assertion they alleged, that it was incredible, that the Supreme Deity, perfectly good, and infinitely removed from all evil, should either create or modify matter, which is essentially malignant and corrupt, or bestow upon it, in any degree, the riches of his wisdom and liberality. They were, however, aware of the insuperable difficulties that lay against their system; for, when they were called to explain in an accurate and satisfactory manner, how this rude and corrupt matter came to be arranged into such a regular and harmonious frame as that

[a] The history of the oriental philosophy by Mr. Stanley, though it is not void of all kind of merit, is yet extremely defective. That learned author is so far from having exhausted his subject, that he has left it, on the contrary, in many places, wholly untouched. The history of philosophy, published in Germany by the very learned Mr. Brucker, is vastly preferable to Mr. Stanley's work; and the German author, indeed, much superior to the English one, both in point of genius and of erudition.

[b] See Hyde's History of the Religion of the Ancient Persians, a work full of erudition, but indigested and interspersed with conjectures of the most improbable kind.

[c] See Wolf's Manichæismus ante Manichæos.

[d] See Abulpharagius de Moribus Arabum, published by Pocock.

[e] Some parts of the Veda have been published; or, it may rather be said that pretended portions of it have appeared; but, whatever may be alleged by oriental enthusiasts, these Brahminical remains do not evince the "sublime knowledge or wisdom" which many writers attribute to the ancient inhabitants of India.—Edit.

[f] See Dr. Mosheim's Observations on Cudworth's System.

of the universe, and, particularly, how celestial spirits were ioined to bodies formed out of its malignant mass, they were sadly embarrassed, and found, that the plainest dictates of reason declared their system incapable of defence. In this perplexity they had recourse to wild fictions and romantic fables, in order to give an account of the formation of the world and the origin of mankind.

VI. Those who, by mere dint of fancy and invention, endeavour to cast a light upon obscure points, or to solve great and intricate difficulties, are seldom agreed about the methods of proceeding; and, by a necessary consequence, separate into different sects. Such was the case of the oriental philosophers, when they set themselves to explain the difficulties mentioned above. Some imagined *two eternal principles* from which all things proceeded, one presiding over *light* and the other over *matter;* and, by their perpetual conflict, explained the mixture of good and evil, apparent in the universe. Others maintained, that the being which presided over matter was not an eternal principle, but a subordinate intelligence, one of those whom the Supreme God produced from himself. They supposed that this being was moved by a sudden impulse to reduce to order the rude mass of matter which lay excluded from the mansions of the Deity, and also to create the human race. A third sort devised a system different from the two preceding, and formed to themselves the notion of a triumvirate of beings, in which the Supreme Deity was distinguished both from the material evil principle, and from the creator of this sublunary world. These, then, were the three leading sects of the oriental philosophy, which were subdivided into various factions, by the disputes that arose when they came to explain more fully their respective opinions, and to pursue them into all their monstrous consequences. These multiplied divisions were the natural and necessary consequences of a system which had no solid foundation, and was no more, indeed, than an airy phantom, blown up by the wanton fancies of self-sufficient men. And that these divisions did really subsist, the history of the Christian sects that embraced this philosophy abundantly testifies.

VII. It is, however, to be observed, that, as all these sects were founded upon one common principle, their divisions did not prevent their holding, in common, certain opinions concerning the Deity, the universe, the human race, and several other subjects. They were all, therefore, unanimous in acknowledging the existence of a high and eternal nature, in whom dwelt the fulness of wisdom, goodness, and all other perfections, and of whom no mortal was able to form a complete idea. This great being was considered by them as a most pure and radiant *light*, diffused through the immensity of space, which they called *pleroma*, a Greek word that signifies fulness; and they taught the following particulars concerning him, and his operations: "The eternal nature, infinitely perfect, and infinitely happy, having dwelt from everlasting in a profound solitude, and in a blessed tranquillity, produced, at length, from itself, two minds of a different sex, which resembled their supreme parent in the most perfect manner. From the prolific union of these two beings others arose, which were also followed by different generations; so that, in process of time, a celestial family was formed in the *pleroma*.[a] This divine progeny, being immutable in its nature, and above the power of mortality, was called by the philosophers *æon*,"[b] a term which signifies, in the Greek language, an eternal nature. How many in number these *æons* were, was a point much controverted among the oriental sages.

VIII. "Beyond the mansions of *light*, where dwells the Deity with his celestial offspring, there lies a rude and unwieldy mass of *matter*, agitated by innate, turbulent, and irregular motions. One of the celestial natures descending from the *pleroma*, either by a fortuitous impulse, or in consequence of a divine commission, reduced to order this unseemly mass, adorned it with a rich variety of gifts, created men, and inferior animals of different kinds, to store it with inhabitants, and corrected its malignity by mixing with it a certain portion of light, and also of a matter celestial and divine. This creator of the world is distinguished from the Supreme Deity by the name of *demiurge*. His character is a compound of shining qualities and insupportable arrogance; and his excessive lust of empire effaces his talents and his virtues. He claims dominion over the new world which he has formed, as his sovereign right; and, excluding totally the Supreme Deity from all concern in it, he demands from mankind, for himself and his associates, divine honours."

IX. "Man is a compound of a terrestrial and corrupt body, and a soul which is of celestial origin, and, in some measure, an emanation from the divinity. This nobler part is miserably weighed down and encumbered by the body, which is the seat of all irregular lusts and impure desires. It is this body that seduces the soul from the pursuit of truth, and not only turns it from the contemplation and worship of God, so as to confine its homage and veneration to the creator of this world, but also attaches it to terrestrial objects, and to the immoderate pursuit of sensual pleasures, by which its nature is totally polluted. The sovereign mind employs various means to deliver his offspring from this deplorable servitude, especially the ministry of divine messengers, whom he sends to enlighten, to admonish, and to reform the human race.

[a] It appears highly probable that the apostle Paul had an eye to this fantastic mythology, when, in his First Epistle to Timothy, he exhorts him not to "give heed to fables and endless genealogies, which minister questions," &c.

[b] The word αἰων, or *æon*, is commonly used by the Greek writers, but in different senses. Its signification in the Gnostic system is not very evident, and several learned men have despaired of finding out its true meaning. Αἰων, or *æon*, among the ancients, was used to signify the age of man, or the duration of human life. In after-times, it was employed by philosophers to express the duration of spiritual and invisible beings. These philosophers used the word χρόνος, as the measure of corporeal and changing objects; and αἰων, as the measure of such as were immutable and eternal; and, as God is the chief of those immutable beings which are spiritual, and, consequently, not to be perceived by our outward senses, his infinite and eternal duration was expressed by the term *æon;* and that is the sense in which this word is now commonly understood. It was, however, afterwards attributed to other spiritual and invisible beings; and the oriental philosophers, who lived about the time of Christ's appearance upon earth, and made use of the Greek language, understood by it the *duration* of eternal and immutable things, or the period of time in which they exist. Nor did the variations, through which this word passed, end here; from expressing only the duration of beings, it was, by a metonymy, employed to signify the beings themselves. Thus God was called *æon*, and the angels were distinguished also by the title of *æons*. All this will lead us to the true meaning of that word among the Gnostics. They had formed to themselves the notion of an invisible and spiritual world, composed of *entities* or *virtues*, proceeding from the Supreme Being, and succeeding each other at certain intervals of time, so as to form an eternal *chain*, of which our world was the terminating link; a notion of eternity very different from that of the Platonists, who represented it as stable, permanent, and void of succession. To the beings that formed this eternal chain, the Gnostics assigned a certain term of duration, and a certain sphere of action. Their *terms of duration* were first called *æons*, and they themselves were afterwards metonymically distinguished by that title.

In the mean time, the imperious *demiurge* exerts his power in opposition to the merciful purpose of the Supreme Being, resists the influence of those solemn invitations by which he exhorts mankind to return to him, and labours to efface the knowledge of God in the minds of intelligent beings. In this conflict, such souls as, throwing off the yoke of the creators and rulers of this world, rise to their Supreme Parent, and subdue the turbulent and sinful motions which corrupt *matter* excites within them, shall, at the dissolution of their mortal bodies, ascend directly to the *pleroma*. Those, on the contrary, who remain in the bondage of servile superstition and corrupt matter, shall, at the end of this life, pass into new bodies, until they awake from their sinful lethargy. In the end, however, God shall come forth victorious, triumph over all opposition, and, having delivered from their servitude the greatest part of those souls that are imprisoned in mortal bodies, shall dissolve the frame of this visible world, and involve it in a general ruin. After this solemn period, primitive tranquillity shall be restored in the universe, and God shall reign with happy spirits, in undisturbed felicity, through everlasting ages."

X. Such were the principal tenets of the oriental philosophy. The state of letters and of philosophy among the Jews comes next under consideration; and of this we may form some idea from what has been already said concerning that nation. It is chiefly to be observed, that the dark and hidden science which they called the *kabbala*, was at this time taught and inculcated by many among that superstitious people.[a] This science, in many points, bears a strong resemblance to the oriental philosophy; or, to speak more accurately, it is indeed that same philosophy accommodated to the Jewish religion, and tempered with a certain mixture of truth. Nor were the doctrines of the Grecian sages unknown to the Jews at the period now before us; since, from the time of Alexander the Great, some of them had been admitted, even into the Mosaic religion. We shall say nothing concerning the opinions which they adopted from the philosophical and theological systems of the Chaldeans, Egyptians, and Syrians.[b]

XI. The Greeks, in the opinion of most writers, were yet in possession of the first rank among the nations that cultivated letters and philosophy. In many places, and especially at Athens, there were a considerable number of men distinguished by their learning, acuteness, and eloquence; philosophers of all sects, who taught the doctrines of Plato, Aristotle, Zeno, and Epicurus; rhetoricians also, and men of genius, who instructed the youth in the rules of eloquence, and formed their taste for the liberal arts; so that those who had a passion for the study of oratory, resorted in multitudes to the Grecian schools, in order to perfect themselves in that noble science. Alexandria, in Egypt, was also much frequented for the same purpose, as a great number of the Grecian philosophers and rhetoricians dwelt in that city.

XII. The Romans also, at this time, made a shining figure among the polished and learned nations. All the sciences flourished at Rome. The youth of a higher rank were early instructed in the Greek language and eloquence. From those pursuits they proceeded to the study of philosophy, and the laws of their country; and they finished their education by a voyage into Greece, where they not only gave the last degree of perfection to their philosophical studies, but also acquired that refined wit and elegance of taste, which served to set off their more solid attainments in the most advantageous manner.[c] None of the philosophical sects were more in vogue among the Romans than the Epicureans and the Academics, which were peculiarly favoured by the great, who, soothed by their doctrines into a false security, indulged their passions without remorse, and continued in their vicious pursuits without terror. During the reign of Augustus, the culture of polite learning, and of the fine arts, was holden in great honour, and those who contributed with zeal and success to this, were eminently distinguished by that prince. But after his death, learning languished without encouragement, and was neglected, because the succeeding emperors were more intent upon the arts of war and rapine, than those more amiable arts and inventions which are the fruits of leisure and peace.

XIII. With respect to the other nations, such as the Germans, Celts, and Britons, it is certain, that they were not destitute of learned and ingenious men. Among the Gauls, the people of Marseilles had long acquired a shining reputation for their progress in the sciences;[d] and there is no doubt that the neighbouring countries received the benefit of their instructions. Among the Celts, the Druids, who were priests, philosophers, and legislators, were highly remarkable for their wisdom; but their writings, at least such as are yet extant, are not sufficient to inform us of the nature of their philosophy.[e] The Romans, indeed, introduced letters and philosophy into all the provinces which submitted to their victorious arms, in order to soften the rough manners of the savage nations, and form in them, imperceptibly, the sentiments and feelings of humanity.[f]

CHAPTER II.

Concerning the Doctors and Ministers of the Church, and its Form of Government.

I. THE great end of Christ's mission was to form an universal church, gathered out of all the nations of the world, and to extend the limits of this great society from age to age. But, in order to this, it was necessary, first, to appoint extraordinary teachers, who, converting the Jews and Gentiles to the truth, should erect, every where, Christian assemblies; and then, to establish ordinary ministers, and interpreters of the divine will, who should repeat and enforce the doctrines delivered by the former, and maintain the people in their holy profession, and in the practice of the Christian virtues; for the best system of religion must necessarily either dwindle to nothing, or be egregiously corrupted, if it be not perpetually inculcated and explained by a regular and standing ministry.

---

[a] See Jo. Franc. Buddei Introductio in Historiam Philos. Hebræorum; and also the works which B. Wolf mentions, with encomiums, in his Bibliotheca Hebraica, tom. iii.

[b] See the same publications.

[c] See Paganini Gaudentii Liber de Philosophiæ apud Romanos initio et progressu, in tertio fasciculo Novæ Collectionis Variorum Scriptorum. Halæ 1717.

[d] See the Histoire Literaire de la France par des Religieux Benedictins. Dissert. Prelim. p. 42, &c.

[e] Martin, Religion des Gaulois.

[f] Juvenal, Sat. xv. ver. 110.

"Nunc totus Graias nostrasque habet orbis Athenas:
Gallia causidicos docuit facunda Britannos:
De conducendo loquitur jam rhetore Thule."

II. The extraordinary teachers whom Christ employed to lay the foundations of his everlasting kingdom, were the twelve apostles, and the seventy disciples, of whom mention has been made above. To these the Evangelists are to be added, by which title those were distinguished whom the apostles sent to instruct the nations, or who, of their own accord, abandoned every worldly attachment, and consecrated themselves to the sacred office of propagating the Gospel.[a] In this rank, also, we must place those to whom, in the infancy of the church, the marvellous power of speaking in foreign languages which they had never learned, was communicated from above; for the person to whom the divine omnipotence and liberality had imparted the gift of tongues, might conclude, with the utmost assurance, from the gift itself, (which a wise being would not bestow in vain,) that he was appointed by God to propagate the truth, and employ his talents in the service of Christianity.[b]

III. Many have undertaken to write the history of the apostles;[c] a history which we find loaded with fables, doubts, and difficulties, when we pursue it farther than the books of the New Testament, and the most ancient writers in the Christian church. In order to have a just idea of the nature, privileges, and authority of the apostolic function, we must consider an apostle as a person who was honoured with a divine commission, invested with the power of making laws, of restraining the wicked, when that was expedient, and of working miracles, when necessary; and sent to mankind, to unfold to them the divine will, to open to them the paths of salvation and immortality, and to separate from the multitude, and unite in the bonds of one sacred society, those who were attentive and obedient to the voice of God, addressed to men by their ministry.[d]

IV. The accounts we have of the seventy disciples are still more obscure than those of the apostles, since the former are only once mentioned in the New Testament, Luke, x. 1. The illustrations that we have yet remaining, relative to their character and office, were certainly composed by the more modern Greeks, and, therefore, can have little authority or credit.[e] Their commission extended no farther than the Jewish nation, as appears from the express words of St. Luke, though it is highly probable, that, after Christ's ascension, they performed the function of Evangelists, and declared the glad tidings of salvation, and the means of obtaining it, through different nations and provinces.

V. Neither Christ himself, nor his holy apostles, have commanded any thing clearly or expressly concerning the external form of the church, or the precise method according to which it should be governed.[f] Hence we may infer, that the regulation of this was, in some measure, to be accommodated to the time, and left to the wisdom and prudence of the chief rulers, both of the state and of the church. If, however, it be true, that the apostles acted by divine inspiration, and in conformity with the commands of their blessed Master, (and this no Christian can call in question,) it follows, that the form of government which the primitive churches borrowed from that of Jerusalem, the first Christian assembly established by the apostles themselves, must be esteemed as of divine institution. But from this it would be wrong to conclude that such a form is immutable, and ought to be invariably observed; for this a great variety of events may render impossible. In those early times, every Christian church consisted of the people, their leaders, and the ministers or deacons; and these, indeed, belong essentially to every religious society.

[a] See St. Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians, iv. 11; and also Euseb. Hist. Eccles. lib. iii. cap. xxxvii.

[b] 1 Cor. xiv. 22.

[c] The authors who have given accounts of the apostles, are enumerated by Sagittarius in his Introduction to Ecclesiastical History, and by Buddeus in his treatise de Ecclesiâ Apostolicâ.

[d] See Fred. Spanheim, de Apostolis et Apostolatu, tom. ii. op. p. 289. It is not without weighty reasons, and without having considered the matter attentively, that I have supposed the apostles invested with the power of *enacting laws*. I am sensible that some very learned men among the moderns have denied this power; but I apprehend they differ from me rather in words than in any material point.

[e] These accounts are to be seen at the end of three books concerning the life and death of Moses, which were discovered and illustrated by Gilb. Gaulminus, and republished by Fabricius in his Biblioth. Græc.

[f] Those who imagine, that Christ himself, or the apostles by his direction and authority, appointed a certain fixed form of church-government, have not determined what that form was. The principal opinions that have been adopted upon this head may be reduced to the four following: The first is that of the Roman Catholics, who maintain, "That Christ's declared intention was, that his followers should be collected into one sacred empire, subjected to the government of St. Peter and his successors, and divided, like the kingdoms of this world, into several provinces; that, in consequence thereof, Peter fixed the seat of ecclesiastical dominion at Rome, but afterwards, to alleviate the burthen of his office, divided the church into three great provinces, according to the division of the world at that time, and appointed a person to preside in each, who was dignified with the title of *patriarch*; that the European patriarch resided at Rome, the Asiatic at Antioch, and the African at Alexandria; that the bishops of each province, among whom also there were various ranks, were to reverence the authority of their respective patriarchs, and that both bishops and patriarchs were to be passively subject to the supreme dominion of the Roman pontiff."* This romantic account scarcely deserves a serious refutation. The second opinion concerning the government of the church, makes no mention of a supreme head, or of patriarchs, constituted by divine authority, but supposes that the apostles divided the Roman empire into as many ecclesiastical provinces as there were secular or civil ones; that the *metropolitan* bishop, *i. e.* the prelate who resided in the capital city of each province, presided over the clergy of that province, and that the other bishops were subject to his authority. This opinion has been adopted by some of the most learned of the Romish church,† and has also been favoured by some of the most eminent British divines.† Some Protestant writers of note have endeavoured to prove that it is not supported by sufficient evidence.‡ The third opinion is that of those who acknowledge, that, when the Christians began to multiply exceedingly, metropolitans, patriarchs, and archbishops, were indeed created, but only by *human* appointment and authority, though they confess, at the same time, that it is consonant to the orders and intentions of Christ and his apostles, that, in every Christian church there should be one person invested with the highest authority, and clothed with certain rights and privileges above the other doctors of that assembly. This opinion has been embraced by many English divines of the first rank in the learned world, and also by many in other countries and communions. The fourth or last opinion is that of the Presbyterians, who affirm, that Christ's intention was, that the Christian doctors and ministers should all enjoy the same rank and authority, without any sort of pre-eminence or subordination, any distinction of rights and privileges. The reader will find an ample account of these opinions with respect to church-government in Dr. Mosheim's Larger History of the first Century. This learned and impartial writer, who condemns with reason the fourth opinion, as it is explained by those bigoted Puritans, who look upon all subordination and variety of rank among the doctors of the church as condemnable and antichristian, observes, however, with equal reason, that this opinion may be explained and modified so as to reconcile the moderate advocates of the episcopal discipline with the less rigid Presbyterians. The opinion, modified by Dr. Mosheim, amounts to this: "That the Christian doctors are *equal* in this sense: that Christ has left no positive and special decree which constitutes a distinction among them, nor any *divine* commandment by which those who, in consequence of the appointments of human wisdom,

* See Leo Allatius, de perpetuâ consens. Eccles. Orient. et Occident. lib. i. cap. ii.—Morinus, Exercitat. Ecclesiast. lib. i. exer. i.

* Petrus de Marca, de concord. sacerdot. et imperii, lib. vi. cap. i.—Morinus, Exerc. Eccl. lib. i. ex. xviii.—Pagi Critica in annal. Baronii ad an. xxxvii.

† Hammond, Diss. de Episcop.—Beveregii Cod. Canon. Vet. Eccles. Vindic. lib. ii. cap. v. tom. ii. Patr. Apost.—Usser. de Origine Episcop. et Metropol.

‡ Basnage, Hist. de l'Eglise, tome i. liv. i. cap. viii.—Böhmer, Annot. ad Petrum de Marca de concordia sacerd. et imperii.

The people were, undoubtedly, the first in authority; for the apostles showed, by their own example, that nothing of moment was to be carried on or determined without the consent of the assembly;[a] and such a method of proceeding was both prudent and necessary in those critical times.

VI. It was, therefore, the assembly of the people, which chose rulers and teachers, or received them by a free and authoritative consent, when recommended by others. The same people rejected or confirmed, by their suffrages, the laws that were proposed by their rulers to the assembly; excommunicated profligate and unworthy members of the church; restored the penitent to their forfeited privileges; passed judgment upon the different subjects of controversy and dissension, that arose in their community; examined and decided the disputes which happened between the elders and deacons; and, in a word, exercised all that authority which belongs to such as are invested with sovereign power. The people, indeed, had in some measure purchased these privileges, by administering to the support of their rulers, ministers, and poor, and by offering large and generous contributions, when the safety or interests of the community rendered them necessary. In these supplies, each bore a part proportioned to his circumstances; and the various gifts which were thus brought into the public assemblies, were called *oblations*.

VII. There reigned among the members of the Christian church, however distinguished they were by worldly rank and titles, not only an amiable harmony, but also a perfect equality. This appeared by the feast of charity, in which all were indiscriminately assembled; by the names of *brethren* and *sisters*, with which they saluted each other; and by several circumstances of a like nature. Nor, in this first century, was the distinction made between Christians, of a more or less perfect order, which took place afterwards. Whoever acknowledged Christ as the Saviour of mankind, and made a solemn profession of his confidence in him, was immediately baptized and received into the church. But, when the church began to flourish, and its members to increase, it was thought prudent and necessary to divide Christians into two orders, distinguished by the names of believers and catechumens. The former were those who had been solemnly admitted into the church by baptism, and, in consequence thereof, were instructed in all the mysteries of religion, had access to all the parts of divine worship, and were authorized to vote in the ecclesiastical assemblies. The latter were such as had not yet been dedicated to God and Christ by baptism, and were, therefore, neither admitted to the public prayers nor to the holy communion, nor to the ecclesiastical assemblies.

The rulers of the church were called either *presbyters*,[b] or *bishops*,—titles which, in the New Testament, are undoubtedly applied to the same order of men.[c] These were persons of eminent gravity, and such as had distinguished themselves by their superior sanctity and merit.[d] Their particular functions were not always the same; for, while some of them confined their labours to the instruction of the people, others contributed in different ways to the edification of the church. Hence the distinction between teaching and ruling presbyters has been adopted by certain learned men. But if ever this distinction existed, which I neither affirm nor deny, it certainly did not continue long, since it is manifest that St. Paul requires, that all bishops or presbyters be qualified, and ready to teach and instruct.[e]

IX. Among the first professors of Christianity, there were few men of learning; few, who had capacity enough to insinuate, into the minds of a gross and ignorant multitude, the knowledge of divine things. God, therefore, in his infinite wisdom, judged it necessary to raise up, in many churches, extraordinary teachers, who were to discourse in the public assemblies, upon the various points of the Christian doctrine, and to treat with the people, in his name, as guided by his direction, and clothed with his authority. Such were the prophets of the New Testament,[f] an order of men, whose commission is too much limited by the writers who confine it to the interpretation of the books of the Old Testament, and especially the prophecies;[g] for it is certain, that they, who claimed the rank of prophets, were invested with the power of censuring publicly such as had been guilty of any irregularity: but, to prevent the abuses that designing men might make of this institution, by pretending to this extraordinary character, in order to execute unworthy ends, there were always present, in the public auditories, judges divinely appointed, who, by certain and infallible marks, were able to distinguish the false prophets from the true. The order of prophets ceased, when the want of teachers, which gave rise to it was abundantly supplied.

X. The church was, undoubtedly, provided from the beginning with inferior ministers or deacons. No society can be without its servants, and still less such societies as those of the first Christians were. And it appears not only probable but evident, that the *young men*, who carried away the dead bodies of Ananias and Sapphira, were the subordinate ministers, or *deacons*, of the church of Jerusalem, who attended the apostles to execute their orders.[h] These first deacons, being chosen from among the Jews who were born in Palestine, were suspected by the foreign Jews of partiality in distributing the offerings which were

are in the higher ranks, can demand by divine right the obedience and submission of the inferior doctors or ministers, their abstaining from the exercise of certain functions," &c.

The truth is, that, Christ, by leaving this matter undetermined, has left to Christian societies a discretionary power of modeling the government of the church in such a manner, as the circumstantial reasons of times, places, &c. may require; and, therefore, the wisest government of the church is the best and most divine; and every Christian society has a right to make laws for itself, provided that these laws be consistent with charity and peace, and with the fundamental doctrines and principles of Christianity.

[a] Acts i. 15; vi. 3; xv. 4; xxi. 22.

[b] The word *Presbyter*, or elder, is taken from the Jewish institution, and signifies rather the venerable prudence and wisdom of old age, than age itself.

[c] Acts xx. 17, 28. Phil. i. 1. Tit. i. 5, 7. 1 Tim. iii. 1.

[d] 1 Tim. iii. 1. Tit. i. 5.

[e] 1 Tim. iii. 2, &c. See, concerning the word *Presbyter*, the illustrations given by the learned Vitringa, de Synagogâ vetere, lib. iii. cap. i. p. 609; and by the venerable Jo. Bened. Carpzovius, in his Exerc. in Epist. ad Hebræos ex Philone, p. 499. As to the presbyters themselves, and the nature of their office, the reader will receive much satisfaction from the accounts given of that order by Buddeus, de Ecclesiâ Apostolicâ, cap. vi. p. 719, and by the most learned Pfaffius, de Originibus Juris Eccles. p. 49.

[f] Rom. xiii. 6. 1 Cor. xii. 28; xiv. 3, 29. Eph. iv. 11.

[g] See Mosheim's Dissertation de illis qui Prophetæ vocantur in Novo Fœdere, which is to be found in the second volume of his Syntagma Dissertationum ad Historiam Eccles. pertinentium.

[h] Acts v. 6, 10.

Those who may be surprised at my affirming that the *young men*, mentioned in the passage here referred to, were the *deacons* or ministers of the church of Jerusalem, are desired to consider that the words νεώτεροι, νεανίσκοι, i. e. *young men*, are not always used to determine the ages of the persons to whom they are applied, but are frequently employed to point out their offices, or functions, both by the Greek and Latin writers.

presented for the support of the poor.[a] To remedy this disorder, seven other deacons were chosen, by order of the apostles, and employed in the service of that part of the church at Jerusalem, which was composed of the foreign Jews converted into Christianity. Of these new ministers six were foreigners, as appears by their names; the seventh was chosen out of the proselytes, of whom there were a certain number among the first Christians at Jerusalem, and to whom it was reasonable that some regard should be shown, in the election of the deacons, as well as to the foreign Jews. All the other Christian churches followed the example of that of Jerusalem, in whatever related to the choice and office of the deacons. Some, particularly the eastern churches, elected deaconesses, and chose for that purpose matrons or widows of eminent sanctity, who also ministered to the necessities of the poor, and performed several other offices, that tended to the maintenance of order and decency in the church.[b]

XI. Such was the constitution of the Christian church in its infancy, when its assemblies were neither numerous nor splendid. Three or four presbyters, men of remarkable piety and wisdom, ruled these small congregations in perfect harmony; nor did they stand in need of any president or superior to maintain concord and order where no dissensions were known. But the number of the presbyters and deacons increasing with that of the churches, and the sacred work of the ministry growing more painful and weighty, by a number of additional duties, these new circumstances required new regulations. It was then judged necessary, that one man of distinguished gravity and wisdom should preside in the council of presbyters, in order to distribute among his colleagues their several tasks, and to be a centre of union to the whole society. This person was, at first, styled the *angel*[c] of the church to which he belonged, but was afterward distinguished by the name of *bishop*, or inspector; a name borrowed from the Greek language, and expressing the principal part of the episcopal function, which was to inspect and superintend the affairs of the church. It is highly probable that the church of Jerusalem, grown considerably numerous, and deprived of the ministry of the apostles, who were gone to instruct the other nations, was the first which chose a president or bishop; and it is no less probable, that the other churches followed by degrees such a respectable example.

XII. Let none, however, confound the bishops of this primitive and golden period of the church with those of whom we read in the following ages; for, though they were both distinguished by the same name, yet they differed in many respects. A bishop during the first and second century, was a person who had the care of one Christian assembly, which, at that time was, generally speaking, small enough to be contained in a private house. In this assembly he acted, not so much with the authority of a master, as with the zeal and diligence of a faithful servant. He instructed the people, performed the several parts of divine worship, attended the sick, and inspected the circumstances and supplies of the poor. He charged, indeed, the presbyters with the performance of those duties and services, which the multiplicity of his engagements rendered it impossible for him to fulfil; but he had not the power to decide or enact any thing without the consent of the presbyters and people; and, though the episcopal office was both laborious and singularly dangerous, yet its revenues were extremely small, since the church had no certain income, but depended on the gifts or oblations of the multitude, which were, no doubt, inconsiderable, and were moreover to be divided among the bishops, presbyters, deacons, and poor.

XIII. The power and jurisdiction of the bishops were not long confined to these narrow limits, but were soon extended by the following means. The bishops, who lived in the cities, had, either by their own ministry, or that of their presbyters, erected new churches in the neighbouring towns and villages. These churches, continuing under the inspection and ministry of the bishops, by whose labours and counsels they had been engaged to embrace the Gospel, grew imperceptibly into ecclesiastical provinces, which the Greeks afterwards called *dioceses*. But, as the bishop of the city could not extend his labours and inspection to all these churches in the country and in the villages, he appointed certain suffragans or deputies to govern and to instruct these new societies; and they were distinguished by the title of *chorepiscopi*, i. e. country bishops. This order held the middle rank between bishops and presbyters.

XIV. The churches, in those early times, were entirely independent, none of them being subject to any foreign jurisdiction, but each governed by its own rulers and its own laws; for, though the churches founded by the apostles had this particular deference shown to them, that they were consulted in difficult and doubtful cases, yet they had no juridical authority, no sort of supremacy over the others, nor the least right to enact laws for them. Nothing, on the contrary, is more evident than the perfect equality that reigned among the primitive churches; nor does there even appear, in this first century, the smallest trace of that association of

The same rule of interpretation, that diversifies the sense of the word *presbyter* (which, as all know, signifies sometimes the age of a person, and, at other times his function,) is manifestly applicable to the words before us. As, therefore, by the title of presbyters, the rulers of a society are pointed out, without any regard to their ages, so, by the expression *young men*, we are often to understand *ministers*, or *servants*, because such are generally in the flower of youth. This interpretation may be confirmed by examples taken from the New Testament. Christ himself seems to attribute this sense to the word νεώτερος, Luke xxii. 26. ὁ μειζων ἐν ὑμῖν, γενέσθω ὡς ὁ νεώτερος. He explains the term μείζων, by the word ἡγὲμενος, and it therefore signifies a presbyter, or ruler; he also substitutes, a little after, ὁ διακονῶν in the place of νεώτερος, which confirms our interpretation in the most unanswerable manner: so that μείζων and νεώτερος are not here indications of certain ages, but of certain functions, and the precept of Christ amounts to this: "Let not him who performs the office of a presbyter or elder among you, think himself superior to the ministers or deacons." The passage of 1 Pet. v. 5, is still more express to our purpose: Ὁμοίως, νεώτεροι, ὑποτάγητε τοῖς πρεσβυτέροις. It is evident from the preceding verses, that *presbyter* here is the name of an office, and points out a ruler or teacher of the church; and that the term νεώτερος is also to be interpreted, not a *young man* in point of age, but a *minister* or servant of the church. St. Peter, having solemnly exhorted the presbyters not to abuse the power that was committed to them, addresses his discourse to the ministers: "But likewise, ye younger, *i. e.* deacons, despise not the orders of the presbyters or elders, but perform cheerfully whatsoever they command you." In the same sense St. Luke employs this term, Acts v. 6, 10. and his νεώτεροι and νεανίσκοι are undoubtedly the deacons of the church of Jerusalem, of whom the Greek Jews complain afterwards to the apostles, (Acts vi. 1, &c.) on account of the partial distribution of the alms. I might confirm this sense of the words *young men*, by numberless citations from Greek and Roman writers, and a variety of authors, sacred and profane; but this is not the proper place for demonstrations of this nature.

[a] Acts vi. 1, &c.

[b] For an ample account of the deacons and deaconesses of the primitive church, see Zeigler, de Diaconis et Diaconissis, cap. xix. p. 347.—Basnagii Annal. Polit. Eccles. ad an. xxxv. tom. i. p. 450.—Bingham, Orig. Eccles. lib. ii. cap. xx.

[c] Rev. ii. 3.

provincial churches, from which *councils* and *metropolitans* derive their origin. It was only in the second century that the c ıstom of holding councils commenced in Greece, whence it soon spread through the other provinces.[a]

XV. The principal place among the Christian Doctors, and among those also, who by their writings were instrumental in the progress of the truth, is due to the apostles and some of their disciples, who were set apart and inspired by God, to record the actions of Christ and his apostles. The writings of these holy men, which are comprehended in the books of the New Testament, are in the hands of all who profess themselves Christians. Those who are desirous of particular information with respect to the history of these sacred books, and the arguments which prove their divine authority, their genuineness, and purity, must consult the learned authors who have written professedly upon that head.[b]

XVI. The opinions, or rather the conjectures of the learned, concerning the time when the books of the New Testament were collected into one volume, as also about the authors of that collection, are extremely different. This important question is attended with great and almost insuperable difficulties to us in these latter times.[c] It is, however, sufficient for us to know, that, before the middle of the second century, the greatest part of the books of the New Testament were read in every Christian society throughout the world, and received as a divine rule of faith and manners. Hence it appears, that these sacred writings were carefully separated from several human compositions upon the same subject, either by some of the apostles themselves, who lived so long, or by their disciples and successors.[d] We are well assured,[e] that the four Gospels were formed into a volume during the life of St. John, and that the three first received the approbation of this divine apostle. And why may we not suppose that the other books of the New Testament were collected at the same time?

XVII. What renders this highly probable is, that the most urgent necessity required its being done; for, not long after Christ's ascension into heaven, several histories of his life and doctrines, full of pious frauds and fabulous wonders, were composed by persons, whose intentions, perhaps, were not bad, but whose writings discovered the greatest superstition and ignorance. Nor was this all productions appeared which were imposed upon the world by fraudulent men, as the writings of the holy apostles.[f] These apocryphal and spurious writings must have produced a sad confusion, and rendered both the history and the doctrine of Christ uncertain, had not the rulers of the church used all possible care and diligence in separating the books that were truly apostolical and divine from all that spurious trash, and conveying them down to posterity in one volume.

XVIII. The writer, whose fame surpassed that of all others in this century, the apostles excepted, was Clemens, bishop of Rome. The accounts which remain of his life, actions, and death, are for the most part uncertain.[g] Two Epistles to the Corinthians,[h] written in Greek, have been attributed to him, of which the second is deemed spurious, and the first genuine, by many learned writers.[i] But even this seems to have been corrupted and interpolated by some ignorant and presumptuous author, who appears to have been displeased at observing a defect of learning and genius in the writings of so great a man as Clemens.[k]

XIX. The learned are now unanimous in regarding the other writings which bear the name of Clemens, viz. the Apostolic Canons, the Apostolic Constitutions, the Recognitions of Clemens and Clementina,[l] as spurious productions ascribed by some impostor to this venerable prelate, in order to procure them a high degree of authority.[m] The Apostolical Canons, which consist of eighty-five ecclesiastical laws, contain a view of the church government and discipline received among the Greek and oriental Christians in the second and third centuries. The eight books of Apostolical Constitutions are the work of some austere and melancholy author, who, having taken it into his head to reform the Christian worship, which he looked upon as degenerated from its original purity, made no scruple to prefix to his rules the names of the apostles, that thus they might be more

[a] The meeting of the church of Jerusalem, mentioned in the xvth chapter of the Acts, is commonly considered as the first Christian council. But this notion arises from a manifest abuse of the word *council*. That meeting was only of one church; and, if such a meeting be called a *council*, it will follow that there were innumerable councils in the primitive times. But, every one knows, that a *council* is an assembly of deputies, or commissioners, sent from several churches associated by certain bonds in a general body, and therefore the supposition above mentioned falls to the ground.

[b] For the history of the books of the New Testament, see particularly Jo. Alb. Fabricius, Biblioth. Græc. lib. iv. cap. v. p. 122—227. The same learned author has given an accurate list of the writers, who have defended the divinity of these sacred books, in his Delectus Argumentorum et Syllabus Scriptorum pro verit. relig. Christianæ, cap. xxvi. p. 502.

[c] See Jo. Ens, Bibliotheca S. seu Diatriba de librorum N. T. Canone, published at Amsterdam in 1710; as also Jo. Mill. Prolegomen. ad Nov. Test. sect. 1.

[d] See Fricklus, de Curâ Veteris Ecclesiæ circa Canon. cap. iii.

[e] This is expressly affirmed by Eusebius, in the xxivth chapter of the third book of his Ecclesiastical History.

[f] Such of these writings as are yet extant have been carefully collected by Fabricius, in his Codex Apocryphus Novi Testamenti. Many ingenious and learned observations have been made on these spurious books by the celebrated Beausobre, in his Histoire Critique des Dogmes de Manichée.

[g] After Tillemont, Cotelerius and Grabe have given some accounts of this great man; and all that has been said concerning him by the best and most credible writers, has been collected by Rondinini, in the former of two books published at Rome, in 1706, under the following title, Libri Duo de S. Clemente, Papâ, et Martyre, ejusque Basilicâ in urbe Româ.

[h] J. A. Fabricius, in the fourth book of his Bibliotheca Græca, mentions the editions that have been given of St. Clements' epistles. To this account we must add the edition published at Cambridge, in 1718, which is preferable to the preceding ones in many respects.

☞ [i] See the ample account that is given of these two Greek epistles of Clemens, by Dr. Lardner, in the first volume of the second part of his valuable work, entitled, the Credibility of the Gospel History.

[k] See J. Bapt. Cotelerii Patres Apost. tom. i.; and Bernardi Adnotatiunculæ in Clementem, in the last edition of these fathers of the church, published by Le Clerc. The learned Wotton has endeavoured, though without success, in his observations on the epistles of Clemens, to refute the annotations above mentioned.

☞ [l] Beside these writings attributed to Clemens, we may reckon two epistles which the learned Wetstein found in a Syriac version of the New Testament, which he took the pains to translate from Syriac into Latin. He has subjoined both the original and the translation to his famous edition of the Greek Testament, published in 1752; and the title is as follows: "Duæ Epistolæ S. Clementis Romani, Discipuli Petri Apostoli, quas ex Codice Manuscripto Novi Test. Syriaci nunc primum erutas, cum versione Latinâ adpositâ, edidit Jo. Jacobus Wetstenius." The manuscript of the Syriac version, whence these epistles were taken, was procured by the good offices of Sir James Porter, a judicious patron of literature, who, at that time, was British ambassador at Constantinople. Their authenticity is boldly maintained by Wetstein, and learnedly opposed by Dr. Lardner. The celebrated professor Venema, of Franeker, also considered them as spurious. See an account of his controversy with Wetstein on that subject, in the Bibliothèque des Sciences et des Beaux Arts, tom. ii.

[m] For an account of the fate of these writings, and the editions that have been given of them, it will be proper to consult two dissertations of the learned Ittigius; one, de Patribus Apostolicis, which he has prefixed to his Bibliotheca Patrum Apostolicorum; and the other, de Pseudepigraphis Apostolicis, which he has subjoined to the Appendix of his book de Hæresiarchis Ævi Apostolici. See also Fabricius, Bibliotheca Græca, lib. v. cap. i., and lib. vi. cap. i.

speedily and favourably received.[a] The Recognitions of Clemens, which differ very little from the Clementina, are the witty and agreeable productions of an Alexandrian Jew, well versed in philosophy. They were written in the third century, with a view of answering, in a new manner, the objections of the Jews, philosophers, and Gnostics, against the Christian religion; and the careful perusal of them will be exceedingly useful to such as are desirous of information with respect to the state of the Christian church in the primitive times.[b]

XX. Ignatius, bishop of Antioch, succeeds Clemens in the list of the apostolic fathers, among whom were placed such Christian doctors as had conversed with the apostles themselves, or their disciples. This pious and venerable man, who was the disciple and familiar friend of the apostles, was, by the order of Trajan, exposed to wild beasts in the public theatre at Rome, where he suffered martyrdom with the utmost fortitude.[c] There are yet extant several epistles, attributed to him, concerning the authenticity of which there have been, however, tedious and warm disputes among the learned. Of these epistles, seven are said to have been written by this eminent martyr, during his journey from Antioch to Rome; and these the majority of learned men acknowledge to be genuine, as they stand in the edition that was published in the seventeenth century, from a manuscript in the Medicean library. The others are generally rejected as spurious. As to my own sentiments of this matter, though I am willing to adopt this opinion as preferable to any other, I cannot help looking upon the authenticity of the Epistle to Polycarp as extremely dubious, on account of the difference of style; and indeed, the whole question relating to the epistles of St. Ignatius in general, seems to me to labour under much obscurity, and to be embarrassed with many difficulties.[d]

XXI. The Epistle to the Philippians, which is ascribed to Polycarp bishop of Smyrna, who, in the middle of the second century, suffered martyrdom in a venerable and advanced age, is considered by some as genuine; by others, as spurious; and it is no easy matter to determine this question.[e] The Epistle of Barnabas was the production of some Jew, who, most probably, lived in this century, and whose mean abilities and superstitious attachment to Jewish fables, show, notwithstanding the uprightness of his intentions, that he must have been a very different person from the true Barnabas, who was St. Paul's companion.[f] The work which is entitled the Shepherd of Hermas, because the angel, who bears the principal part in it, is represented in the form and habit of a shepherd, was composed in the second century by Hermas, who was brother to Pius, bishop of Rome.[g] This whimsical and visionary writer has taken the liberty of inventing several dialogues or conversations between God and the angels, in order to insinuate, in a more easy and agreeable manner the precepts which he thought useful and salutary, into the minds of his readers. But indeed, the discourse, which he puts into the mouths of those celestial beings is more insipid and senseless, than what we commonly hear among the meanest of the multitude.[h]

XXII. We may here remark in general, that these apostolic fathers, and the other writers, who, in the infancy of the church, employed their pens in the cause of Christianity, were neither remarkable for their learning nor for their eloquence. On the contrary, they express the most pious and admirable sentiments in the plainest and most illiterate style.[i] This, indeed, is rather a matter of honour than of reproach to the Christian cause, since we see, from the conversion of a great part of mankind by the ministry of weak and illiterate men, that the progress of Christianity is not to be attributed to human means but to a divine power.

CHAPTER III.

Concerning the Doctrine of the Christian Church in this Century.

I. THE whole of the Christian religion is comprehended in two great points, one of which regards what we are to believe, and the other relates to our conduct and actions; or, in a shorter phrase, the Gospel presents to us objects of *faith* and rules of *practice*. The apostles express the former by the term *mystery*, or the *truth*, and the latter by that of *godliness*, or *piety*.[k] The rule and standard of both are those books which contain the revelation that God made of his will to persons chosen for that purpose, whether before or after the birth of Christ; and these divine books are usually called *the Old and New Testament*.

II. The apostles and their disciples took all possible care, in the earliest times of the church, that these sacred books might be in the hands of all Christians, that they might be read and explained in the assemblies of the faithful, and thus contribute, both in private and in public, to excite and nourish in the minds of Christians a fervent zeal for the truth, and a firm attachment to the ways of piety and virtue. Those who performed the office of interpreters studied above all things plainness and perspicuity. At the same time it must be acknowledged, that, even in this century, several Christians adopted the absurd and corrupt custom, used among the Jews, of darkening the plain words of the Holy Scriptures by insipid and forced allegories, and of drawing them violently from their proper and natural meanings, in order to extort from them mysterious and hidden significations. For a proof of this, we need go no farther than the Epistle of Barnabas, which is yet extant.

[a] Buddeus has collected the various opinions of the learned concerning the Apostolical Canons and Constitutions, in his Isagoge in Theologiam.

[b] See, for a full account of this work, Mosheim's Dissertation, de turbatâ per recentiores Platonicos Ecclesiâ, sect. 34. ☞This Dissertation is in the first volume of that learned work which our author published under the title of Syntagma Dissertationum ad Historiam Ecclesiasticam pertinentium.

[c] See Tillemont's Memoires pour servir à l'Histoire de l'Eglise, tom. ii.

[d] For an account of this controversy, it will be proper to consult the Bibliotheca Græca of Fabricius, lib. v. cap. i.

[e] For an account of this martyr, and of the epistle attributed to him, see Tillemont's Memoires, tom. ii., and Fabricii Biblioth. Græca, lib. v.

[f] See Tillemont's Memoires, and Ittigius' Select. Hist. Eccles. Capita, sæc. i.

[g] This now appears with the utmost evidence from a very ancient fragment of a small book, concerning the canon of the Scriptures, which the learned Lud. Anton. Muratori published from an ancient manuscript in the library at Milan, and which is to be found in the Antiq. Italic. medii Ævi, tom. iii. diss. xliii.

[h] We are indebted for the best edition of the Shepherd of Hermas, to Fabricius, who has added it to the third volume of his Codex Apocryphus N. Testamenti. We find also some account of this writer in the Biblioth. Græca of the same learned author, book v. chap. ix., and also in Ittigius' dissertation de Patribus Apostolicis, sect. 55.

[i] All the writers mentioned in this chapter are usually called *apostolic fathers*. Of the works of these authors, Jo. Bapt. Cotelerius, and after him Le Clerc, have published a collection in two volumes, accompanied with their own annotations, and the remarks of other learned men.

[k] 1 Tim. iii. 9; vi. 3. Tit. i. 1

III. The method of teaching the sacred doctrines of religion was, at this time, most simple, far removed from all the subtle rules of philosophy, and all the precepts of human art. This appears abundantly, not only in the writings of the apostles, but also in all those of the second century, which have survived the ruins of time. Neither did the apostles, or their disciples, ever think of collecting into a regular system the principal doctrines of the Christian religion, or of demonstrating them in a scientific and geometrical order. The beautiful and candid simplicity of these early ages rendered such philosophical niceties unnecessary; and the great study of those who embraced the Gospel was rather to express its divine influence in their dispositions and actions, than to examine its doctrines with an excessive curiosity, or to explain them by the rules of human wisdom.

IV. There is extant, indeed, a brief summary of the principal doctrines of Christianity in that form which bears the name of the *Apostles' Creed*, and which, from the fourth century downwards, was almost generally considered as a production of the apostles. All, however, who have the least knowledge of antiquity, look upon this opinion as entirely false, and destitute of all foundation.[a] There is much more reason in the opinion of those who think, that this creed was not all composed at once, but, from small beginnings, was imperceptibly augmented in proportion to the growth of heresy, and according to the exigencies and circumstances of the church, from which it was designed to banish the errors that daily arose.[b]

V. In the earliest times of the church, all who professed firmly to believe that Jesus was the only Redeemer of the world, and who in consequence of this profession, promised to live in a manner conformable to the purity of his holy religion, were immediately received among the disciples of Christ. This was all the preparation for baptism then required; and a more accurate instruction in the doctrines of Christianity was to be administered to them after their reception of that sacrament. But, when Christianity had acquired more consistence, and churches rose to the true God and his eternal Son, almost in every nation, this custom was changed for the wisest and most solid reasons. Then baptism was administered to none but such as had been previously instructed in the principal points of Christianity, and had also given satisfactory proofs of pious dispositions and upright intentions. Hence arose the distinction between *catechumens*, who were in a state of probation, and under the instruction of persons appointed for that purpose; and *believers*, who were consecrated by baptism, and thus initiated into all the mysteries of the Christian faith.

VI. The methods of instructing the catechumens differed according to their various capacities. To those, in whom the natural force of reason was small, only the fundamental principles and truths, which are, as it were, the basis of Christianity, were taught. Those, on the contrary, whom their instructors judged capable of comprehending, in some measure, the whole system of divine truth, were furnished with superior degrees of knowledge; and nothing was concealed from them, which could have any tendency to render them firm in their profession, and to assist them in arriving at Christian perfection. The care of instructing such was committed to persons who were distinguished by their gravity and wisdom, and also by their learning and judgment. Hence the ancient doctors generally divide their flock into two classes; the one comprehending such as were solidly and thoroughly instructed; the other, those who were acquainted with little more than the first principles of religion; nor do they deny that the methods of instruction applied to these two sorts of persons were extremely different.

VII. The Christians took all possible care to accustom their children to the study of the Scriptures, and to instruct them in the doctrines of their holy religion; and schools were every where erected for this purpose, even from the very commencement of the Christian church. We must not, however, confound the *schools* designed only for children, with the *gymnasia* or academies of the ancient Christians, erected in several large cities, in which persons of riper years, especially such as aspired to be public teachers, were instructed in the different branches, both of human learning and of sacred erudition. We may, undoubtedly, attribute to the apostles themselves, and to the injunctions given to their disciples, the excellent establishments, in which the youth destined to the holy ministry received an education suitable to the solemn office they were to undertake.[c] St. John erected a school of this kind at Ephesus, and one of the same nature was founded by Polycarp at Smyrna:[d] but these were not in greater repute than that which was established at Alexandria,[e] commonly called the *catechetical school*, and generally supposed to have been erected by St. Mark.[f]

VIII. The ancient Christians are supposed by many to have had a *secret doctrine*; and if by this be meant, that they did not teach all in the same manner, or reveal all at once, and to all indiscriminately, the sublime mysteries of religion, there is nothing in this that may not be fully justified. It would have been improper, for example, to propose to those who were yet to be converted to Christianity, the more difficult doctrines of the Gospel, which surpass the comprehension of imperfect mortals. Such were, therefore, first instructed in those points which are more obvious and plain, until they became capable of higher and more difficult attainments in religious knowledge. And even those who were already admitted into the society of Christians, were, in point of instruction, differently dealt with according to their respective capacities. Those who consider the *secret doctrine* of this century in any other light, or give to it a greater extent than what we have here attri-

[a] See Buddei Isagoge ad Theologium, lib. i. cap. ii. sect. 2. p. 441, as also Walchii Introductio in libros Symbolicos, lib. i. cap. ii. p. 87.

[b] This opinion is confirmed in the most learned and ingenious manner by Sir Peter King, in his history of the Apostles' Creed. Such, however, as read this valuable work with pleasure, and with a certain degree of prepossession, would do well to consider that its author, upon several occasions, has given us conjectures instead of proofs; and also, that his conjectures are not always so happy as justly to command our assent.

[c] 2 Tim. ii. 2.

[d] Irenæus, adv. Hæres. lib. ii. cap. xxii. Eusebius, Hist. Eccles. lib. v. cap. xx.

[e] The Alexandrian School was renowned for a succession of learned doctors, as we find by the accounts of Eusebius and St. Jerom; for, after St. Mark, Pantænus, Clemens Alexandrinus, Origen, and many others, taught in it the doctrines of the Gospel, and rendered it a famous seminary for Christian philosophy and religious knowledge. There were also at Rome, Antioch, Cæsarea, Edessa, and in several other cities, schools of the same nature, though not all of equal reputation.

[f] See the dissertation of Schmidius, de Scholâ Catecheticâ Alexandrinâ; as also Aulisius, delle Scuole Sacre, book ii. ch. i. ii. xxi. The curious reader will find a learned account of the more famous Christian schools in the eastern parts, at Edessa, Nisibis, and Seleucia; and, indeed of the ancient schools in general, in Assemani Biblioth. Oriental. Clement. Vaticanæ, tom. iii. par. ii.

buted to it, confound the superstitious practices of the following ages, with the simplicity of that discipline which prevailed at the time of which we write.[a]

IX. The lives and manners of the Christians in this century are highly celebrated by most authors, and recommended to succeeding generations as unspotted models of piety and virtue; and, if these encomiums be confined to the greater part of those who embraced Christianity in the infancy of the church, they are certainly distributed with justice: but many run into extremes upon this head, and, estimating the lives and manners of all by the illustrious examples of some eminent saints, or the sublime precepts and exhortations of certain pious doctors, fondly imagine, that every appearance of vice and disorder was banished from the first Christian societies. The greatest part of those authors who have treated of the innocence and sanctity of the primitive Christians, have fallen into this error; and a gross error indeed it is, as the strongest testimonies too evidently prove.

X. One of the circumstances which contributed chiefly to preserve, at least, an external appearance of sanctity in the Christian church, was the right of excluding from it, and from all participation of the sacred rites and ordinances of the Gospel, such as had been guilty of enormous transgressions, and to whom repeated exhortations to repentance and amendment had been administered in vain. This right was vested in the church from the earliest period of its existence, by the apostles themselves, and was exercised by each Christian assembly upon its respective members. The rulers, or doctors, denounced the persons whom they thought unworthy of the privileges of church communion; and the people, freely approving or rejecting their judgment, pronounced the decisive sentence. It was not, however, irrevocable; for such as gave undoubted signs of their sincere repentance, and declared their solemn resolutions of future reformation, were re-admitted into the church, however enormous their crimes had been; but, in case of a relapse, their second exclusion became absolutely irreversible.[b]

XI. It will easily be imagined, that unity and peace could not reign long in the church, since it was composed of Jews and Gentiles, who regarded each other with the bitterest aversion. Besides, as the converts to Christianity could not extirpate radically the prejudices which had been formed in their minds by education, and confirmed by time, they brought with them into the bosom of the church more or less of the errors of their former religion. Thus the seeds of discord and controversy were early sown, and could not fail to spring up soon into animosities and dissensions, which accordingly broke out, and divided the church. The first of these controversies arose in the church of Antioch. It regarded the necessity of observing the law of Moses; and its issue is mentioned by St. Luke in the Acts of the Apostles.[c] This controversy was followed by many others, either with the Jews, who were violently attached to the worship of their ancestors, or with the votaries of a wild and fanatical sort of philosophy, or with such as, mistaking the true genius of the Christian religion, abused it monstrously to the encouragement of their vices, and the indulgence of their appetites and passions.[d] St. Paul and the other apostles have, in several places of their writings, mentioned these controversies, but with such brevity, that it is difficult, at this distance of time, to discover the true state of the question in these various disputes.

XII. The most weighty and important of all these controversies, was that which some Jewish doctors raised at Rome, and in other Christian churches, concerning the means of justification and acceptance with God, and the method of salvation pointed out in the word of God. The apostles, wherever they exercised their ministry, had constantly declared all hopes of acceptance and salvation delusive, except such as were founded on Jesus the Redeemer, and his all-sufficient *merits*, while the Jewish doctors maintained the *works* of the law to be the true efficient cause of the soul's eternal salvation and felicity. The latter sentiment not only led to other errors prejudicial to Christianity, but was particularly injurious to the glory of its divine Author; for those who looked upon a course of life conformable to the law, as a meritorious title to eternal happiness, could not consider Christ as the Son of God, and the Saviour of mankind, but only as an eminent prophet, or a divine messenger, sent from above to enlighten and instruct a darkened world. It is not, therefore, surprising, that St. Paul took so much pains in his Epistle to the Romans, and in his other writings, to extirpate such a pernicious and capital error.

XIII. The controversy that had been raised concerning the necessity of observing the ceremonies of the Mosaic law, was determined by the apostles in the wisest and most prudent manner.[e] Their authority, however, respectable as it was, had not its full effect; for the prejudices, which the Jews, especially those who lived in Palestine, entertained in favour of the Mosaic law and their ancient worship, were so deeply rooted in their minds, that they could not be thoroughly removed. The force of these prejudices was indeed, somewhat diminished after the destruction of Jerusalem and the ruin of the temple, but not entirely destroyed. And hence, as we shall see in its place, a part of the judaizing Christians separated themselves from the rest, and formed a particular sect, distinguished by their adherence to the law of Moses.

CHAPTER IV.

Concerning the Rites and Ceremonies used in the Church during this Century.

I. THE Christian religion was singularly commendable on account of its beautiful and divine simplicity, which appears from its two great and fundamental principles—faith and charity. This simplicity was not, however, incompatible with external ceremonies and positive institutions, which, indeed, are necessary, in this imperfect state, to keep alive a sense of religion in the minds of men. The rites instituted by Christ himself were only two in number; and these were intended to continue to the end of the church here below, without any variation. These rites were baptism and the holy supper, which are not to

[a] Many learned observations upon the *secret discipline* have been collected by the celebrated Christoph. Matt. Pfaffius, in his Dissert. poster. de Præjudiciis Theolog. sect. 13, p. 149, &c. in Primitiis Tubingensibus.

[b] See Morinus, Comm. de Disciplinâ Pœnitentiæ, lib. ix. cap. xix. p. 670.

[c] Chap. xv.

[d] See, for an illustration of these points, Witsius' Missellanea Sacra, tom. ii. Exercit. xx. xxi. xxii. p. 668., and also Camp. Vitringa, Observ. Sacræ, lib. iv., cap. ix. x. xi., p. 952.

[e] Acts xv.

be considered as mere ceremonies, nor yet as symbolic representations only, but also as ordinances accompanied with a sanctifying influence upon the heart and the affections of true Christians. And we cannot help observing here, that since the divine Saviour thought fit to appoint no more than two plain institutions in his church, this shows us that a great number of ceremonies are not essential to his religion, and that he left it to the free and prudent choice of Christians to establish such rites as the circumstances of the times, or the exigencies of the church, might require.

II. There are several circumstances, however, which incline us to think, that the friends and apostles of our blessed Lord either tolerated through necessity, or appointed for wise reasons, many other external rites in various places. At the same time, we are not to imagine that they ever conferred upon any person a perpetual, indelible, pontifical authority, or that they enjoined the same rites in all churches. We learn on the contrary, from authentic records, that the Christian worship was, from the beginning, celebrated in a different manner in different places, undoubtedly by the orders, or at least with the approbation of the apostles and their disciples. In those early times it was both wise and necessary to show, in the establishment of outward forms of worship, some indulgence to the ancient opinions, manners, and laws of the respective nations to which the Gospel was preached.

III. Hence it follows that the opinion of those who maintain that the Jewish rites were adopted every where, in the Christian churches, by order of the apostles, or their disciples, is destitute of all foundation. In those Christian societies, which were totally or principally composed of Jewish converts, it was natural to retain as much of the Jewish ritual as the genius of Christianity would suffer; and a multitude of examples testify that this was actually done. But that the same translation of Jewish rites should take place in Christian churches, where there were no Jews, or a very small and inconsiderable number, is utterly incredible, because such an event was morally impossible. In a word, the external forms of worship used in ancient times, must necessarily have been regulated and modified according to the character, genius, and manners of the different nations on which the light of the Gospel arose.

IV. Since then there was such a variety in the ritual and discipline of the primitive churches, it must be very difficult to give such an account of the worship, manners, and institutions, of the ancient Christians, as will agree with what was practised in all those countries where the Gospel flourished. There are, notwithstanding, certain laws, whose authority and obligation were universal and indispensable among Christians; and of these we shall here give a brief account. All Christians were unanimous in setting apart the first day of the week, on which the triumphant Saviour arose from the dead, for the solemn celebration of public worship. This pious custom, which was derived from the example of the church of Jerusalem, was founded upon the express appointment of the apostles, who consecrated that day to the same sacred purpose, and was observed universally throughout the Christian churches, as appears from the united testimonies of the most credible writers.[a] The seventh day of the week was also observed as a festival,[b] not by the Christians in general, but by such churches only as were principally composed of Jewish converts; nor did the other Christians censure this custom as criminal or unlawful. It appears, moreover, that all the Christian churches observed two great anniversary festivals; one in memory of Christ's glorious resurrection, and the other to commemorate the descent of the Holy Ghost upon the apostles.[c] To these we may add the days on which the blessed martyrs laid down their lives for the truth, which days were probably dignified with particular solemnities and marks of veneration from the earliest times.

V. The places in which the first Christians assembled to celebrate divine worship, were, no doubt, the houses of private persons. But, in process of time, it became necessary, that these sacred assemblies should be confined to one fixed place in which the books, tables, and desks, required in divine service, might be constantly kept, and the dangers avoided, which in those perilous times, attended their transportation from one place to another. And then, probably, the places of meeting, that had formerly belonged to private persons, became the property of the whole Christian community.[d] These few remarks are, in my opinion, sufficient to determine that question, which has been so long, and so tediously debated,—whether the first Christians had churches or not;[e] since if any are pleased to give the name of church to a house, or the part of a house, which, though appointed as the place of religious worship, was neither separated from common use, nor considered as holy in the opinion of the people, it will be readily granted, that the most ancient Christians had churches.

VI. In these assemblies the holy scriptures were publicly read, and for that purpose were divided into certain portions or lessons. This part of divine service was followed by a brief exhortation to the people, in which eloquence and art gave place to the natural and fervent expression of zeal and charity. If any declared themselves extraordinarily animated by the Spirit, they were permitted to explain successively the divine will, while the other prophets who were present decided how much weight and authority were to be attributed to what they said.[f] The

[a] Phil. Jac. Hartmannus, de rebus gestis Christianorum sub Apostolis, cap. xv. p. 387. Just. Hen. Bohmer, Dissert. 1. Juris Eccles. Antiqui de stato die Christianor. p. 20, &c.

[b] Steph. Curcellæus, Diatriba de Esu Sanguinis, Operum Theolog. p. 958. Gab. Albaspinæus, Observat. Eccles. lib. i. Observ. xiii. It is in vain that many learned men have laboured to prove, that, in *all* the primitive churches, both the first and last day of the week were observed as festivals. The churches of Bithynia, of which Pliny speaks in his letter to Trajan, had only one stated day for the celebration of public worship; and that was, undoubtedly, the first day of the week, or what we call the Lord's day.

[c] There are, it is true, learned men, who look upon it as a doubtful matter whether the day of Pentecost was celebrated as a festival so early as the first century. See Bingham's Antiquities of the Christian Church, book xx. chap. vi. But, notwithstanding this, there are some weighty reasons for believing that this festival was as ancient as that of Easter, which was celebrated, as all agree, from the very first rise of the church. It is also probable that Friday, the day of Christ's crucifixion, was early distinguished by particular honours from the other days of the week. See Jac. Godofred, in Codicem Theodosii, tom. i. Asseman. Biblioth. Oriental. Vatican. tom. i. Martenne, Thesaur. Anecdot. tom. v.

[d] See Camp. Vitringa, de Synagogâ vetere, lib. i. par. iii. cap. i. p. 432.

[e] See Blondel, de Episcopis et Presbyteris, sect. iii. p. 216, 243, 246. Just. Hen. Bohmer, Dissert. ii. Juris Eccles. Antiqui, de Antelucanis Christianorum Cœtibus, sect. 4. Bingham's Antiquities of the Christian Church, book viii. chap. i.

[f] 1 Cor. xiv. 6.

prayers, which formed a considerable part of the public worship, were introduced at the conclusion of these discourses, and were repeated by the people after the bishop or presbyter, who presided in the service.[a] To these were added certain hymns, which were sung, not by the whole assembly, but by persons appointed for that purpose, during the celebration of the Lord's supper, and the feasts of charity. Such were the essential parts of divine worship which were observed in all Christian churches, though, perhaps the method and order in which they were performed were not the same in all.[b]

VII. The prayers of the first Christians were followed by oblations of bread, wine, and other things; and hence both the ministers of the church and the poor, derived their subsistence. Every Christian, who was in an opulent condition, and indeed every one, according to his circumstances, brought gifts and offered them, as it were, to the Lord.[c] Of the bread and wine presented in these offerings, such a quantity was separated from the rest as was required in the administration of the Lord's supper; this was consecrated by certain prayers pronounced by the bishop alone, to which the people assented, by saying Amen.[d] The holy supper was distributed by the deacons; and this sacred institution was followed by sober repasts, denominated (from the excellent purpose to which they were directed,) *agapæ*, or feasts of charity.[e] Many attempts have been made to fix precisely the nature of these social feasts. But here it must be again considered, that the rites and customs of the primitive Christians were very different in different countries, and that consequently these feasts, like other institutions, were not every where celebrated in the same manner. This is the true and only way of explaining all the difficulties that can arise upon this subject.

VIII. The sacrament of *baptism* was administered in this century, without the public assemblies, in places appointed and prepared for that purpose, and was performed by an immersion of the whole body in the baptismal font.[f] At first it was usual for all who laboured in the propagation of the Gospel, to be present at that solemn ceremony; and it was also customary, that the converts should be baptized and received into the church by those under whose ministry they had embraced the Christian doctrine. But this custom was soon changed. When the churches were well established, and governed by a system of fixed laws, then the right of baptizing the converts was vested in the bishop alone. This right, indeed, he conferred upon the *presbyters* and the *chorepiscopi* (country bishops,) when the bounds of the church were still farther enlarged; reserving, however, to himself the confirmation of that baptism which was administered by a presbyter.[g] There were, doubtless, several circumstantial ceremonies observed in the administration of this sacrament for the sake of order and decency. Of these, however, it is not easy, nor perhaps is it possible to give a certain or satisfactory account, since, on this subject we are too much exposed to the illusion which arises from confounding the customs of the primitive times with those of succeeding ages.

IX. Persons who were visited with violent or dangerous disorders, sent, according to the apostle's direction,[h] for the rulers of the church, and, after confessing their sins, were recommended by them to the divine mercy, in prayers full of piety and fervor, and were also anointed with oil. This rite has occasioned many debates, and, indeed, they must be endless, since the silence of the ancient writers upon that head renders it impossible to decide the matter with certainty. The anointing of the sick is very rarely mentioned in the ancient records of the church, though there is no reason to doubt that it was an universal custom among Christians.[i]

X. Neither Christ nor his apostles enacted any law concerning *fasting*. A custom, however, prevailed among many Christians, of joining abstinence with their prayers, especially when they were engaged in affairs of extraordinary importance.[k] As this custom was authorized by no public law, the time that was to be employed in these acts of abstinence was left to every one's private judgment; nor were those looked upon as criminal, who contented themselves with observing the rules of strict temperance, without going farther.[l] In the most ancient times we find no mention of any public and solemn fasts, except on the anniversary of Christ's crucifixion. But, in process of time, days of fasting were gradually introduced, first by custom, and afterwards by positive appointment, though it is not certain what those days were, or whether they were observed in the first century. Those, however, who affirm, that in the time of the apostles, or soon after, the fourth and sixth days of the week were observed as fasts, are not, it must be acknowledged, destitute of specious arguments in favour of their opinion.[m]

CHAPTER V.

Concerning the Divisions and Heresies which troubled the Church during this Century.

I. THE Christian church was scarcely formed, when, in different places, there started up certain pretended reformers, who, not satisfied with the simplicity of that religion which was taught by the apostles, meditated changes of doctrine and worship, and set up a new religion, drawn from their own licentious imaginations. This we learn

[a] See Justin Martyr's second Apology, p. 98, &c.

[b] This must be understood of churches well established, and regulated by fixed laws; for, in the first Christian assemblies, which were yet in an imperfect and fluctuating state, one or other of these circumstances of divine worship may possibly have been omitted.

[c] See the dissertations of the venerable and learned Pfaff, de Oblatione et Consecratione Eucharisticâ, which are contained in his Syntagma Dissertation. Theologic. published at Stutgard in 1720.

[d] Justin Martyr, Apologia secunda. The several authors who have investigated the manner of celebrating the Lord's supper, are mentioned by Jo. Alb. Fabricius, in his Bibliograph. Antiquar. cap. xi.

[e] The authors who have described the *agapæ* are mentioned by Ittigius, in his Selecta Historiæ Eccles. Capita, Sæc. ii. cap. iii.; and also by Pfaff, de Originibus Juris Eccles. p. 68.

[f] See the learned dissertation of Jo. Gerard Vossius concerning baptism, Disp. i. Thes. vi. p. 31, &c. The reader will also find, in the xith chapter and xxvth section of the Bibliogr. Antiquar. of Fabricius, an account of the authors who have written upon this subject.

[g] These observations will illustrate, and, perhaps, decide the question concerning the right of administering baptism, which has been so long debated among the learned, and with such ardour and vehemence. See Bohmer, Dissert. xi. Juris Eccles. p. 500; and also Le Clerc, Biblioth. Universelle et Historique, tom. iv. p. 93.

[h] James v. 14.

[i] The accounts which the ancient authors have given of this custom are the most of them collected in a treatise published by Launoy, de Sacramentis Unctionis infirmorum, cap. i. p. 444. in the first volume of his works. Among these accounts there are very few drawn from the writers of the first ages, and some passages applicable to this subject have been omitted by that learned author.

[k] 1 Cor. vii. 5.

[l] See the Shepherd of Hermas, book iii. Similitud. v.

[m] See Beverege's Vindication of the Canon, in the second volume of his edition of the Apostolic Fathers.

from the writings of the apostles, and particularly from the epistles of St. Paul, where we find, that some were inclined to force the doctrines of Christianity into a conformity with the philosophical systems they had adopted,[a] while others were as studious to blend with these doctrines the opinions, customs, and traditions of the Jews. Several of these are mentioned by the apostles, such as Hymenæus, Alexander, Philetus, Hermogenes, Demas, and Diotrephes; though the four last are rather to be considered as apostates from the truth, than as corrupters of it.[b]

II. The influence of these new teachers was at first inconsiderable. During the lives of the apostles, their attempts toward the perversion of Christianity were attended with little success, and they had a very small number of followers. They, however, acquired credit and strength by degrees; and, even from the first dawn of the Gospel, imperceptibly laid the foundations of those sects, whose animosities and disputes produced afterwards such trouble and perplexity in the Christian church. The true state of these divisions is more involved in darkness than any other part of ecclesiastical history; and this obscurity proceeds, partly from the want of ancient records, partly from the abstruse and unintelligible nature of the doctrines that distinguished these various sects; and, finally, from the ignorance and prejudices of those, who have transmitted to us the accounts of them, which are yet extant. Of one thing, indeed, we are certain, and that is, that the greater part of these doctrines were chimerical and extravagant in the highest degree; and, far from containing any thing that could recommend them to a lover of truth, they rather deserve to occupy a place in the history of human delusion and folly.[c]

III. Among the various sects that troubled the tranquillity of the Christian church, the leading one was that of the Gnostics. These enthusiastic and self-sufficient philosophers boasted of their being able to restore mankind to the *knowledge* (*gnosis*) of the true and Supreme Being, which had been lost in the world. They also foretold the approaching defeat of the *evil principle*, to whom they attributed the creation of this globe, and declared, in the most pompous terms, the destruction of his associates, and the ruin of his empire. An opinion has prevailed, derived from the authority of Clemens the Alexandrian, that the first appearance of the Gnostic sect is to be dated after the death of the apostles, and placed in the reign of the emperor Adrian; and it is also alleged, that, before this time, the church enjoyed a perfect tranquillity, undisturbed by dissensions, or sects of any kind. But the smallest degree of attention to the language of the Scriptures, not to mention the authority of other ancient records, will prevent us from adopting this groundless notion. For, from several passages of the sacred writings,[d] it evidently appears, that, even in the first century, the general Christian meeting was deserted, and separate assemblies were formed in several places, by persons infected with the Gnostic heresy; though, at the same time, it must be acknowledged, that this pernicious sect was not conspicuous, either for its number, or its reputation, before the time of Adrian. It is proper to observe here, that, under the general appellation of Gnostics, are comprehended all those who, in the first ages of Christianity, corrupted the doctrine of the Gospel by a profane mixture of the tenets of the oriental philosophy (concerning the origin of evil and the creation of the world,) with its divine truths.

IV. It was from this oriental philosophy, of which the leading principles have been already mentioned, that the Christian Gnostics derived their origin. If it was one of the chief tenets of this philosophy, that rational souls were imprisoned in corrupt matter, contrary to the will of the Supreme Deity, there were, however, in this same system, other doctrines which promised a deliverance from this deplorable state of servitude and darkness. The oriental sages expected the arrival of an extraordinary messenger of the Most High upon earth; a messenger invested with a divine authority, endowed with the most eminent sanctity and wisdom, and peculiarly commissioned to enlighten, with the knowledge of the Supreme Being, the darkened minds of miserable mortals, and to deliver them from the chains of the tyrants, and usurpers of this world. When, therefore, some of these philosophers perceived that Christ and his followers wrought miracles of the most amazing kind and also of the most salutary nature to mankind, they were easily induced to believe that he was the great Messenger expected from above, to deliver men from the power of the malignant *genii*, or spirits, to which, according to their doctrine, the world was subjected, and to free their souls from the dominion of corrupt matter.—This supposition once admitted, they interpreted, or rather corrupted, all the precepts and doctrines of Christ and his apostles, in such a manner as to reconcile them with their own pernicious tenets.

V. From the false principle above mentioned, arose, as it was natural to expect, a multitude of sentiments and notions, most remote from the tenor of the gospel doctrines, and the nature of its precepts. The Gnostic doctrine, concerning the creation of the world by one or more inferior beings, of an evil, or, at least, of an imperfect nature, led that sect to deny the divine authority of the books of the Old Testament, whose accounts of the origin of things so palpably contradicted this idle fiction. Through a frantic aversion to these sacred books, they lavished their encomiums upon the *serpent*, the first author of sin, and held in veneration some of the most impious and profligate persons of whom mention is made in sacred history. The pernicious influence of their fundamental principle carried them to all sorts of extravagance, filled them with an abhorrence of Moses and the religion he taught, and induced them to assert, that in imposing such a system of disagreeable and severe laws upon the Jews, he was only actuated by the malignant author of this world,

[a] 1 Tim. vi. 20. 1 Tim. i. 3, 4. Tit. iii. 9. Col. ii. 8.

[b] 2 Tim. ii. 18; and in other places. See also the accurate accounts given of these men by Vitringa, Observ. Sacr. lib. iv. cap. ix. p. 952. Ittigius, de Hæresiarchis Ævi Apostol. sect. i. cap. viii. Buddeus, de Ecclesiâ Apostolicâ, cap. v.

[c] Certain authors have written professedly of the sects that divided the church in this, and the following century, such as Ittigius, in his treatise de Hæresiarchis Ævi Apostolici et Apostolico proximi, and also in the Appendix to the same work; Renatus Massuet, in his Dissertations prefixed to Irenæus, and Tillemont, in his Memoires pour servir à l'Histoire de l'Eglise. But these authors, and others whom we shall not mention, have rather collected the materials from which a history of the ancient sects may be composed, than written their history. Hinckelman, Thomasius, Dodwell, Horbius, and Basnage, have some of them promised, others of them attempted such a history; but none of them finished this useful design. It is therefore to be wished that some eminent writer, who, with a competent knowledge of ancient philosophy and literature, also possesses a penetrating and unbiassed judgment, would undertake this difficult but interesting work.

[d] 1 John ii. 18. 1 Tim. vi. 20. Col. ii. 8.

who consulted his own glory and authority, and not the real advantage of men. Their persuasion that *evil* resided in *matter*, as its centre and source, prevented their treating the body with the regard that is due to it, rendered them unfavourable to wedlock, as the means by which corporeal beings are multiplied, and led them to reject the doctrine of the resurrection of the body, and its future re-union with the immortal spirit. Their notion that malevolent *genii* presided in nature, and that from them proceeded all diseases and calamities, wars and desolations, induced them to apply themselves to the study of magic, to weaken the powers or suspend the influences of these malignant agents. I omit the mention of several other extravagances in their system, the enumeration of which would be incompatible with the character of a compendious history.

VI. The notions of this sect concerning Jesus Christ were impious and extravagant. For, though they considered him as the Son of the Supreme God, sent from the *pleroma*, or habitation of the Everlasting Father, for the happiness of miserable mortals, yet they entertained unworthy ideas, both of his person and offices. They denied his deity, looking upon him as the mere Son of God, and consequently inferior to the Father; and they rejected his humanity, upon the supposition that every thing concrete and corporeal is, in itself, essentially and intrinsically evil. Hence the greatest part of the Gnostics denied that Christ was clothed with a *real* body, or that he suffered *really*, for the sake of mankind, the pains and sorrows which he is said to have sustained in the sacred history. They maintained that he came to mortals with no other view, than to deprive the tyrants of this world of their influence upon virtuous and heaven born souls, and, destroying the empire of these wicked spirits, to teach mankind how they might separate the divine mind from the impure body, and render the former worthy of being united to the Father of spirits.

VII. Their doctrine, relating to morals and practice, was of two kinds, which were extremely different from each other. The greatest part of this sect adopted rules of life that were full of austerity, recommended a strict and rigorous abstinence, and prescribed the most severe bodily mortifications, from a notion that these observances had a happy influence in purifying and enlarging the mind, and in disposing it for the contemplation of celestial things. As they looked upon it to be the unhappiness of the soul to have been associated, at all, to a malignant, terrestrial body, so they imagined that the more the body was extenuated, the less it would corrupt and degrade the mind, or divert it from pursuits of a spiritual and divine nature: all the Gnostics, however, were not so severe in their moral discipline. Some maintained that there was no moral difference in human actions; and thus confounding right and wrong, they gave a loose rein to all the passions, and asserted the innocence of following blindly all their motions, and of living by their tumultuous dictates.[a] There is nothing surprising or unaccountable in this difference between the Gnostic moralists; for, when we examine the matter with attention, we shall find, that the same doctrine may very naturally have given rise to these opposite sentiments. As they all deemed the body the centre and source of evil, those of that sect, who were of a morose and austere disposition, would be hence naturally led to mortify and combat the body as the enemy of the soul; and those who were of a vuluptuous turn, might also consider the actions of the body as having no relation, either of congruity or incongruity, to the state of a soul in communion with God.

VIII. Such extraordinary doctrines had certainly need of an undoubted authority to support them; and, as this authority was not to be found in the writings of the evangelists or apostles, recourse was had to fables and stratagems. When the Gnostics were challenged to produce the sources whence they had drawn such strange tenets, and an authority proper to justify the confidence with which they taught them, some referred to fictitious writings of Abraham, Zoroaster, Christ, and his apostles; others boasted of their having drawn these opinions from certain secret doctrines of Christ, which were not exposed to vulgar eyes; others affirmed, that they had arrived at these sublime degrees of wisdom by an innate force and vigour of mind; and some asserted, that they were instructed in these mysterious parts of theological science by Theudas, a disciple of St. Paul, and by Matthias, one of the friends of our Lord. As to those among the Gnostics who did not utterly reject the books of the New Testament, it is proper to observe, that they not only interpreted those sacred books most absurdly, by neglecting the true spirit of the words and the intention of the writers, but also corrupted them, in the most perfiduous manner, by curtailing and adding, in order to remove what was unfavourable, or to produce something conformable to their pernicious and extravagant system.

IX. It has been already observed, that the Gnostics were divided in their opinions before they embraced Christianity. This appears from the account which has been given above of the oriental philosophy; and hence we may see the reason why they were formed into so many different sects after their receiving the Christian faith. For, as all of them endeavoured to force the doctrines of the Gospel into a conformity with their particular sentiments and tenets, so Christianity must have appeared in various forms, among the different members of a sect, which passed, however, under one general name. Another circumstance, which contributed to this diversity of sects, was, that some, being Jews by birth (as Cerinthus and others,) could not so easily assume that contempt of Moses, and that aversion to his history, which were so virulently indulged by those who had no attachment to the Jewish nation or to its religious institutions. We may also observe, that the whole Gnostic system was destitute of any sure or solid foundation, and depended both for its existence and support, upon the airy suggestions of genius and fancy. This consideration alone is a sufficient key to explain the divisions that reigned in this sect, since *uniformity* can never subsist, with assurance, but upon the basis of evident and substantial truth; and *variety* must naturally introduce itself into those systems and institutions which are formed and conducted by the sole powers of invention and fancy.

X. As then the Christian religion was, in its rise, corrupted by the mixture of an impious and chimerical philosophy with its pure and sublime doctrines, it will be proper to mention here the heads of those sects, who, in the first century, cast a cloud upon the lustre of the rising church. Among these, many have given the first place

[a] See the Stromota of Clemens Alexandrinus, lib. iii. cap. v.

to Dositheus, a Samaritan. It is certain, that, about the time of our Saviour, a man so named, lived among the Samaritans, and abandoned that sect; but all the accounts we have of him tend to show, that he is improperly placed among mere heretics, and should rather be ranked among the enemies of Christianity; for this delirious man set himself up for the Messiah, whom God had promised to the Jews, and disowning, in consequence, the divine mission of Christ, could not be said to corrupt his doctrine.[a]

XI. The same observation is applicable to Simon Magus. This impious man is not to be ranked among those who corrupted with their errors the purity and simplicity of the Christian doctrine; nor is he to be considered as the parent and chief of the heretical tribe, in which point of light he has been injudiciously viewed by almost all ancient and modern writers. He is rather to be placed in the number of those who were enemies to the progress and advancement of Christianity; for it is manifest, from all the records we have concerning him, that after his defection from the Christians, he retained not the least attachment to Christ, but opposed himself openly to that divine personage, and assumed to himself blasphemously the title of the *supreme power of God*.[b]

XII. The accounts which ancient writers give us of Simon the magician, and of his opinions, seem so different and indeed so inconsistent with each other, that several learned men have considered them as regarding two different persons, bearing the name of Simon; the one a magician, and an apostate from Christianity; the other a Gnostic philosopher. This opinion, which supposes a fact, without any other proof than a seeming difference in the narration of the ancient historians, ought not to be too lightly adopted. To depart from the authority of ancient writers in this matter is by no means prudent: nor is it necessary to reconcile the different accounts already mentioned, whose inconsistency is not real, but apparent only. Simon was by birth a Samaritan, or a Jew: when he had studied philosophy at Alexandria,[c] he made a public profession of magic (which was not a very uncommon circumstance at that time,) and persuaded the Samaritans, by fictitious miracles, that he had received from God the power of commanding and restraining those evil beings by which mankind were tormented.[d] Having seen the miracles which Philip wrought by a divine power, he joined himself to this apostle, and embraced the doctrine of Christ, but with no other design than to receive the power of working miracles, in order to promote a low interest, and to preserve and increase his impious authority over the minds of men. Then St. Peter pointed out to him solemnly the impiety of his intentions and the vanity of his hopes, in that severe discourse recorded in the eighth chapter of the Acts of the Apostles: then the vile impostor not only returned to his former ways by an entire defection from the Christians, but also opposed, wherever he came, the progress of the Gospel, and even visited different countries with that odious intent. Many things are recorded of this impostor, of his tragical end, and of the statue erected to him at Rome, which the greatest part of the learned reject as fabulous. They are at least uncertain, and destitute of all probability.[e]

XIII. It is beyond all doubt, that Simon was in the class of those philosophers, who not only maintained the eternity of *matter*, but also the existence of an *evil being* who presided, and thus shared the empire of the universe with the supreme and beneficent *Mind*; and, as there was a considerable variety in the sentiments of the different members of this sect, it is more than probable, that Simon embraced the opinion of those who held that matter moved from eternity by an intrinsic and necessary activity, had, by its innate force, produced at a certain period, from its own substance, the evil principle which now exercises dominion over it, with all his numerous train of attendants. From this pernicious doctrine, the other errors attributed to him concerning fate, the indifference of human actions, the impurity of the human body, the power of magic, and the like extravagances, flow naturally, as from their true and genuine source.[f] But this odious magician still proceeded to more shocking degrees of enormity in his monstrous fictions; for he pretended, that in his person resided the greatest and most powerful of the divine æons; that another æon of the female sex, the mother of all human souls, dwelt in the person of his mistress Helena,[g] and that he came, by the command of God upon earth, to abolish the empire of those who had formed this material world, and to deliver Helena from their power and dominion.

XIV. Another wrong-headed teacher, named Menander, a Samaritan also by birth, appeared in this century. He is said to have been instructed by Simon; but this opinion has no other foundation than the groundless notion, that all the Gnostic sects derived their origin from that magician. He ought rather to be ranked with the lunatics, than with the heretics of antiquity, since he also took it into his head to exhibit himself to the world as the promised Saviour; for it appears, by the testimonies of Irenæus, Justin, and Tertullian, that he pretended to be one of the æons sent from the pleroma, or celestial regions, to succour the souls that lay groaning under bodily oppression and servitude, and to maintain them against the violence and stratagems of the dæmons who held the reins of empire in this sublunary world. As this doctrine was built upon the

---

[a] See Basnage, Histoire des Juifs, lib. ii. cap. xiii. and Rich. Simon, Critique de la Bibliothéque des Auteurs Ecclesiastiques de M. Du-Pin, tom. iii. cap. xiii.

[b] Origen adv. Celsum, lib. v.

[c] Clementina Homil. ii. p. 633, tom. ii. PP. Apost.

[d] Acts viii. 9, 10.

[e] See Beausobre, Histoire de Manich. p. 203, 395.—Van Dale's Dissertation, de Statuâ Simonis, subjoined to his discourse concerning the ancient oracles;—Dellingius, Observat. Sacr. lib. i. observ. xxxvi. Tillemont, Memoires pour servir à l'Histoire de l'Eglise, tom. i. p. 340. ☞ The circumstances of Simon's tragical end; his having pretended to fly by a miraculous power, in order to please the emperor Nero, who was fond of magic; his falling to the ground, and breaking his limbs, in consequence of the prayers of St. Peter and St. Paul; and his putting himself to death, through shame and despair, at having been thus defeated by the superior power of the apostles; all these romantic fictions have derived their credit from a set of ecclesiastical writers, who, on many occasions, prefer the marvellous to the truth, as favourable to a system of religion, or rather superstition, which truth and reason loudly disown.

[f] The dissertation of Horbius, concerning Simon, the magician, which was published not long ago in the Biblioth. Hæresiologica of Voigtius, tom. i. part iii. seems preferable to any thing else upon that subject, though it be a juvenile performance, and not sufficiently finished. He follows the steps of his master, Thomasius, who, with admirable penetration, discovered the true source of that multitude of errors with which the Gnostics, and particularly Simon, were so dismally polluted. Voigtius gives a list of the other authors who have made mention of this impostor.

[g] Some very learned men have given an allegorical explication of what the ancient writers say concerning Helena, the mistress of this magician, and imagine, that by the name Helena is signified either *matter* or *spirit*. But nothing is more easy than to show upon what slight foundations this opinion is built.

same foundation with that of Simon Magus, the ancient writers looked upon him as the instructor of Menander.

XV. If then we separate these three persons now successively mentioned, from the heretics of the first century, we may rank among the chief of the Christian sectaries, and particularly those who bear the general name of Gnostics, the Nicolaitans, whom Christ himself mentions with abhorrence by the mouth of his apostle.[a] It is true, indeed, that the divine Saviour does not reproach them with erroneous opinions concerning the deity, but with the licentiousness of their practice, and the contempt of that solemn law which the apostles had enacted (Acts, xv. 29.) against fornication, and the use of meats offered to idols. It is, however, certain, that the writers of the second and the following centuries, Irenæus, Tertullian, Clemens, and others, affirm, that the Nicolaitans adopted the sentiments of the Gnostics concerning the two principles of all things, the æons, and the origin of this terrestrial globe. The authority of these writers would be entirely satisfactory in this matter, were there not some reason to imagine that they confounded, in their narrations, two sects very different from each other; that of the Nicolaitans, mentioned in the Revelations; and another, founded by a certain Nicolaus, in the second century, upon the principles of the Gnostics. But this is a matter of too doubtful a nature to justify a positive decision on either side.

XVI. There is no sort of doubt, that Cerenthus may be placed with propriety among the Gnostics, though the learned are not entirely agreed whether he belongs to the heretics of the first or the second century.[b] This man was by birth a Jew, and, having applied himself to letters and philosophy at Alexandria,[c] attempted at length, to form a new and singular system of doctrine and discipline, by a monstrous combination of the doctrines of Christ with the opinions and errors of the Jews and Gnostics. From the latter he borrowed their pleroma, their æons, their demiurge; &c. and so modified and tempered these fictions, as to give them an air of Judaism, which must have considerably favoured the progress of his heresy. He taught "that the Creator of this world, whom he considered also as the sovereign and lawgiver of the Jewish people, was a being endowed with the greatest virtues, and derived his birth from the Supreme God; that he fell by degrees, from his native virtue and his primitive dignity; that God in consequence of this determined to destroy his empire, and sent upon earth, for this purpose, one of the ever-happy and glorious æons, whose name was Christ; that this Christ chose for his habitation the person of Jesus, a man of the most illustrious sanctity and justice, the son of Joseph and Mary, and, descending in the form of a dove, entered into him while he was receiving baptism from John in the waters of Jordan, that Jesus, after his union with Christ, opposed himself with vigour to the God of the Jews, and was by his instigation, seized and crucified by the Hebrew chiefs; and that, when Jesus became a prisoner, Christ ascended into heaven, so that the man Jesus alone was subjected to the pains of an ignominious death." Cerenthus required of his followers, that they should worship the Father of Christ, even the Supreme God, in conjunction with the Son; that they should abandon the lawgiver of the Jews, whom he looked upon as the Creator of the world; that they should retain a part of the law given by Moses, but should, nevertheless, employ their principal attention and care to regulate their lives by the precepts of Christ. To encourage them to this, he promised them the resurrection of this mortal body, after which was to commence a scene of the most exquisite delights, during Christ's earthly reign of a thousand years, which would be succeeded by a happy and never-ending life in the celestial world; for he held, that Christ will one day return upon earth, and, renewing his former union with the man Jesus, will reign with his people in the land of Palestine during a thousand years.

XVII. It has been already observed, that the church was troubled with early disputes concerning the law of Moses and the Jewish rites. Those, however, who considered the observance of the Mosaic rites as necessary to salvation, had not, in this first century, proceeded so far as to break off all communion with such as differed from them in this matter; therefore they were still regarded as brethren, though of the weaker sort. But when, after the second destruction of Jerusalem, under the emperor Adrian, these zealots for the Jewish rites deserted the ordinary assemblies of Christians, and established separate meetings among themselves, they were numbered with those sects who had departed from the pure doctrine of Christ. Hence arose the names of Nazarenes and Ebionites, by which the judaizing Christians were distinguished from those who looked upon the Mosaic worship and ceremonies as entirely abolished by the appearance of Christ upon earth. We shall only observe farther under this head, that though the Nazarenes and Ebionites are generally placed among the sects of the apostolic age, they really belong to the second century, which was the earliest period of their existence as a sect.

[a] Rev. ii. 6, 14, 15.

[b] See Sam. Basnage, Annal. Polit. Eccles. tom. ii; and Faydit, Eclaircissemens sur l'Histoire Eccles. des deux premiers Siecles, cap. v. The opinion of these two learned men is opposed by Buddeus, de Eccles. Apostolicâ, cap. v.

[c] Theodoret. Fabul. Hæret. lib. ii. cap. iii.

THE SECOND CENTURY.

PART I.

THE EXTERNAL HISTORY OF THE CHURCH.

CHAPTER I.

Concerning the prosperous Events that happened to the Church during this Century.

I. In this century, the Roman sceptre was, for the most part, swayed by princes of a mild and moderate turn. Trajan, though too eagerly bent upon the pursuit of glory, and not always sufficiently attentive to his conduct, or prudent in his measures, was nevertheless endowed with many virtues; and the predominant lines of his character were clemency and benevolence. Adrian was of a more harsh and intractable temper, yet far from deserving the odious appellation of a wicked or unjust prince. He was of a mixed character, chargeable with several vices, and estimable on account of some excellent qualities. The Antonines were illustrious models of humanity, goodness, and sublime virtue. Severus himself, in whose character and disposition such an unexpected and disadvantageous change was effected, was, in the beginning of his reign, unjust toward none; and even the Christians were treated by him with equity and mildness.

II. This lenity of the emperors proved advantageous to those Christians who lived under the Roman sceptre; it sometimes suspended their suffering, and alleviated the burthen of their distresses; for, though edicts of a severe nature were issued out against them, and the magistrates, animated by the priests and by the multitude, shed their blood with a cruelty which frequently exceeded even the dictates of the most barbarous laws, yet there was always some remedy that accompanied these evils, and softened their severity. Trajan, however condemnable in other respects, on account of his conduct toward the Christians, was yet engaged, by the representation that Pliny the younger gave of them, to forbid all search to be made after them. He also prohibited all anonymous libels and accusations, by which they had so often been perfidiously exposed to the greatest sufferings.[a] Antoninus Pius went so far as to enact penal laws against their accusers;[b] and others, by various acts of beneficence and compassion, defended them from the injurious treatment of the priests and people. Hence it came to pass, that, in this century, the limits of the church were considerably enlarged, and the number of converts to Christianity prodigiously augmented. Of the truth of this, we have the most respectable and authentic testimonies in the writings of the ancients; testimonies, whose evidence and authority are every way superior to the vain attempts which some have made to obscure and weaken them.[c]

III. It is not easy to point out particularly the different countries on which the light of celestial truth first rose in this age. The ancient records that yet remain, do not give us information sufficient to determine that point with certainty; nor is it, indeed, a matter of high importance. We are, however, assured, by the most unexceptionable testimonies, that Christ was worshipped as God almost throughout the whole East, as also among the Germans, Spaniards, Celts, Britons, and many other nations;[d] but which of them received the Gospel in the first century and which in the second, is a question unanswerable at this distance of time. Pantænus, the head of the Alexandrian school, is said to have conveyed to the Indians the knowledge of Christ.[e] But, after an attentive examination of the account which Eusebius gives of this point, it will appear that these supposed Indians were Jews, inhabitants of the happy Arabia, whom Bartholomew the apostle had before instructed in the doctrines of Christianity; for, according to the account of St. Jerome, Pantænus found among this people the Gospel of St. Matthew which they had received from Bartholomew, their first teacher.

IV. The Christian religion, having penetrated into the province of Gaul, seems to have passed thence into that part of Germany which was subject to the Romans, and afterwards into Britain.[f] Certain German churches, indeed, are fondly ambitious of deriving their origin from St. Peter, and from the companions of the other apostles. The Britons also are willing to believe, upon the authority of Bede, that in this century, and under the reign of Marcus Antoninus, their king Lucius addressed himself to Eleutherus, the Roman pontiff, for doctors to instruct him in the Christian religion, and, having obtained his request, embraced the Gospel.[g] But, after all, these traditions are extremely doubtful, and are, indeed, rejected by such as have learning sufficient to weigh the credibility of ancient narrations.

V. It is very possible that the light of Christianity may have reached Trans-Alpine Gaul, now called France, be-

[a] See Pliny's epistles, book x. let. xcviii.

[b] Eusebius, Eccl. Hist. lib. iv. cap. xiii.

[c] See Moyle's letters concerning the thundering legion, with the remarks which Dr. Mosheim has annexed to his latin translation of them, published at the end of a work entitled, Syntagma Dissert. ad Sanctiores Disciplinas pertinentium. See also the Dialogue between Justin Martyr and Trypho the Jew.

[d] Irenæus contra Hæres. lib. i. cap. x.—Tertullian adv. Judæos, cap. vii.

[e] Eusebius, Hist. Eccl. b. v. c. x.—Jerome, Catal. Script. Eccl. c. xxxvi.

[f] Ursinus, Bebelius and others, have written learnedly concerning the origin of the German churches, which Tertullian and Irenæus mention as erected in this century. Add to these the ample illustrations of this subject, which are to be found in Liron's Singularités Histor. et Liter. tom. iv. The celebrated Dom. Calmet has judiciously refuted the common and popular accounts of the first Christian doctors in Germany, in his Hist. de la Lorraine, tom. i. Diss. sur les Evèques de Treves, par iii. iv. See also Bollandus, Act. Sanctor., and Hontheim, Diss. de Æra Episcop. Trevir. tom. i.

[g] See Usher's Antiq. Eccles. Britann. cap. i.; as also Godwin, de Conversione Britan. cap. i.; and Rapin's History of England.

fore the conclusion of the apostolic age, either by the ministry of the apostles themselves, or their immediate successors. But we have no records that mention, with certainty, the establishment of Christian churches in this part of Europe before the second century. Pothinus, a man of exemplary piety and zeal, set out from Asia in company with Irenæus and others, and laboured in the Christian cause with such success among the Gauls, that churches were established at Lyons and Vienne, of which Pothinus himself became the first bishop.[a]

VI. The writers of this century attribute this rapid progress of Christianity to the power of God, to the energy of divine truth, to the extraordinary gifts which were imparted to the first Christians, and the miracles and prodigies that were wrought in their behalf, and at their command; and they scarcely ascribe any part of the amazing success that attended the preaching of the Gospel, to the intervening succours of human means, or second causes. But this is carrying the matter too far. The wisdom of human counsels, and the useful efforts of learning and prudence, are too inconsiderately excluded from this account of things; for it is beyond all doubt, that the pious diligence and zeal, with which many learned and worthy men recommended the sacred writings, and spread them abroad in translations, so as to render them useful to those who were ignorant of the language in which they were written, contributed much to the success and propagation of the Christian doctrine. Latin versions of these sacred books were multiplied by the pious labours of the learned, with particular diligence, because that language was now more general then any other.[b] Among these versions, that which was distinguished by the name of the Italic obtained universally the preference, and was followed by the Syriac, Egyptian, and Æthiopic versions, whose dates it is impossible to fix with certainty.[c]

VII. Among the obstacles that retarded the progress of Christianity, the impious calumnies of its enemies were the most considerable. The persons, the characters, and religious sentiments of the first Christians, were most unjustly treated, and most perfidiously misrepresented to the credulous multitude,[d] who were restrained by this only from embracing the Gospel. Those, therefore, who, by their apologetic writings for the Christians, destroyed the poisonous influence of detraction, rendered, no doubt, signal service to the doctrine of Christ, by removing the chief impediment to its progress. Nor were the writings of such as combated with success the ancient heretics without their use, especially in the early periods of the church; for the insipid and extravagant doctrines of these sectaries, and the gross immoralities with which they were chargeable, were extremely prejudicial to the Christian religion, by disgusting many at whatever bore the Christian name; but, when it was known by the writings of those who defended Christianity, that these corrupt heretics were held in aversion, instead of being patronized by the true followers of Christ, the clouds that were cast over the religion of Jesus were dispersed, and the prejudices that had been raised against it were fully removed.

VIII. It is easier to conceive than to express, how much the *miraculous powers* and *extraordinary gifts*, which were displayed in the ministry of the first heralds of the Gospel, contributed to enlarge the bounds of the church. These gifts, however, which were bestowed for wise and important reasons, began gradually to diminish in proportion as the reasons ceased for which they were conferred. And, accordingly, when almost all nations were enlightened with the truth, and the number of Christian churches daily increased, the miraculous gift of tongues began gradually to decrease. It appears at the same time, from unexceptionable testimonies, that the other extraordinary gifts with which the omnipotence and wisdom of the Most High had so richly endowed the rising church, were in several places continued during this century.[e]

IX. We cannot indeed place, with certainty, among the effects of a miraculous power yet remaining in the church, the story of the Christian legion, who, by their prayers, drew from heaven a refreshing shower upon the army of Marcus Antoninus, ready to perish with thirst, when that emperor was at war with the Marcomanni. This remarkable event (which gave to the Christians, to whom it was attributed, the name of the *thundering legion*, on account of the thunder and lightning that destroyed the enemy, while the shower revived the fainting Romans) has been mentioned by many writers. But whether it was really miraculous or not, has been much disputed among learned men. Some think that the Christians, by a pious sort of mistake, attributed this unexpected and seasonable shower, which saved the Roman army, to a miraculous interposition; and this opinion is, indeed, supported by the weightiest reasons, as well as by the most respectable authorities.[f]

X. Let us distinguish what is doubtful in this story, from that which is certain. It is undoubted, that the Roman troops, enclosed by the enemy, and reduced to the most deplorable and even desperate condition, by the thirst under which they languished in a parched desert, were revived by a sudden and unexpected rain. It is also

[a] See the epistle of Peter de Marca, concerning the rise of Christianity in France, published among the dissertations of that author, and also by Valesius, in his edition of Eusebius' Ecclesiastical History. See also Histoire Literaire de la France, tom. i., and Liron's Singularités Histor. et Literaires, vol. iv.

[b] See Augustin. de doctrinâ Christianâ, lib. ii. cap. xi.

[c] See Jo. Gottlob Carpzov. Critica sacra Vet. Test. p. 663.

☞ [d] Nothing more injurious can be conceived than the terms of contempt, indignation, and reproach, which the Heathens employed in expressing their hatred against the Christians, who were called by them *atheists*, because they derided the heathen Polytheism; *magicians*, because they wrought miracles; *self-murderers*, because they suffered martyrdom cheerfully for the truth; *haters of the light*, because, to avoid the fury of the persecutions raised against them, they were obliged, at first, to hold their religious assemblies in the night. See Bingham's Antiquities of the Christian Church, book i. cap. ii.

[e] Pfanner, de donis miraculosis; Spencer. Not. ad Orig. contra Celsum; Mammachius, Origines et Antiquitat. Christian. tom. i.

[f] Such readers as are desirous to know what learned men have alleged on both sides of this curious question, may consult Witsius' Dissertat. de Legione Fulminatrice, which is subjoined to his Ægyptiaca, in defence of this miracle; as also what is alleged against it by Dan. La-Roque, in a discourse upon that subject subjoined to the Adversaria Sacra of Matth. La Roque, his father. But, above all, the controversy between Sir Peter King* and Mr. Walter Moyle, upon this subject, is worthy of the attention of the curious; and likewise the dissertation of the learned Jablonski, inserted in the eighth volume of the Miscellanea Lipsiensia, p. 417, under the title of Spicilegium de Legione Fulminatrice. The last mentioned author investigates, with great acuteness, the reasons and motives which induced the Christians to place so inconsiderately this *shower* in the list of miracles.

☞ * It is by mistake that Dr. Mosheim confounds Sir Peter King, lord Chancellor of England, with the person who carried on the controversy with Moyle, concerning the thundering legion. Moyle's adversary was Mr. King, rector of Topsham, near Exeter, which was the place of his nativity, and also that of the famous chancellor who bore his name. See the letters addressed to the Rev. Mr. King, in the posthumous collection of Locke's Letters, published by Collins. See also Lardner's Collection of Heathen and Jewish Testimonies, &c., vol. ii.

certain, that both the Heathens and the Christians considered this event as extraordinary and miraculous; the former attributing it to Jupiter, Mercury, or the power of magic; the latter to Christ, interposing thus unexpectedly, in consequence of their prayers. It is equally indisputable, that a considerable number of Christians served at this time in the Roman army; and it is exceedingly probable, that, in such trying circumstances of calamity and distress, they implored the merciful interposition and succour of their God and Saviour; and, as the Christians of those times looked upon all extraordinary events as miracles, and ascribed to their prayers all the uncommon occurrences of an advantageous nature that happened to the Roman empire, it will not appear surprising, that, on the present occasion, they attributed the deliverance of Antoninus and his army to a miraculous interposition which they had obtained from above. But, on the other hand, it must be carefully observed, that it is an invariable maxim, universally adopted by the wise and judicious, that no events are to be esteemed miraculous, which may be rationally attributed to natural causes, and accounted for by a recourse to the ordinary dispensations of Providence; and, as the unexpected shower, which restored the expiring force of the Romans, may be easily explained without rising beyond the usual and ordinary course of nature, the conclusion is manifest; nor can it be doubtful in what light we are to consider that remarkable event.

XI. The Jews were visited with new calamities, first under Trajan, and then under Adrian, when, under the standard of Barcochebas, who gave himself out for the Messiah, they rose in rebellion against the Romans. In consequence of this sedition, prodigious numbers of that miserable people were put to the sword; and a new city, called Ælia Capitolina, was raised upon the ruins of Jerusalem, into which no Jew was permitted to enter.[a] This defeat of the Jews tended to confirm, in some measure, the external tranquillity of the Christian church; for that turbulent and perfidious nation had hitherto vexed and oppressed the Christians, not only by presenting every where to the Roman magistrates complaints and accusations against them, but also by treating them in the most injurious manner in Palestine and the neighbouring countries, because they refused to succour them against the Romans. But this new calamity, which fell upon that seditious nation, put it out of their power to exercise their malignity against the disciples of Jesus, as they had formerly done.

XII. Among other accessions to the splendour and force of the growing church, we may reckon the learned and ingenious labours of those philosophers and literati, who were converted to Christianity in this century. I am sensible that the advantages hence arising to the cause of true religion will be disputed by many; and, indeed, when the question is thus proposed, whether, upon the whole, the interests of Christianity have gained or lost by the writings of the learned, and the speculations of philosophers who have been employed in its defence, I confess myself incapable of solving it in a satisfactory manner; for nothing is more manifest than this truth, that the noble simplicity and dignity of religion were sadly corrupted in many places, when the philosophers blended their opinions with its pure doctrines, and were so audacious as to submit that divine system of faith and piety to be scrutinized and modified by the fallible rules of imperfect reason.

[a] Justin Mart. Dial. cum Tryphone, p. 49, 278.

[b] Eusebius, Hist. Eccles. lib. iii. cap. xxxii.

[c] See Pliny's Letters, book x. let. xcvii. and xcviii., which have been illustrated by many learned men, such as Vossius, Böhmer, Baldwin, Heuman, and others.

CHAPTER II.

Concerning the calamitous Events that happened to the Church during this Century.

I. IN the beginning of this century, there were no laws in force against the Christians; for the senate had annulled the cruel edicts of Nero, and Nerva had abrogated the sanguinary laws of his predecessor, Domitian. But notwithstanding this, a horrid custom prevailed, of persecuting the Christians, and even of putting them to death, as often as sanguinary priests, or an outrageous populace instigated by those ecclesiastics, demanded their destruction. Hence it happened, that, even under the reign of the good Trajan, popular clamours [b] were raised against the Christians, many of whom fell victims to the rage of a merciless multitude. Such were the riotous proceedings that happened in Bithynia, under the administration of Pliny the younger, who, on that occasion, wrote to the emperor, to know in what manner he was to conduct himself toward the Christians. The answer which he received from Trajan amounted to this, "That the Christians were not to be officiously sought after,[c] but that such as were accused and convicted of an adherence to Christianity were to be put to death as wicked citizens, if they did not return to the religion of their ancestors."

II. This edict of Trajan, being registered among the public and solemn laws of the Roman empire, set bounds, indeed, to the fury of those who persecuted the Christians, but was the occasion of martyrdom to many, even under the best emperors. For, as often as an accuser appeared, and the person accused of an adherence to Christianity confessed the truth of the charge, the alternative was apostasy or death, since a magnanimous perseverance in the Christian faith was, according to the edict of Trajan, a capital crime. And, accordingly, the venerable and aged Simeon, son of Cleophas, and bishop of Jerusalem, was, by this very law, crucified in consequence of an accusation formed against him by the Jews.[d] By the same law, also, was the great and pious Ignatius, bishop of Antioch, ordered by Trajan himself to expire in the Roman theatre, exposed to the rapacity of furious beasts;[e] for, as the law simply denounced death to such as were convicted of an attachment to Christ, the kind of punishment was left by the legislator to the choice of the judge.

III. Such of the Christians as could conceal their profession were indeed sheltered under the law of Trajan, which was, therefore, a disagreeable restraint upon the heathen priests, who breathed nothing but fury against the disciples of Jesus. The office of an accuser was also become dangerous, and very few were disposed to undertake it, so that the sacerdotal craft was now inventing new methods to oppress the Christians. The law of Trajan was therefore artfully evaded under the reign of his

[d] Eusebius, Hist. Eccles. lib. iii. cap. xxxii. p. 103.

[e] See the Acta Martyrii Ignatiani, published by Ruinart, and also in the Collection of the Apostolic Fathers.

successor Adrian. The populace, set in motion by the priests, demanded of the magistrates, with one voice, during the public games, the destruction of the Christians; and the magistrates, fearing that a sedition might be the consequence of despising or opposing these popular clamours, were too much disposed to indulge them in their request. During these commotions, Serenus Granianus, proconsul of Asia, represented to the emperor how barbarous and unjust it was to sacrifice, to the fury of a lawless multitude, persons who had been convicted of no crime. Nor were his wise and equitable remonstrances fruitless; for Adrian, by an edict issued out to these magistrates, prohibited the putting the Christians to death, unless they were regularly accused and convicted of crimes committed against the laws; and this edict appears to have been a solemn renewal of the law of Trajan.[a] The moderation of the emperor, in this edict, may, perhaps, have been produced by the admirable apologies of Quadratus and Aristides, in favour of the Christians, which were every way proper to dispel the angry prejudices of a mind that had any sense of equity and humanity left. But it was not from the Romans alone, that the disciples of Christ were to feel oppression; Barcochebas, the pretended king of the Jews, whom Adrian afterwards defeated, vented against them all his fury, because they refused to join his standard, and second his rebellion.[b]

IV. The law of Adrian, according to its natural sense, seemed to cover the Christians from the fury of their enemies, since it rendered them punishable on no other account than the commission of crimes, and since the magistrates refused to interpret their religion as the crime mentioned in the imperial edict. Therefore their enemies invented a new method of attacking them under the reign of Antoninus Pius, even by accusing them of impiety and atheism. This calumny was refuted in an *apology* for the Christians, presented to the emperor by Justin Martyr; in consequence of which, this equitable prince ordered that all proceedings against them should be regulated by the law of Adrian.[c] This, however, was not sufficient to suppress the rage of blood-thirsty persecution; for some time after this, on occasion of some earthquakes which happened in Asia, the people renewed their violence against the Christians, whom they considered as the authors of those calamities, and treated consequently in the most cruel and injurious manner. The emperor, informed of these unjust and barbarous proceedings, addressed an edict to the whole province of Asia, in which he denounced capital punishment against such as should, for the future, accuse the Christians, without being able to prove them guilty of any crime.[d]

V. This worthy prince was succeeded by Marcus Aurelius Antoninus, the philosopher, whom most writers have celebrated beyond measure on account of his extraordinary wisdom and virtue. It is not, however, in his conduct toward the Christians that we must look for the reasons of these pompous encomiums; for, here the clemency and justice of that emperor suffer a strange eclipse. He did not, indeed, revoke the edict of Antoninus Pius, or abrogate the laws which the preceding emperors had enacted in favour of the Christians; but he did what was equally pernicious to them. Without examining impartially their cause, he lent an easy and attentive ear to the most virulent insinuations of their enemies, especially to the malignant calumnies of the philosophers, who accused them of the most horrid crimes and the most monstrous impiety, and charged them with renewing the shocking feasts of Thyestes, and the incestuous amours of the Theban prince; so that, if we except that of Nero, there was no reign under which the Christians were more injuriously and cruelly treated, than under that of the wise and virtuous Marcus Aurelius; and yet there was no reign under which such numerous and victorious *Apologies* were published in their behalf. Those which Justin Martyr, Athenagoras, and Tatian, wrote upon this occasion, are still extant.

VI. This emperor issued against the Christians, whom he regarded as a vain, obstinate, and vicious set of men, edicts,[e] which, upon the whole, were very unjust; though we do not know, at this distance of time, their particular contents. In consequence of these imperial edicts, the judges and magistrates received the accusations, which even slaves, and the vilest of the perjured rabble, brought against the followers of Jesus; and the Christians were put to the most cruel tortures and were condemned to meet death in the most barbarous forms, notwithstanding their perfect innocence, and their persevering and solemn denial of the horrid crimes laid to their charge. The imperial edicts were so positive and express against inflicting punishment upon such of the Christians as were guilty of no crime, that the corrupt judges, who, through motives of interest or popularity, desired their destruction, were obliged to suborn false accusers to charge them with actions that might bring them within the reach of the laws. Hence many fell victims to cruel superstition and popular fury, seconded by the corruption of a wicked magistracy, and the connivance of a prince, who, with respect to one set of men, forgot those principles of justice and clemency which directed his conduct toward all others. Among these victims, there were many men of illustrious piety and some of eminent learning and abilities, such as the holy and venerable Polycarp, bishop of Smyrna, and Justin Martyr, so deservedly renowned for his erudition and philosophy.[f] Many churches, particularly those of Lyons and Vienne, were almost entirely destroyed, during this violent persecution, which raged in the year 177, and will be an indelible stain upon the memory of the prince by whose order is was carried on.[g]

VII. During the reign of Commodus, the Christians

[a] Compare Eusebius, Hist. Eccles. lib. iv. cap. ix. with Balduinus ad Edicta Princip. in Christianos, p. 73.

[b] Justin Mart. Apologia secunda, p. 72, edit. Colon.

[c] Eusebius, Hist. Eccles. lib. iv. cap. xxvi. p. 148.

[d] Eusebius, Hist. Eccles. lib. iv. cap. xiii. p. 126. ☞ It is proper to be observed, that the word *crime*, in several former edicts, had not been sufficiently determined in its signification; so that we find the enemies of the Christians, and even the Roman magistrates, applying this term to the profession of Christianity. But the equitable edict of this good emperor decided that point on the side of humanity and justice, as appears from the letter he addressed to the province of Asia, in favour of the persecuted Christians, and which concludes with the following words: "If any one, for the future, shall molest the Christians, and accuse them merely on account of their religion, let the person thus accused be discharged, though he is found to be a Christian, and the accuser be punished according to the rigour of the law."

[e] See Melito ap. Euseb. Hist. Eccles. lib. iv. cap. xxvi. p. 147.

[f] A full account of their martyrdom is to be found in the valuable work of Ruinart, entitled, Acta Sincera Martyrum.

[g] See the letter of the Christians at Lyons concerning this persecution, which is to be found in Eusebius' Ecclesiastical History, book v. chap. ii. and also in Fox's Martyrology, vol. i.

suffered very little; no general persecution raged against them; and any cruelties which they endured were confined to a small number, who had newly abandoned the Pagan superstitions.[a] But the scene changed toward the latter end of this century, when Severus was declared emperor. Then Egypt and other provinces were dyed with the blood of martyrs, as appears from the testimonies of Tertullian, Clemens of Alexandria, and other writers. Those, therefore, are not to be followed, who affirm, that the Christians suffered nothing under Severus, before the beginning of the third century, which was distinguished by the cruel edicts of this emperor against their lives and fortunes; for, as the imperial laws against the Christians were not abrogated, and the iniquitous edicts of Trajan and Marcus Antoninus were still in force, there was a door, in consequence, open to the fury and injustice of corrupt magistrates, as often as they were pleased to exercise them upon the church. It was this series of calamities, under which it groaned toward the conclusion of the second century, which engaged Tertullian to write his Apology, and several other books, in defence of the Christians.

VIII. It is very easy to account for the sufferings and calamities with which the disciples of Jesus were loaded, when we consider how they were blackened and rendered odious by the railings, the calumnies, and libels of the Heathen priests, and the other defenders of a corrupt and most abominable system of superstition. The injurious imputations, the horrid charges, of which we took notice above, are mentioned by all those who have written in defence of the Christians, and ought indeed, to stand always upon record, as proofs both of the weakness and wickedness of their adversaries. Nothing can be more frivolous and insignificant than the objections with which the most famous defenders of Paganism assailed Christianity at this time; and such as desire a convincing proof of this assertion, have only to read the arguments of Celsus on that subject. This philosopher wrote against the Christians during the reign of Adrian, and was admirably refuted, in the following century, by Origen, who represents him as an Epicurean, (a mistake which has been almost generally followed;) whereas it appears with the utmost probability, that he was a Platonic philosopher of the sect of Ammonius.[b] Be that as it will, Celsus was a trifling caviller, as is manifest from the answer of Origen; nor do his writings against Christianity serve any other purpose, than to show his malignant and illiberal turn of mind.

Fronto, the rhetorician, and Crescens, the Cynic philosopher, made also some wretched attempts against Christianity. The efforts of the former are only known by the mention that is made of them by Minutius Felix;[c] and the enterprises of the latter were confined to a vehement zeal for the ruin of the Christians, and a virulent persecution of Justin Martyr, which ended in the cruel death of that eminent saint.[d]

[a] Eusebius, lib. v.

☞ [b] The learned Dr. Lardner does not think it possible that Celsus could have been of the sect of Ammonius, since the former lived and wrote in the second century, whereas the latter did not flourish before the third. And indeed we learn from Origen himself, that he knew of two only of the name of Celsus, one who lived in the time of Nero, and the other in the reign of Adrian, and afterwards. The latter was the philosopher who wrote against Christianity.

[c] Octavius, p. 266, edit. Heraldi.

[d] Justin Mart. Apologia secunda, p. 21.—Tatian, Orat. contra Græcos.

PART II.

THE INTERNAL HISTORY OF THE CHURCH.

CHAPTER I.

Concerning the state of Letters and Philosophy during this Century.

I. Under the reign of Trajan, letters and philosophy came forth from the retreat where they had languished during the savage tyranny of his predecessors, and, by the auspicious protection of that excellent prince, were in some measure restored to their former lustre.[a] This happy revolution in the republic of letters, was indeed of a short duration, as it was not supported by the following emperors, who were, for the most part, averse to literary pursuits. Even Marcus Antoninus, who surpassed them all in learning, gave protection and encouragement to the Stoics alone, and, after the example of that supercilious sect, treated the arts and sciences with indifference and contempt.[b] And here we see the true reason why the writers of this century are, in general, so much inferior to those of the former in point of elegance and purity, eloquence and taste.

II. It must be observed, at the same time, that this degeneracy of erudition and taste did not amount to an utter extinction of the one and the other; for, even in this century, there were, both among the Greeks and Romans, men of eminent genius and abilities, who set off, in the most advantageous manner, the learning of the times in which they lived. Among the learned Grecians, the first place is due to Plutarch, a man of vast erudition, whose knowledge was various, but indigested, and whose philosophical taste was corrupted by the sceptical tenets of the academics. There were, likewise, in all the more considerable cities of the Roman empire, rhetoricians, sophists, and grammarians, who, by a variety of learned exercises, seemed zealous in forming the youth to their arts of eloquence and declamation, and in rendering them fit, by their talents and their acquisitions, to be useful to their country. But the instruction acquired in these schools was more specious than solid; and the youth who received their education in them, distinguished themselves, at their entrance upon the active stage of life, more by empty declamation, than by true eloquence; more by pompous erudition, than by wisdom and dexterity in the management of public affairs. The consequence of this was, that the rhetoricians and sophists, though agreeable to the corrupt taste of the time, which was incapable, generally speaking, of perceiving the native charms of truth, yet fell into contempt among the prudent and the wise, who held in derision the knowledge and education acquired in their auditories. Beside the schools now mentioned, there were two public academies in the empire; one at Rome, founded by Adrian, in which all the sciences were taught; and the other at Berytus in Phœnicia, which was principally destined for the education of youth in the science of law.[c]

III. Many philosophers of all the different sects flourished at this time, whose names we do not think it necessary to mention.[d] Two, however, there were, of such remarkable and shining merit, as rendered them real ornaments to the Stoic philosophy; which the meditations of Marcus Antoninus and the manual of Epictetus abundantly testify. These two great men had more admirers than disciples and followers; for, in this century, the Stoical sect was not in the highest esteem, as the rigour and austerity of its doctrine were by no means suited to the dissolute manners of the times. The Platonic schools were more frequented for several reasons, and particularly for these two, that their moral precepts were less rigorous and severe than those of the Stoics, and their doctrines more conformable to, or rather less incompatible with, the common opinions concerning the gods. But, of all the philosophers, the Epicureans enjoyed the greatest reputation, and had undoubtedly the greatest number of followers, because their opinions tended to encourage the indolent security of a voluptuous and effeminate life, and to banish the remorse and terrors that haunt vice, and naturally incommode the wicked in their sensual pursuits.[e]

IV. Toward the conclusion of this century, a new sect of philosophers suddenly arose, spread with amazing rapidity through the greatest part of the Roman empire, swallowed up almost all other sects, and proved extremely detrimental to the cause of Christianity. Alexandria in Egypt, which had been, for a long time, the seat of learning, and, as it were, the centre of all the liberal arts and sciences, gave birth to this new philosophy. Its votaries chose to be called Platonists, though, far from adhering to all the tenets of Plato, they collected from the different sects such doctrines as they thought conformable to truth, and formed thereof one general system. The reason, then, why they distinguished themselves by the title of Platonists, was, that they thought the sentiments of Plato, concerning that most noble part of philosophy, which has the Deity and things invisible for its objects, much more rational and sublime than those of the other philosophers.

V. What gave to this new philosophy a superior air of reason and dignity, was, the unprejudiced spirit of candor and impartiality on which it seemed to be founded. This recommended it particularly to those real sages, whose inquiries were accompanied with wisdom and moderation, and who were sick of those arrogant and contentious sects, which required an invariable attachment to their particular systems. And, indeed, nothing could have a more engaging aspect than a set of men, who, abandoning all cavil, and all prejudices in favour of any party, professed searching after the truth alone, and were ready to adopt, from all the different systems and sects, such tenets as they thought agreeable to it. Hence also they were called Eclectics. It is, however, to be observed, as we hinted in the former section, that though these phi-

[a] Plin. epist. lib. iii. ep. 18.

[b] In the first book of his Meditations, sect. 7, 17.

[c] See the Meditations of Marcus Antoninus, book i. sect. 7, 10.

[d] Justin Mart. Dialog. cum Tryphone, op. p. 218, &c. We find also many of these philosophers mentioned in the meditations of Marcus Antoninus.

[e] Lucian's Pseudomant. p. 763. tom. i. op.

losophers were attached to no particular sect, yet they preferred, as appears from a variety of testimonies, the sublime Plato to all other sages, and approved most of his opinions concerning the Deity, the universe, and the human soul.

VI. This new species of Platonism was embraced by such of the Alexandrian Christians as were desirous of retaining, with the profession of the Gospel, the title, the dignity, and the habit of philosophers. It is also said to have had the particular approbation of Athenagoras, Pantænus, Clemens the Alexandrian, and of all those who, in this century, were charged with the care of the public school[a] which the Christians had at Alexandria. These sages were of opinion, that true philosophy, the greatest and most salutary gift of God to mortals, was scattered in various portions through all the different sects; and that it was, consequently, the duty of every wise man, and more especially of every Christian doctor, to gather it from the several corners where it lay dispersed, and to employ it, thus re-united, in the defence of religion, and in destroying the dominion of impiety and vice. The Christian Eclectics had this also in common with the others, that they preferred Plato to the other philosophers, and looked upon his opinions concerning God, the human soul, and things invisible, as conformable to the spirit and genius of the Christian doctrine.

VII. This philosophical system underwent some changes, when Ammonius Saccas, who taught, with the highest applause, in the Alexandrian school about the conclusion of this century, laid the foundations of that sect which was distinguished by the name of the New Platonists. This learned man was born of Christian parents, and never, perhaps, gave up entirely the outward profession of that divine religion in which he had been educated.[b] As his genius was vast and comprehensive, so were his projects bold and singular. For he attempted a general reconciliation or coalition of all sects, whether philosophical or religious, and taught a doctrine which he looked upon as proper, to unite them all, the Christians not excepted, in the most perfect harmony. And herein lies the difference between this new sect and the Eclectics, who had, before this time, flourished in Egypt. The Eclectics held, that, in every sect, there was a mixture of good and bad, of truth and falsehood; and, accordingly, they chose and adopted, out of each of them, such tenets as seemed to them conformable to reason and truth, and rejected such as they thought repugnant to both. Ammonius, on the contrary, maintained, that the great principles of all philosophical and religious truth were to be found equally in all sects; that they differed from each other only in their method of expressing them, and in some opinions of little or no importance; and that, by a proper interpretation of their respective sentiments, they might easily be united into one body. It is farther to be observed, that the propensity of Ammonius to singularity and paradox, led him to maintain, that all the Gentile religions, and even the Christian, were to be illustrated and explained by the principles of this universal philosophy; but that, in order to this, the fables of the priests were to be removed from Paganism, and the comments and interpretations of the disciples of Jesus from Christianity.

VIII. This arduous design, which Ammonius had formed, of bringing about a coalition of all the philosophical sects, and all the systems of religion that prevailed in the world, required many difficult and disagreeable things in order to its execution. Every particular sect or religion must have several of its doctrines curtailed or distorted, before it could enter into the general mass. The tenets of the philosophers, the superstitions of the Heathen priests, the solemn doctrines of Christianity, were all to suffer in this cause, and forced allegories were to be employed with subtilty in removing the difficulties with which it was attended. How this vast project was effected by Ammonius, the writings of his disciples and followers, that yet remain, abundantly testify. In order to the accomplishment of his purpose, he supposed, that true philosophy derived its orgin and its consistence from the eastern nations; that it was taught to the Egyptians by Hermes; that it was brought from them to the Greeks, by whose vain subtilties, and litigious disputes, it was rendered somewhat obscure and deformed; but was however, preserved in its original purity by Plato, who was the best interpreter of Hermes, and of the other oriental sages. He maintained, that all the different religions which prevailed in the world, were, in their original integrity, conformable to the genius of this ancient philosophy; but that it unfortunately happened, that the symbols and fictions, under which, according to the eastern manner, the ancients delivered their precepts and their doctrines, were, in process of time, erroneously understood both by priests and people in a literal sense; that, in consequence of this, the invisible beings and demons, whom the Supreme Deity had placed

[a] The title and dignity of philosophers delighted so much these honest men, that though they were advanced in the church to the rank of presbyters, they would not abandon the philosophers' cloak. See Origen, Epist. ad. Eusebium, tom. i. op. edit. de la Rue.

[b] Porphyry, in his third book against the Christians, maintains, that Ammonius deserted the Christian religion and went over to Paganism as soon as he came to that time of life when the mind is capable of making a wise and judicious choice. Eusebius, on the other hand, denies this assertion; maintaining, that Ammonius persevered constantly in the profession of Christianity; and he is followed in this opinion by Valesius, Bayle, Basnage, and others. The learned Fabricius is of opinion, that Eusebius confounded two persons who bore the name of Ammonius, one of whom was a Christian writer, and the other a Heathen philosopher. See Fabric. Biblioth. Græca, lib. iv. cap. xxvi. The truth of the matter seems to have been, that Ammonius Saccas was a Christian, who adopted with such dexterity the doctrines of the pagan philosophy, as to appear a Christian to the Christians, and a Pagan to the Pagans. See Brucker's Historia Critica Philosophiæ, vol. ii. and iii. Since the first edition of this work appeared, the learned Dr. Lardner has maintained, not without a certain degree of asperity, which is unusual in his valuable writings, the opinion of Fabricius, against Eusebius, and particularly against Dr Mosheim. See his Collection of Heathen and Jewish Testimonies, vol. iii. Dr. Mosheim was once of the same opinion with Fabricius, and he maintained it in a Dissertation, *de ecclesia turbata per recentiores Platonicos;* but he afterwards saw reason to change his mind. His reasons may be seen in his book, de rebus Christianorum, ante Const. Mag. p. 281, &c. They indeed weigh little with Dr. Lardner, who, however, opposes nothing to them but mere assertions, unsupported by the smallest glimpse of evidence. For the letter of Origen, which he quotes from Eusebius, is so far from proving that Ammonius was *merely* a Heathen philosopher, and not a Christian, that it would not be sufficient to demonstrate that there was ever such a person as Ammonius in the world, since he is not so much as named in that letter. But allowing with Valesius that it is Ammonius whom Origen has in view, when he talks of the philosophical master from whom he and Heracles received instruction, it seems very whimsical to conclude from this circumstance, that Ammonius was no Christian. The coalition between Platonism and Christianity, in the second and third centuries, is a fact too fully proved to be rendered dubious by mere affirmations. The notion, therefore, of two persons bearing the name of Ammonius, the one a Heathen philosopher, and the other a Christian writer, of which Dr. Lardner seems so fond, rests upon little more than an hypothesis formed to remove an imaginary difficulty.

in the different parts of the universe as the ministers of his providence, were, by the suggestions of superstition, converted into gods, and worshipped with a multiplicity of vain ceremonies. He therefore insisted, that the religions of all nations should be restored to their original purity, and reduced to their primitive standard, viz. "The ancient philosophy of the east;" and he affirmed, that this his project was agreeable to the intentions of Jesus Christ, whose sole view, in descending upon earth, was, to set bounds to the reigning superstition, and to remove the errors that had crept into all religions, but not to abolish the ancient theology from which they were derived.

IX. Taking these principles for granted, Ammonius adopted the doctrines which were received in Egypt, the place of his birth and education, concerning the universe and the Deity, considered as constituting one great whole; as also concerning the eternity of the world, the nature of souls, the empire of Providence, and the government of this world by demons. For it seems evident, that the Egyptian philosophy, which was said to be derived from Hermes, was the basis of that of Ammonius; or, as it is otherwise called, of modern Platonism; and the book of Jamblichus, concerning the mysteries of the Egyptians, puts the matter beyond dispute. Ammonius, therefore, associated the sentiments of the Egyptians with the doctrines of Plato, which was easily done by adulterating some of the opinions of the latter, and forcing his expressions from their obvious and natural sense; and, to finish this conciliatory scheme, he so interpreted the doctrines of the other philosophical and religious sects, by the violent succours of art, invention, and allegory, that they seemed, at length, to bear some resemblance to the Egyptian and Platonic systems.

X. To this monstrous coalition of heterogeneous doctrines, its fanatical author added a rule of life and manners, which carried an aspect of high sanctity and uncommon austerity. He, indeed, permitted the people to live according to the laws of their country, and the dictates of nature; but a more sublime rule was laid down for the wise. They were to raise, above all terrestrial things, by the towering efforts of holy contemplation, those souls whose origin was celestial and divine. They were ordered to extenuate, by hunger, thirst, and other mortifications, the sluggish body, which confines the activity, and restrains the liberty of the immortal spirit; that thus, in this life, they might enjoy communion with the Supreme Being, and ascend after death, active and unencumbered, to the universal Parent, to live in his presence for ever. As Ammonius was born and educated among the Christians, he embellished these injunctions, and even gave them an air of authority, by expressing them partly in terms borrowed from the sacred scriptures, of which we find a vast number of citations also in the writings of his disciples. To this austere discipline, he added the pretended art of so purging and refining that faculty of the mind which receives the images of things, as to render it capable of perceiving the demons, and of performing many marvellous things, by their assistance. This art, which the disciples of Ammonius called *theurgy*, was not, however, communicated to all the schools of this fanatical philosopher, but only to those of the first rank.

XI. The extravagant attempts of Ammonius did not cease here. To reconcile the popular religions of different countries, and particularly the Christian, with this new system, he fell upon the following inventions; 1st, He turned into a mere allegory the whole history of the gods, and maintained, that those beings whom the priests and people dignified with this title, were no more than celestial ministers, to whom a certain kind of worship was due, but a worship inferior to that which was to be reserved for the Supreme Deity. 2dly, He acknowledged Christ to be a most excellent man, the friend of God, the admirable *theurge;* he denied, however, that Jesus intended to abolish entirely the worship of demons, and of the other ministers of divine Providence; and affirmed, on the contrary, that his only intention was to purify the ancient religion, and that his followers had manifestly corrupted the doctrine of their divine master.[a]

XII. This new species of philosophy, imprudently adopted by Origen and many other Christians, was extremely prejudicial to the cause of the Gospel, and to the beautiful simplicity of its celestial doctrines. For hence it was, that the Christian doctors began to introduce their perplexed and obscure erudition into the religion of Jesus; to involve, in the darkness of a vain philosophy, some of the principal truths of Christianity, that had been revealed with the utmost plainness, and were indeed obvious to the meanest capacity; and to add, to the divine precepts of our Lord, many of their own, which had no sort of foundation in any part of the sacred writings. From the same source arose that melancholy set of men, who have been distinguished by the name of Mystics, whose system, when separated from the Platonic doctrine concerning the nature and origin of the soul, is but a lifeless mass, without any vigour, form, or consistence. Nor did the evils, which sprang from this Ammonian philosophy, end here. For, under the specious pretext of the necessity of contemplation, it gave occasion to that slothful and indolent course of life, which continues to be led by myriads of monks retired in cells, and sequestered from society, to which they are neither useful by their instructions, nor by their examples. To this philosophy we may trace, as to their source, a multitude of vain and foolish ceremonies, calculated only to cast a veil over truth, and to nourish superstition; and which are, for the most part, religiously observed by many, even in the times in which we live. It would be endless to enumerate all the pernicious consequences that may be justly attributed to this new philosophy, or rather to this monstrous attempt to reconcile falsehood with truth, and light with darkness. Some of its most fatal effects were, its alienating the minds of many, in the following ages, from the Christian religion; and its substituting, in the place of the pure and sublime simplicity of the Gospel, an unseemly mixture of Platonism and Christianity.

XIII. The number of learned men among the Christians, which was very small in the preceding century, increased considerably in this. Among these there were few rhetoricians, sophists, or orators. The majority were

[a] What we have here mentioned concerning the doctrines and opinions of Ammonius, is gathered from the writings and disputations of his disciples, who are known by the name of the Modern Platonists. This philosopher has left nothing in writing behind him. He even imposed a law upon his disciples not to divulge his doctrines among the multitude; which law, however, they made no scruple to neglect and violate. See Porphyr. Vit. Plotini, cap. iii. At the same time, there is no sort of doubt, that all these inventions belong properly to Ammonius, whom all the later Platonists acknowledge as the founder of this sect, and the author of their philosophy.

philosophers attached to the Eclectic system, though they were not all of the same sentiments concerning the utility of letters and philosophy. Those who were themselves initiated into the depths of philosophy, were desirous that others, particulary such as aspired to the offices of bishops or doctors, should apply themselves to the study of human wisdom, in order to their being the better qualified for defending the truth with vigour, and instructing the ignorant with success. Others were of a quite different way of thinking upon this subject, and were for banishing all argumentation and philosophy from the limits of the church, from a notion that erudition might prove detrimental to the true spirit of religion. Hence the early beginnings of that unhappy contest between *faith* and *reason*, *religion* and *philosophy*, *piety* and *genius*, which increased in the succeeding ages, and is prolonged, even to our times, with a violence that renders it extremely difficult to be brought to a conclusion. Those who maintained that learning and philosophy were rather advantageous than detrimental to the cause of religion, gained, by degrees, the ascendant; and, in consequence thereof, laws were enacted, which excluded the ignorant and illiterate from the office of public teachers. The opposite side of the question was not, however, without defenders; and the defects and vices of learned men and philosophers contributed much to increase their number, as will appear in the progress of this history.

CHAPTER II.

Concerning the Doctors and Ministers of the Church, and the Form of its Government.

I. THE form of ecclesiastical government, whose commencement we have seen in the last century, was brought in this to a greater degree of stability and consistence. One inspector, or *bishop*, presided over each Christian assembly, to which office he was elected by the voices of the whole people. In this post he was to be watchful and provident, attentive to the wants of the church, and careful to supply them. To assist him in this laborious province, he formed a council of *presbyters*, which was not confined to any fixed number; and to each of these he distributed his task, and appointed a station, in which he was to promote the interests of the church. To the bishops and presbyters, the ministers or *deacons* were subject; and the latter were divided into a variety of classes, as the state of the church required.

II. During a great part of this century, the Christian churches were independent with respect to each other; nor were they joined by association, confederacy, or any other bonds than those of charity. Each Christian assembly was a little state, governed by its own laws, which were either enacted, or at least, approved by the society. But, in process of time, all the Christian churches of a province were formed into one large ecclesiastical body, which, like confederate states, assembled at certain times in order to deliberate about the common interests of the whole. This institution had its origin among the Greeks, with whom nothing was more common than this confederacy of independent states, and the regular assemblies which met, in consequence thereof, at fixed times, and were composed of the deputies of each respective state. But these ecclesiastical associations were not long confined to the Greeks; their great utility was no sooner perceived, than they became universal, and were formed in all places where the gospel had been planted.[a] To these assemblies, in which the deputies or commissioners of several churches consulted together, the names of *synods* was appropriated by the Greeks, and that of *councils* by the Latins; and the laws that were enacted in these general meetings, were called *canons*, i. e. *rules*,

III. These *councils* of which we find not the smallest trace before the middle of this century, changed the whole face of the church, and gave it a new form: for by them the ancient privileges of the people were considerably diminished, and the power and authority of the bishops greatly augmented. The humility, indeed, and prudence of these pious prelates, prevented their assuming all at once the power with which they were afterward invested. At their first appearance in these general councils, they acknowledged that they were no more than the delegates of their respective churches, and that they acted in the name, and by the appointment of their people. But they soon changed this humble tone, imperceptibly extended the limits of their their authority, turned their influence into dominion, and their counsels into laws; and openly asserted, at length, that Christ had empowered them to prescribe to his people *authoritative rules* of *faith* and *manners*. Another effect of these councils was, the gradual abolition of that perfect equality which reigned among all bishops in the primitive times. For the order and decency of these assemblies required, that some one of the provincial bishops, meeting in council, should be invested with a superior degree of power and authority; and hence the rights of Metropolitans derive their origin. In the mean time the bounds of the church were enlarged; the custom of holding councils was followed wherever the sound of the gospel had reached; and the universal church had now the appearance of one vast republic, formed by a combination of a great number of little states. This occasioned the creation of a new order of ecclesiastics, who were appointed, in different parts of the world, as heads of the church, and whose office it was to preserve the consistence and union of that immense body, whose members were so widely dispersed throughout the nations. Such were the nature and office of the *patriarchs*, among whom, at length, ambition, having reached its most insolent period, formed a new dignity, investing the bishop of Rome, and his successors, with the title and authority of prince of the patriarchs.

IV. The Christian doctors had the good fortune to persuade the people, that the ministers of the Christian church succeeded to the character, rights, and privileges, of the Jewish priesthood; and this persuasion was a new source both of honours and profit to the sacred order. This notion was propagated with industry some time after the reign of Adrian, when the second destruction of Jerusalem had extinguished among the Jews all hopes of seeing their government restored to its former lustre, and their country arising out of ruins. And, accordingly, the bishops considered themselves as invested with a rank and character similar to those of the high priest among the Jews, while the presbyters represented the priests, and the deacons the Levites. It is, indeed, highly probable, that they who first introduced this absurd comparison of offices, so entirely distinct, did it rather through ignorance and error, than

[a] Tertullian, Lib. de Jejuniis, cap. xiii. p. 711.

through artifice or design. The notion, however, once entertained, produced its natural effects; and these effects were pernicious. The errors to which it gave rise were many; and we may justly consider, as one of its immediate consequences, the establishment of a greater difference between the Christian pastors and their flock, than the genius of the Gospel seems to admit.

V. From the government of the church, let us turn our eyes to those who maintained its cause by their learned and judicious writings. Among these we may mention Justin, a man of great piety and considerable learning, who, from a pagan philosopher, became a Christian martyr. He had frequented all the different sects of philosophy in an ardent and impartial pursuit of truth; and finding, neither among Stoics nor Peripatetics, neither in the Pythagorean nor Platonic schools, any satisfactory account of the perfections of the Supreme Being, and the nature and destination of the human soul, he embraced Christianity on account of the light which it cast upon these interesting subjects.—We have yet remaining his two Apologies in behalf of the Christians, which are highly esteemed, as they deserve to be, although, in some passages of them, he shows himself an incautious disputant, and betrays a want of acquaintance with ancient history.

Irenæus, bishop of Lyons, a Greek by birth, and probably born of Christian parents, a disciple also of Polycarp, by whom he was sent to preach the Gospel among the Gauls, is another of the writers of this century, whose labours were remarkably useful to the church. He turned his pen against its internal and domestic enemies, by attacking the monstrous errors which had been adopted by many of the primitive Christians, as appears by his five Books against Heresies, which are yet preserved in a Latin translation,[a] and are considered as one of the most precious monuments of ancient erudition.

Athenagoras also deserves a place among the estimable writers of this age. He was a philosopher of no mean reputation; and his apology for the Christians, and his treatise upon the Resurrection, afford striking proofs of his learning and genius.

The works of Theophilus, bishop of Antioch, are more remarkable for their erudition, than for their order and method; this, at least, is true of his three Books in Defence of Christianity, addressed to Autolycus.[b] But the most illustrious writer of this century, and the most justly renowned for his various erudition, and his perfect acquaintance with the ancient sages, was Clemens, the disciple of Pantænus, and the head of the Alexandrian school, destined for the instruction of the catechumens. His Stromata, Pedagogue, and Exhortation, addressed to the Greeks, which are yet extant, abundantly show the extent of his learning and the force of his genius, though he is neither to be admired for the precision of his ideas, nor for the perspicuity of his style. It is also to be lamented, that his excessive attachment to the reigning philosophy led him into a variety of pernicious errors.

Hitherto we have made no mention of the Latin writers, who employed their pens in the Christian cause. And, indeed, the only one of any note we find in this century, is Tertullian, by birth a Carthaginian, who, having first embraced the profession of the law, became afterwards a presbyter, and concluded by adopting the heretical visions of Montanus. He was a man of extensive learning, of a fine genius, and highly admired for his elocution in the Latin tongue. We have several works of his yet remaining, which were designed to explain and defend the truth, and to nourish pious affections in the hearts of Christians. There was, indeed, such a mixture in the qualities of this man, that it is difficult to fix his real character, and to determine which of the two predominated—his virtues or his defects. He was endowed with a great genius, but seemed deficient in point of judgment. His piety was warm and vigorous, but, at the same time, melancholy and austere. His learning was extensive and profound; and yet his credulity and superstition were such as could only have been expected from the darkest ignorance. And with respect to his reasonings, they had more of the subtilty that dazzles the imagination, than of that solidity which brings light and conviction to the mind.[c]

CHAPTER III.

Concerning the Doctrine of the Christian Church in this Century.

I. THE Christian system, as it was hitherto taught, preserved its native and beautiful simplicity, and was comprehended in a small number of articles. The public teachers inculcated no other doctrines, than those which are contained in what is commonly called the Apostles' Creed; and in the method of illustrating them, all vain subtilties, all mysterious researches, every thing that was beyond the reach of common capacities, were carefully avoided. This will not appear surprising to those who consider that, at this time, there was not the least controversy about those capital doctrines of Christianity, which were afterwards so keenly debated in the church; and who reflect, that the bishops of these primitive times were, for the most part, plain and illiterate men, remarkable rather for their piety and zeal, than for their learning and eloquence.

II. This venerable simplicity was not, indeed, of a long duration; its beauty was gradually effaced by the laborious efforts of human learning, and the dark subtilties of imaginary science. Acute researches were employed upon several religious subjects, concerning which ingenious decisions were pronounced; and, what was worst of all, several tenets of a chimerical philosophy were imprudently incorporated into the Christian system. This disadvantageous change, this unhappy alteration of the primitiv simplicity of the Christian religion, arose partly from pride, and partly from a sort of necessity. The former cause was the eagerness of certain learned men to bring about a union between the doctrines of Christianity and the opinions of the philosophers; for they thought it a very fine accomplishment, to be able to express the precepts of

[a] The first book is yet extant in the original Greek; of the rest, we have only a Latin version, through the barbarity of which, though excessive, it is easy to discern the eloquence and erudition that reign throughout the original. See Hist. Literaire de la France.

[b] Theophilus was the author of several works, beside those mentioned by Dr. Mosheim, particularly of a commentary upon the Proverbs, another upon the Four Evangelists, and of some short and pathetic discourses, which he published from time to time for the use of his flock. He also wrote against Marcion and Hermogenes, and, in refuting the errors of these heretics, he quotes several passages of the Revelations.

[c] It is proper to point out, to such as are desirous of a more particular account of the works, as also of the excellencies and defects of these ancient writers, the authors who have professedly written of them; and the principal are those who follow: Jo. Alb. Fabricius, in Biblioth. Græc. et Latin.—Cave, Hist. Liter. Scriptor. Eccl.—Du-Pin et Cellier, Biblioth. des Auteurs Ecclesiastiques.

Christ in the language of *philosophers, civilians,* and *rabbis.* The other reason that contributed to alter the simplicity of the Christian religion, was, the necessity of having recourse to logical definitions and nice distinctions, in order to confound the sophistical arguments which the infidel and the heretic employed, one to overturn the Christian system, and the other to corrupt it. ☞ These philosophical arms, in the hands of the judicious and wise, were both honourable and useful to religion; but, when they were handled by every ignorant and self-sufficient meddler, as was afterwards the case, they produced nothing but perplexity and confusion, under which genuine Christianity almost disappeared.

III. Many examples might be alleged, which verify the observations we have now been making; and, if the reader is desirous of a striking one, he has only to take a view of the doctrines which began to be taught in this century, concerning the state of the soul after the dissolution of the body. Jesus and his disciples had simply declared, that the souls of good men were, at their departure from their bodies, to be received into heaven, while those of the wicked were to be sent to hell; and this was sufficient for the first disciples of Christ to know, as they had more piety than curiosity, and were satisfied with the knowledge of this solemn fact, without any inclination to penetrate its manner, or to pry into its secret reasons. But this plain doctrine was soon disguised, when Platonism began to infect Christianity. Plato had taught that the souls of heroes, of illustrious men, and eminent philosophers alone, ascended after death into the mansions of light and felicity, while those of the generality, weighed down by their lusts and passions, sunk into the infernal regions, whence they were not permitted to emerge before they were purified from their turpitude and corruption.[a] This doctrine was seized with avidity by the Platonic Christians, and applied as a commentary upon that of Jesus. Hence a notion prevailed, that only the martyrs entered upon a state of happiness immediately after death, and that, for the rest, a certain obscure region was assigned, in which they were to be imprisoned until the second coming of Christ, or, at least, until they were purified from their various pollutions. This doctrine, enlarged by the irregular fancies of injudicious men, became a source of innumerable errors, vain ceremonies, and monstrous superstitions.

IV. But, however the doctrines of the Gospel may have been abused by the commentaries and interpretations of different sects, all were unanimous in regarding the Scriptures with veneration, as the great rule of faith and manners; and hence arose the laudable and pious zeal of adapting them to general use. We have mentioned already the translations that were made of them into different languages, and it will not be improper to say something here concerning those who employed their useful labours in explaining and interpreting them. Pantænus, the head of the Alexandrian school, was probably the first who enriched the church with a version of the sacred writings, which has been lost among the ruins of time. The same fate attended the *commentary* of Clemens the Alexandrian, upon the *canonical epistles;* and also another celebrated work[b] of the same author, in which he is said to have explained, in a compendious manner, almost all the sacred writings. The *Harmony of the Evangelists,* composed by Tatian, is yet extant. But the *Exposition of the Revelations,* by Justin Martyr, and of the *four Gospels* by Theophilus bishop of Antioch, together with several illustrations of the Mosaic history of the creation, by other ancient writers, are lost.

V. The loss of these ancient productions is the less to be regretted as we know, with certainty, their vast inferiority to the expositions of the holy Scriptures that appeared in succeeding times. Among the persons already mentioned, none deserved the name of an able and judicious interpreter of the sacred text. They all attributed a *double sense* to the words of Scripture; the one *obvious* and literal, the other *hidden* and mysterious, which lay concealed, as it were under the veil of the outward letter. The former they treated with the utmost neglect, and turned the whole force of their genius and application to unfold the latter; or, in other words, they were more studious to darken the Scriptures with their idle fictions, than to investigate their true and natural sense. Some of them also forced the expressions of sacred writ out of their obvious meaning, in order to apply them to the support of their philosophical systems; of which dangerous and pernicious attempts, Clemens of Alexandria is said to have given the first example. With respect to the expositors of the Old Testament in this century, we shall only make this general remark, that their excessive veneration for the Alexandrian version, commonly called the Septuagint, which they regarded almost as of divine authority, confined their views, fettered their critical spirit, and hindered them from producing any thing excellent in the way of sacred criticism or interpretation.

VI. If this age was not very fertile in sacred critics, it was still less so in expositors of the doctrinal parts of religion; for hitherto there was no attempt made, at least that has come to our knowledge, to compose a *system* or complete view of the Christian doctrine. Some treatises of Arabians, relative to this subject, are indeed mentioned; but, as they are lost, and seem not to have been much known by any of the writers whose works have survived them, we can form no conclusions concerning them. The books of Papias, concerning the sayings of Christ and his apostles, were according to the account which Eusebius gives of them, rather an historical commentary, than a theological system. Melito, bishop of Sardis, is said to have written several treatises; one concerning faith, another on the creation, a third respecting the church, and a fourth for the illustration of truth; but it does not appear from the titles of these writings, whether they were of a doctrinal or controversial nature.[c] Several of the polemic writers, indeed, have been naturally led, in the course of controversy to explain amply certain points of religion. But those doctaines which have not been disputed, are very rarely defined with such accuracy, by the ancient writers, as to point out to us clearly what their opinions concerning them were. Hence it ought not to appear surprising, that all the

[a] See an ample account of the opinions of the Platonists and other ancient philosophers on this subject, in the notes which Dr. Mosheim has added to his Latin translation of Cudworth's Intellectual System, vol. ii.

[b] Viz. Clementis *Hypotyposes.*

☞ [c] Melito, beside his Apology for the Christians, and the treatises mentioned by Dr. Mosheim, wrote a discourse upon Esther and several other dissertations, of which we have only some scattered fragments remaining; but what is worthy of remark here, is, that he is the first Christian writer who has given us a catalogue of the books of the Old Testament. His catalogue, also, is perfectly conformable to that of the Jews, except in this point only, that he has omitted in it the book of Esther.

different sects of Christians pretend to find, in the writings of the fathers, decisions favourable to their respective tenets.

VII. The controversial writers, who shone in this century, had three different sorts of adversaries to combat; the Jews, the Pagans, and those who, in the bosom of Christianity, corrupted its doctrines, and produced various sects and divisions in the church. Justin Martyr, and Tertullian, embarked in a controversy with the Jews, which it was not possible for them to manage with the highest success and dexterity, as they were very little acquainted with the language, the history, and the learning of the Hebrews, and wrote with more levity and inaccuracy, than such a subject would justify. Of those who managed the cause of Christianity against the Pagans, some performed this important task by composing apologies for the Christians, and others by addressing pathetic exhortations to the Gentiles. Among the former were Athenagoras, Melito, Quadratus, Miltiades, Aristides, Tatian, and Justin Martyr; and among the latter, Tertullian, Clemens, Justin, and Theophilus bishop of Antioch. All these writers attacked, with judgment, dexterity, and success, the pagan superstition, and also defended the Christians, in a victorious manner, against all the calumnies and aspersions of their enemies. But they did not succeed so well in unfolding the true nature and genius of Christianity, nor were the arguments adduced by them to demonstrate its truth and divinity so full of energy, so striking and irresistible, as those by which they overturned the pagan system. In a word, both their explication and defence of many of the doctrines of Christianity are defective aud unsatisfactory in several respects. As to those who directed their polemic efforts against the heretics, their number was prodigious, though few of their writings have come down to our times. Irenæus refuted the whole tribe in a work destined solely for that purpose. Clemens,[a] Tertullian,[b] and Justin Martyr, wrote also against all the sectaries; but the work of the last, upon that subject, is not extant. It would be endless to mention those who combated particular errors; of whose writings also, many have disappeared amidst the decays of time, and the revolutions that have happened in the republic of letters.

VIII. If the primitive defenders of Christianity were not always happy in the choice of their arguments, yet they discovered more candour and probity than those of the following ages. The artifice of sophistry, and the habit of employing pious frauds in support of the truth, had not, as yet, infected the Christians. And this, indeed, is all that can be said in their behalf; for they are worthy of little admiration on account of the accuracy or depth of their reasonings. The most of them appear to have been destitute of penetration, learning, order, application and force. They frequently make use of arguments void of all solidity, and much more proper to dazzle the fancy, than to enlighten and convince the mind. One, laying aside the sacred writings, from which all the weapons of religious controversy ought to be drawn, refers to the decisions of those bishops who ruled the apostolic churches. Another thinks, that the antiquity of a doctrine is a mark of its truth, and pleads prescription against his adversaries, as if he was maintaining his property before a civil magistrate; than which method of disputing nothing can be more pernicious to the cause of truth. A third imitates those wrong-headed disputants among the Jews, who, infatuated with their cabalistic jargon, offered, as arguments, the imaginary powers of certain mystic words and chosen numbers.[c] Nor do they seem to err, who are of opinion, that, in this century, that vicious method[d] of disputing, which afterwards obtained the name of *œconomical*, was first introduced.[e]

IX. The principal points of morality were treated by Justin Martyr, or, at least, by the writer of the Epistle to Zena and Serenus, which is to be found among the works of that celebrated author. Many other writers confined themselves to particular branches of the moral system, which they handled with much attention and zeal. Thus Clemens of Alexandria wrote several treatises concerning calumny, patience, continence, and other virtues, which discourses have not reached our times. Those of Tertullian upon chastity, upon flight in the time of persecution, as also upon fasting, shows, female ornaments, and prayer, have survived the waste of time, and might be read with much fruit, were the style in which they are written less laboured and difficult, and the spirit they breathe less melancholy and morose.

X. Learned men are not unanimous with regard to the degree of esteem that is due to the authors now mentioned, and the other ancient moralists. Some represent them as the most excellent guides in the paths of piety and virtue; while others place them in the lowest rank of moral writers, consider them as the worst of all instructers, and treat their precepts and decisions as perfectly insipid, and, in many respects, pernicious. We leave the determination of this point to such as are more capable of pronouncing decisively upon it, than we pretend to be.[f] It, however, appears to us incontestable, that in the writings of the primitive fathers, there are several sublime sentiments, judicious thoughts, and many things that are naturally adapted to form a religious temper, and to excite pious and virtuous affections; while it must be confessed on the other hand, that they abound still more with precepts of an excessive and unreasonable austerity, with stoical and academical dictates, vague and indeterminate notions, and what is ye worse, with decisions that are absolutely false, and in evi dent opposition to the precepts of Christ. Before the question mentioned above concerning the merit of the ancient fathers, as moralists, be decided, a previous question must be determined, namely, What is meant by a bad director in point of morals? and, if by such a person be meant, one who has no determinate notion of the nature and limits of the duties incumbent upon Christians, no clear and distinct

[a] In his work entitled, Stromata.

[b] In his Præscriptiones adversus Hæreticos.

[c] Several examples of this senseless method of reasoning are to be found in different writers. See particularly Basnage, Histoire des Juifs, tom. iii. p. 660, 694.

[d] The *œconomical* method of disputing was that in which the disputants accommodated themselves, as far as was possible, to the taste and prejudices of those whom they were endeavouring to gain over to the truth. Some of the first Christians carried this condescension too far, and abused St. Paul's example, (1 Cor. ix. 20, 21, 22.) to a degree inconsistent with the purity and simplicity of the Christian doctrine.

[e] Rich. Simon, Histoire Critique des principaux Commentateurs du N. T. cap. ii. p. 21.

[f] This question was warmly and learnedly debated between the deservedly celebrated Barbeyrac and Cellier, a Benedictine monk. Budeus has given us a history of this controversy, with his own judgment of it, in his Isagoge ad Theologiam, lib. ii. cap. iv. p. 620, &c. Barbeyrac, however, published after this a particular treatise in defence of the severe sentence he had pronounced against the *fathers*. This ingenious performance was printed at Amsterdam in 1720, under the title of Traité sur la Morale des Peres; and is highly worthy of the perusal of those who have a taste for this interesting branch of literature, though

ideas of virtue and vice; who has not penetrated the spirit and genius of those sacred books, to which alone we must appeal in every dispute about Christian virtue, and who, in consequence thereof, fluctuates often in uncertainty, or falls into error in explaining the divine laws, though he may frequently administer sublime and pathetic instructions; if, by a bad guide in morals, such a person, as we have now delineated, be meant, then it must be confessed, that this title belongs indisputably to many of the fathers.

XI. The cause of morality, and indeed, of Christianity in general, suffered deeply by a capital error which was received in this century; an error admitted without any sinister views, but yet with great imprudence, and, which, through every period of the church, even until the present time, has produced other errors without number, and multiplied the evils under which the Gospel has so often groaned. Jesus Christ prescribed to all his disciples one and the same rule of life and manners. But certain Christian doctors, either through a desire of imitating the nations among whom they lived, or in consequence of a natural propensity to a life of austerity (which is a disease not uncommon in Syria, Egypt, and other Eastern provinces), were induced to maintain, that Christ had established a double rule of sanctity and virtue, for two different orders of Christians. Of these rules one was ordinary, the other extraordinary; one of a lower dignity, the other more sublime; one for persons in the active scenes of life, the other for those who, in a sacred retreat, aspired to the glory of a celestial state. In consequence of this wild system, they divided into two parts all those moral doctrines and instructions which they had received, either by writing or tradition. One of these divisions they called *precepts* and the other *counsels*. They gave the name of precepts to those laws which were obligatory upon all orders of men; and that of counsels to such as related to Christians of a more sublime rank, who proposed to themselves great and glorious ends, and aspired to an intimate communion with the Supreme Being.

XII. This double doctrine suddenly produced a new set of men, who made profession of uncommon degrees of sanctity and virtue, and declared their resolution of obeying all the counsels of Christ, that they might enjoy communion with God here; and also, that, after the dissolution of their mortal bodies, they might ascend to him with greater facility, and find nothing to retard their approach to the supreme centre of happiness and perfection. They looked upon themselves as prohibited from the use of things which it was lawful for other Christians to enjoy, such as wine, flesh, matrimony, and trade.[a] They thought it their indispensable duty, to extenuate the body by watchings, abstinence, labour and hunger. They looked for felicity in solitary retreats, in desert places, where, by severe and assiduous efforts of sublime meditation, they raised the soul above all external objects and all sensual pleasures. Both men and women imposed upon themselves the most severe tasks, the most austere discipline; all which however the fruit of pious intention, was, in the issue, extremely detrimental to Christianity. These persons were called Ascetics, Σπουδαῖοι, Ἐκλεκτοί, and philosophers; nor were they only distinguished by their title from other Christians, but also by their garb.[b] In this century, indeed, such as embraced this austere kind of life, submitted themselves to all these mortifications in private, without breaking asunder their social bonds, or withdrawing themselves from the concourse of men. But, in process of time, they retired into deserts; and after the example of the Essenes and Therapeutæ, they formed themselves into certain companies.

XIII. Nothing is more obvious than the reasons that gave rise to this austere sect. One of the principal was, the ill judged ambition of the Christians to resemble the Greeks and Romans, many of whose sages and philosophers distinguished themselves from the generality by their maxims, by their habits, and, indeed, by the whole plan of life and manners which they had formed to themselves, and by which they acquired a high degree of esteem and authority. It is also well known, that, of all these philosophers, there were none whose sentiments and discipline were so well received by the ancient Christians as those of the Platonists and Pythagoreans, who prescribed in their lessons two rules of conduct; one for the sages, who aspired to the sublimest heights of virtue; and another for the people, involved in the cares and hurry of an active life.[c] The law of moral conduct, which the Platonists prescribed to the philosophers, was as follows: "The soul of the wise man ought to be removed to the greatest possible distance from the contagious influence of the body; and, as the depressing weight of the body, the force of its appetites, and its connexions with a corrupt world, are in direct opposition to this sacred obligation, all sensual pleasures are to be carefully avoided; the body is to be supported, or rather extenuated, by a slender diet; *solitude* is to be sought as the true mansion of virtue, and *contemplation* to be employed as the means of raising the soul, as far as is possible, to a sublime freedom from all corporeal ties, and to a noble elevation above all terrestrial things.[d] The person who lives in this manner, shall enjoy, even in the present state, a certain degree of communion with the Deity; and, when the corporeal mass is dissolved, shall immediately ascend to the sublime regions of felicity and perfection, without passing through that state of purification and trial, which awaits the generality of mankind." It is easy to perceive, that this rigorous discipline was a natural consequence of the peculiar opinions which these philosophers, and some others who resembled them, entertained concerning the nature of the soul, the influence of matter, the operations of invisible beings, or demons, and the formation of the world; and, as these opinions were adopted by the more learned among the Christians, it was natural that they should embrace also the moral discipline which flowed from them.

XIV. There is a particular consideration that will enable us to render a natural account of the origin of those religious severities of which we have been now speaking, and that is drawn from the genius and temper of the people by whom they were first practised. It was in Egypt that

they will find in it some imputations cast upon the fathers, against which they may be easily defended.

[a] Athenagoras, Apologia pro Christian. cap. xxviii.

[b] See Salmas. Comm. in Tertullianum de Pallio.

[c] These famous sects made an important distinction between *living according to nature*, Ζῆν κατὰ φύσιν, and *living above nature*, Ζῆν ὑπὲρ φύσιν. The former was the rule prescribed to the vulgar; the latter, that which was to direct the conduct of the philosophers, who aimed at superior degrees of virtue. See Æneas Gazeus in Theophrast.

[d] The reader will find the principles of this fanatical discipline, in Porphyry's book περὶ ἀποχῆς, i. e. concerning abstinence. That celebrated Platonist has explained at large the respective duties that belong to *active* and *contemplative* life, book i. sect. 27 and 41.

this morose discipline had its rise. That country, we may observe, has in all times, as it were by an immutable law, or disposition of nature, abounded with persons of a melancholy complexion, and produced, in proportion to its extent, more gloomy spirits than any other part of the world.[a] It was here that the Essenes and Therapeutæ, those dismal and gloomy sects, dwelt principally, long before the coming of Christ; as also many others of the Ascetic tribe, who, led by a melancholy turn of mind, and a delusive notion of rendering themselves more acceptable to the Deity by their austerities, withdrew themselves from human society, and from all the innocent pleasures and comforts of life.[b] From Egypt, this sour and insocial discipline passed into Syria, and the neighbouring countries, which also abounded with persons of the same dismal constitution with that of the Egyptians;[c] and thence, in process of time, its infection reached the European nations. Hence arose that train of austere and superstitious vows and rites, that still, in many places, throw a veil over the beauty and simplicity of the Christian religion. Hence the celibacy of the priestly order, the rigour of unprofitable penances and mortifications, the innumerable swarms of monks, who, in the senseless pursuit of a visionary sort of perfection, refused their talents and labours to society. Hence also that distinction between the *theoretical* and *mystical* life, and many other fancies of a like nature, which we shall have occasion to mention in the course of this history.

XV. It is generally true, that delusions travel in a train, and that one mistake produces many. The Christians who adopted this austere system had certainly made a very false step, and done much injury to their excellent and most reasonable religion. But they did not stop here; another erroneous practice was adopted by them, which, though it was not so general as the other, was yet extremely pernicious, and proved a source of numberless evils to the Christian church. The Platonists and Pythagoreans held it as a maxim, that it was not only lawful, but even praiseworthy, to deceive, and even to use the expedient of a lie, in order to advance the cause of truth and piety. The Jews, who lived in Egypt, had learned and received this maxim from them, before the coming of Christ, as appears incontestably from a multitude of ancient records; and the Christians were infected from both these sources with the same pernicious error, as appears from the number of books attributed falsely to great and venerable names, from the Sibylline verses, and several suppositious productions which were spread abroad in this and the following century. It does not indeed seem probable, that all these *pious frauds* were chargeable upon the professors of *real* Christianity, upon those who entertained just and rational sentiments of the religion of Jesus. The greatest part of these fictitious writings undoubtedly flowed from the fertile invention of the Gnostic sects, though it cannot be affirmed that even true Christians were entirely innocent and irreproachable in this respect.

XVI. As the boundaries of the church were enlarged, the number of vicious and irregular persons who entered into it, received a proportional increase, as appears from the many complaints and censures that we find in the writers of this century. Several methods were practised to stem the torrent of iniquity. Excommunication was peculiarly employed to prevent or punish the most heinous and enormous crimes, and the crimes deemed such, were murder, idolatry, and adultery, which terms, however, we must here understand in their more full and extensive sense. In some places, the commission of any of these sins irrevocably cut off the criminals from all hopes of restoration to the privileges of church communion; in others, after a long, laborious, and painful course of probation and discipline, they were re-admitted into the bosom of the church.[d]

XVII. It is here to be attentively observed, that the form, used in the exclusion of heinous offenders from the society of Christians, was, at first, extremely simple. A small number of plain, yet judicious rules, made up the whole of this solemn institution, which, however was imperceptibly altered, enlarged by an addition of a vast multitude of rites, and new-modeled according to the discipline used in the Heathen mysteries.[e] Those who have any acquaintance with the singular reasons that obliged the Christians of those ancient times to be careful in restraining the progress of vice, will readily grant, that it was incumbent upon the rulers of the church to perfect their discipline, and to render the restraints upon iniquity more severe. They will justify the rulers of the primitive church in their refusing to restore excommunicated members to their forfeited privileges, before they had given incontestable marks of the sincerity of their repentance. Yet it remains to be examined, whether it was expedient to borrow from the enemies of the truth the rules of this salutary discipline, and thus to sanctify in some measure, a part of the Heathen superstition. But, however delicate such a question may be, when determined with a view to all the indirect or immediate consequences of the matter in debate, the equitable and candid judge will consider principally the good intentions of those from whom these ceremonies and institutions proceeded, and will overlook the rest from a charitable condescension and indulgence to human weakness.

CHAPTER IV.

Of the Ceremonies used in the Church during this Century.

I. THERE is no institution so pure and excellent which the corruption and folly of man will not in time alter for the worse, and load with additions foreign to its nature and original design. Such, in a particular manner, was the fate of Christianity. In this century many unnecessary rites and ceremonies were added to the Christian worship, the introduction of which was extremely offensive to wise and good men.[f] These changes, while they destroyed the beautiful simplicity of the gospel, were naturally pleasing to the gross multitude, who are more delighted with the pomp and splendour of external institutions, than with the native charms of rational and solid piety, and who generally give little attention to any objects

[a] See Maillet, Description de l'Egypte, tom. ii.

[b] Herodot. Histor. lib. ii.—Epiphanius, Exposit. Fidei, sect. 11.—Tertullian, de Exhortatione Castitat. cap. xiii.—Athanas. Vita Antonii.

[c] Voyages en Perse, par Jean Chardin, tom. iv.

[d] By this distinction, we may easily reconcile the different opinions of the learned concerning the effects of excommunication. See Morinus, de Disciplinâ Pœnitent. lib. ix. cap. xix. p. 67.—Sirmond, Historia Pœnitentiæ publicæ, cap. i.—Joseph. Augustin. Orsi, Dissert. de Criminum capitalium per tria priora Sæcula Absolutione, published at Milan in 1730.

[e] See Fabricius, Bibliograph. Antiquar. p. 397, and Morinus, de Pœnitentiâ, lib. i. cap. xv, &c.

[f] Tertullian, Lib. de Creatione, p. 792, op.

but those which strike their outward senses.[a] But other reasons may be added to this, which, though they suppose no bad intention, yet manifest a considerable degree of precipitation and imprudence.

II. And here we may observe, in the first place, that there is a high degree of probability in the notion of those who think that the bishops augmented the number of religious rites in the Christian worship, by way of accommodation to the infirmities and prejudices, both of Jews and heathens, in order to facilitate their conversion to Christianity. Both Jews and heathens were accustomed to a great variety of pompous and magnificent ceremonies in their religious service. And as they deemed these rites an essential part of religion, it was natural that they should behold with indifference, and even with contempt, the simplicity of the Christian worship, which was destitute of those idle ceremonies that rendered their service so specious and striking. To remove then, in some measure, this prejudice against Christianity, the bishops thought it necessary to increase the number of ceremonies, and thus to render the public worship more striking to the outward senses.[b]

III. This addition of external rites was also designed to remove the opprobious calumnies which the Jewish and pagan priests cast upon the Christians on account of the simplicity of their worship, considering them as little better than atheists, because they had no temples, altars, victims, priests, nor any mark of that external pomp in which the vulgar are so prone to place the essence of religion. The rulers of the church adopted, therefore, certain external ceremonies, that thus they might captivate the senses of the vulgar, and be able to refute the reproaches of their adversaries. ☞ This, it must be confessed, was a very awkward, and indeed, a very pernicious stratagem; it was obscuring the native lustre of the Gospel, in order to extend its influence, and making it lose, in point of real excellence, what it gained in point of popular esteem. Some accommodations to the infirmities of mankind, some prudent instances of condescension to their invincible prejudices, are necessary in ecclesiastical, as well as in civil institutions; but they must be of such a nature as not to inspire ideas, or encourage prejudices, incompatible with just sentiments of the great object of religious worship, and of the fundamental truths which God has imparted by reason and revelation to the human race. How far this rule has been disregarded and violated, will appear too plainly in the progress of this history.

IV. A third cause of the multiplication of ceremonies in the Christian church, may be deduced from the abuse of certain titles that distinguished the sacerdotal orders among the Jews. Every one knows, that many terms used in the New Testament to express the different parts of the Christian doctrine and worship, are borrowed from the Jewish law, or bear a certain analogy to the forms and ceremonies instituted by Moses. The Christian doctors not only imitated this analogical manner of speaking, but even extended it farther than the apostles had done; and though in this there was nothing that deserved reproach, yet the consequences of this method of speaking became, through abuse, detrimental to the purity of the Gospel; for, in process of time, many asserted, (whether through ignorance or artifice is not easy to determine,) that these forms of speech were not figurative, but highly proper, and exactly suitable to the nature of the things they were designed to express. The bishops, by an innocent allusion to the Jewish manner of speaking, had been called chief priests; the elders, or presbyters, had received the title of priests, and the deacons that of Levites. But, in a little time, these titles were abused by an aspiring clergy, who thought proper to claim the same rank and station, the same rights and privileges, that were conferred with those titles upon the ministers of religion under the Mosaic dispensation. Hence the rise of *tithes, first-fruits, splendid garments*, and many other circumstances of external grandeur, by which ecclesiastics were eminently distinguished. In like manner the comparison of the Christian oblations with the Jewish victims and sacrifices, produced a multitude of unnecessary rites, and was the occasion of introducing that erroneous notion of the eucharist, which represents it as a real sacrifice, and not merely as a commemoration of the great offering that was once made upon the cross for the sins of mortals.

V. The profound respect that was paid to the Greek and Roman mysteries, and the extraordinary sanctity that was attributed to them, were additional circumstances that induced the Christians to give their religion a mystic air, in order to put it upon an equal footing, in point of dignity, with that of the Pagans. For this purpose, they gave the name of *mysteries* to the institutions of the Gospel, and decorated particularly the holy sacrament with that solemn title. They used in that sacred institution, as also in that of baptism, several of the terms employed in the Heathen mysteries, and proceeded so far, at length, as even to adopt some of the ceremonies of which those renowned mysteries consisted.[c] This imitation began in the eastern provinces; but, after the time of Adrian, who first introduced the mysteries among the Latins,[d] it was followed by the Christians who dwelt in the western parts of the empire. A

☞ [a] It is not improper to remark here, that this attachment of the vulgar to the pomp of ceremonies, is a circumstance that has always been favourable to the ambitious views of the Romish clergy, since the pomp of religion naturally casts a part of its glory and magnificence upon its ministers, and thereby gives them, imperceptibly, a vast ascendency over the minds of the people. The late lord Bolingbroke, being present at the elevation of the host in the cathedral at Paris, expressed to a nobleman who stood near him, his surprise that the king of France should commit the performance of such an august and striking ceremony to any subject. How far ambition may, in this and the succeeding ages, have contributed to the accumulation of gaudy ceremonies, is a question not easily determined.

[b] A remarkable passage in the life of Gregory, surnamed Thaumaturgus, *i. e.* the wonder worker, will illustrate this point in the clearest manner. The passage is as follows: "Cum animadvertisset (Gregorius) quod ob corporeas delectationes et voluptates simplex et imperitum vulgus in simulacrorum cultus errore permaneret—permisit eis, ut in memoriam et recordationem sanctorum martyrum sese oblectarent, et in lætitiam effunderentur, quod successu temporis aliquando futurem esset, ut suâ sponte ad honestiorum et accuratiorem vitæ rationem transirent." *i. e.* "When Gregory perceived that the ignorant multitude persisted in their idolatry, on account of the pleasures and sensual gratifications which they enjoyed at the pagan festivals, he granted them a permission to indulge themselves in the like pleasures, in celebrating the memory of the holy martyrs, hoping that, in process of time, they would return of their own accord, to a more virtuous and regular course of life." There is no sort of doubt, that, by this permission, Gregory allowed the Christians to dance, sport, and feast at the tombs of the martyrs, upon their respective festivals, and to do every thing which the pagans were accustomed to do in their temples, during the feasts celebrated in honour of their gods."

[c] See, for many examples of this, Isaac Casaubon, Exercitat. xvi. in Annal. Cardin. Baronii, p. 388, edit. Genev. 1654. Tollius, Insign. itineris Italici, not. p. 151, 163.—Spanheim's notes to his French translation of Julian's *Cæsars*, p. 133.—Clarkson *on Liturgies.*

[d] Spartian, Vit. Hadriani, c. xiii.

great part, therefore, of the service of the church, in this century, had a certain air of the Heathen mysteries, and resembled them considerably in many particulars.

VI. It may be farther observed, that the custom of teaching their religious doctrines by images, actions, signs, and other sensible representations, which prevailed among the Egyptians, and, indeed, in almost all the eastern nations, was another cause of the increase of external rites in the church. As there were many persons of narrow capacities, whose comprehension scarcely extended beyond sensible objects, the Christian doctors thought it advisable to instruct such in the essential truths of the Gospel, by placing these truths as it were, before their eyes, under sensible images. Thus they administered milk and honey, the ordinary food of infants, to such as were newly, received into the church, showing by this sign, that by their baptism they were born again, and were bound to manifest the simplicity and innocence of infants in their lives and conversation. Certain military forms were borrowed to express the new and solemn engagements, by which Christians attached themselves to Christ as their leader and their chief; and the ancient ceremony of manumission was used to signify the liberty of which they were made partakers, in consequence of their redemption from the guilt and dominion of sin, and their deliverance from the power of the prince of darkness.[a]

VII. If it be considered, in the first place, that the Christians who composed the church, were Jews and Heathens, accustomed from their birth, to various insignificant ceremonies and superstitious rites,—and if it be also considered, that such a long course of custom and of education forms prejudices that are extremely obstinate and difficult to be conquered—it will then appear, that nothing less than a continued miracle could have totally prevented the entrance of all superstitious mixtures into the Christian worship. A single example will tend to the illustrations of this matter. Before the coming of Christ, all the eastern nations performed divine worship with their faces turned to that part of the heavens where the sun displays his rising beams. This custom was founded upon a general opinion, that God, whose *essence* they looked upon to be *light*, and whom they considered as being circumscribed within certain limits, dwelt in that part of the firmament, from which he sends forth the sun, the bright image of his benignity and glory. The Christian converts, indeed, rejected this gross error; but they retained the ancient and universal custom of worshipping toward the east, which sprang from it. Nor is that custom abolished even in our times, but still prevails in a great number of Christian churches. From the same source arose various rites among the Jews, which many Christians, especially those who live in the eastern countries, observe religiously at this very day.[b]

VIII. We shall take no more than a brief view of these rites and ceremonies, since a particular consideration of them would lead us into endless discussions, and open a field too vast to be comprehended in such a compendious history as we here give of the Christian church. The first Christians assembled for the purposes of divine worship, in private houses, in caves, and in vaults, where the dead were buried. Their meetings were on the first day of the week; and, in some places, they assembled also on the seventh, which was celebrated by the Jews. Many also observed the fourth day of the week, on which Christ was betrayed; and the sixth, which was the day of his crucifixion. The hour of the day appointed for holding these religious assemblies varied according to the different times and circumstances of the church; but it was generally in the evening after sun-set, or in the morning before the dawn. During these sacred meetings, prayers were repeated;[c] the holy scriptures were publicly read; short discourses, upon the duties of Christians, were addressed to the people; hymns were sung; and a portion of the oblations, presented by the faithful was employed in the celebration of the Lord's Supper and the feast of charity.

IX. The Christians of this century celebrated anniversary festivals in commemoration of the death and resurrection of Christ, and of the effusion of the Holy Ghost upon the apostles. The day which was observed as the anniversary of Christ's death was called the *paschal* day, or passover, because it was looked upon to be the same with that on which the Jews celebrated the feast of that name In the manner, however, of observing this solemn day the Christians of Asia Minor differed much from the rest, and in a more especial manner from those of Rome. They both indeed, fasted during the *great week* (so that was called in which Christ died,) and afterwards celebrated, like the Jews, a sacred feast, at which they distributed a paschal lamb in memory of the holy supper. But the Asiatic Christians kept this feast on the fourteenth day of the first Jewish month, when the Jews celebrated their passover, and, three days after, commemorated the resurrection of the triumphant Redeemer. They affirmed, that they had derived this custom from the apostles John and Philip; and pleaded, moreover, in its behalf, the example of Christ himself who held his paschal feast on the day of the Jewish passover. The western churches observed a different method; they celebrated their paschal feast on the night that preceded the anniversary of Christ's resurrection, and thus connected the commemoration of his crucifixion with that of his victory over death and the grave. Nor did they differ thus from the Asiatics, without pleading also apostolic authority for what they did; for they alleged that of St. Peter and St. Paul, as a justification of their conduct in this matter.

X. The Asiatic rule for keeping the paschal feast, was attended with two great inconveniences, to which the Christians at Alexandria and Rome, and all the western churches, refused to submit; for, in the first place, as the Asiatics celebrated their festival on the same day that Christ is said to have eaten the paschal lamb with his disciples, this occasioned an inevitable interruption in the fast of the *great week*, which the other churches looked upon as almost criminal, at least as highly indecent. Nor was this the only inconvenience arising from this rule: for, as they celebrated the memory of Christ's resurrection, precisely on the third day after their paschal supper, it happened for the most part, that this great festival (which afterwards was called by the Latins *pascha*, and to which we give the name of *Easter*) was holden on other days of the week than the first. This circumstance was ex-

[a] See Edm. Merillii *Observat.* lib. iii. cap. iii.

[b] See Spencer *de Legibus ritualibus Hebræorum, Prolegom.*

[c] There is an excellent account given of these prayers, and of the Christian worship in general, in Tertullian's Apology, chap. xxxix which is one of the most noble productions of ancient times.

tremely displeasing to the greatest part of the Christians, who thought it unlawful to celebrate the resurrection of our Lord on any day but Sunday, as that was the day on which this glorious event happened. Hence arose sharp and vehement contentions between the Asiatic and western Christians. About the middle of this century, during the reign of Antoninus Pius, the venerable Polycarp went to Rome to confer with Anicet, bishop of that see, upon this matter, with a view to terminate the warm disputes which it had occasioned. But this conference, though conducted with great decency and moderation, was without effect. Polycarp and Anicet only agreed in this, that the bonds of charity were not to be broken on account of this controversy; but they respectively continued, at the same time, in their former sentiments; nor could the Asiatics be engaged by any arguments to alter the rule which they pretended to have received by tradition from St. John.[a]

XI. Toward the conclusion of this century, Victor, bishop of Rome, endeavoured to force the Asiatic Christians by the pretended authority of his laws and decrees, to follow the rule which was observed by the western churches in this point. Accordingly, after having taken the advice of some foreign bishops, he wrote an imperious letter to the Asiatic prelates commanding them to imitate the example of the western Christians with respect to the time of celebrating the festival of Easter. The Asiatics answered this lordly requisition by the pen of Polycrates, bishop of Ephesus, who declared in their name, with great spirit and resolution, that they would by no means depart, in this manner from the custom handed down to them by their ancestors. Upon this the thunder of excommunication began to roar. Victor, exasperated by this resolute answer of the Asiatic bishops, broke communion with them, pronounced them unworthy of the name of his brethren, and excluded them from all fellowship with the church of Rome. This excommunication, indeed, extended no farther: nor could it cut off the Asiatic bishops from communion with the other churches, whose bishops were far from approving the conduct of Victor.[b] The progress of this violent dissension was stopped by the wise and moderate remonstrances, which Irenæus, bishop of Lyons, addressed to the Roman prelate on this occasion, in which he showed him the imprudence and injustice of the step he had taken, and also by the long letter which the Asiatic Christians wrote in their own justification. In consequence therefore of this cessation of arms, the combatants retained each their own customs, until the fourth century, when the council of Nice abolished that of the Asiatics, and rendered the time of the celebration of Easter the same through all the Christian churches.[c]

XII. In these times, the sacrament of the Lord's Supper was celebrated, for the most part, on Sundays, and the ceremonies observed upon that occasion were such as follow. Of the bread and wine, which were presented among the other oblations of the faithful, a part was separated from the rest, and consecrated by the prayers of the bishop. The wine was mixed with water, and the bread was divided into several portions. A part of the consecrated bread and wine was carried to the sick or absent members of the church, as a testimony of fraternal love, sent to them by the whole society.[d] It appears by many and undoubted testimonies, that this holy rite was looked upon as essential to salvation; and, when this is duly considered, we shall be less disposed to censure, as erroneous, the opinion of those who have affirmed, that the Lord's Supper was administered to infants during this century.[e] The feasts of charity, that followed the celebration of the Lord's Supper, have been already mentioned.

XIII. The sacrament of baptism was administered publicly twice every year, at the festivals of Easter and Pentecost or Whitsuntide,[f] either by the bishop, or, in consequence of his authorization and appointment, by the presbyters. The persons that were to be baptized, after they had repeated the Creed, confessed and renounced their sins, and particularly the devil and his pompous allurements, were immersed under water, and received into Christ's kingdom by a solemn invocation of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, according to the express command of our Blessed Lord. After baptism, they received the sign of the cross, were anointed, and by prayers and imposition of hands, were solemnly recommended to the mercy of God, and dedicated to his service; in consequence of which they received milk and honey, which concluded the ceremony.[g] The reasons of this particular ritual coincide with what we have said in general concerning the origin and causes of the multiplied ceremonies that crept from time to time into the church.

Adult persons were prepared for baptism by abstinence prayer, and other pious exercises. It was to answer for them that sponsors, or godfathers, were first instituted, though they were afterwards admitted also in the baptism of infants.[h]

CHAPTER V.

Concerning the Heresies and Divisions that troubled the Church during this Century.

I. AMONG the many sects which divided the Christian church during this century, it is natural to mention, in the first place, that which an attachment to the Mosaic law separated from the rest of their Christian brethren. The first rise of this sect is placed under the reign of Adrian; for, when this emperor had, at length, razed Jerusalem, entirely destroyed even its very foundations, and enacted laws of the severest kind against the whole body of the

[a] Eusebius, Hist. Eccles. lib. iv. v.

[b] This whole affair furnishes a striking argument, among the multitude that may be drawn from ecclesiastical history, against the supremacy and universal authority of the bishop of Rome.

☞ [c] Dr. Mosheim, in a note, refers us for a more copious account of this controversy to his Commentar. de rebus Christianorum ante Constantinum M. He had said in that work, that Faydit had perceived the error of the common opinion, concerning the disputes which arose in the church about the time of keeping Easter. But here he retracts this encomium, and, after a second reading of Faydit's book, finds himself obliged to declare, that this writer has entirely missed the true state of the question. See the account of this controversy, given by the learned Heuman in one of the treatises of his Sylloge, or collection of small pieces.

[d] Henricus Rixnerus, de Ritibus veterum Christianorum circa Eucharistiam.

[e] See Jo. Frid. Mayer, Diss. de Eucharistiâ Infantum; as also Zornius, Histor. Eucharist. Infantum.

[f] See Wall's History of Infant Baptism, and Vicecomes de Ritibus Baptismi.

[g] See Tertullian on Baptism.

[h] See Ger. a Maestricht, de Susceptoribus Infantium ex Baptismo, though he is of a different opinion in this matter, and thinks that *sponsers* were not used in the baptism of adult persons. See also Wall's History of Infant Baptism. ☞ See moreover, upon this subject, Isaaci Jundt, Arg. de Susceptorum Baptismalium Origine Commentatio, published in 1755, of which an account may be seen in the Biblioth. des Sciences et des Beaux Arts, tom. vi.

Jewish people, the greatest part of the Christians, who lived in Palestine, to prevent their being confounded with the Jews, abandoned entirely the Mosaic rites, and chose a bishop named Mark, a foreigner by nation, and consequently an alien from the commonwealth of Israel. This step was highly shocking to those, whose attachment to the Mosaic rites was violent and invincible; and such was the case of many. These, therefore, separated themselves from the brethren, and founded in Peræa, a country of Palestine, and in the neighbouring parts, particular assemblies, in which the law of Moses maintained its primitive dignity, authority, and lustre.[a]

II. This body of judaizing Christians, which set Christ and Moses upon an equal footing, in point of authority, afterwards divided itself into two sects, extremely different both in their rites and in their opinions, and distinguished by the names of Nazarenes and Ebionites. The former are not placed by the ancient Christians in the heretical register;[b] but the latter were considered as a sect, whose tenets were destructive of the fundamental principles of the Christian religion. These sects made use of a *gospel*, or history of Christ, different from that which is received among us, and concerning which there have been many disputes among the learned.[c] The term Nazarene was not originally the name of a sect, in that which distinguished the disciples of Jesus but general; and, as those whom the Greeks called Christians, received the name of Nazarenes among the Jews, the latter name was not considered as a mark of ignominy or contempt. Those, indeed, who, after their separation from their brethren, retained the title of Nazarenes, differed much from the true disciples of Christ, to whom that name had been originally given: "they held, that Christ was born of a virgin, and was also in a *certain manner* united to the divine nature; they refused to abandon the ceremonies prescribed by the law of Moses, but were far from attempting to impose the observance of these ceremonies upon the Gentile Christians; and they rejected all those additions which had been made to the Mosaic institutions, by the Pharisees and the doctors of the law;"[d] and hence we may easily see the reason why the greatest part of the Christians treated the Nazarenes with a more than ordinary degree of gentleness and forbearance.

III. It is doubtful whether the Ebionites derived their name from one of their principal doctors, or from their poverty.[e] One thing, however, is certain, that their sentiments and doctrines were much more pernicious than those of the Nazarenes;[f] for, though they believed the celestial mission of Christ, and his participation of a divine nature, yet they regarded him as a man born of Joseph and Mary, according to the ordinary course of nature. They also asserted, that the ceremonial law, instituted by Moses, was not only obligatory upon the Jews, but upon all others, and that the observance of it was essential to salvation; and as St. Paul had very different sentiments from them, concerning the obligation of the ceremonial law, and had opposed the observance of it in the warmest manner, so, in consequence, they held this apostle in abhorrence, and treated his writings with the utmost disrespect. Nor were they only attached to the rites instituted by Moses: they went still farther, and received, with an equal degree of veneration, the superstitions of their ancestors, and the ceremonies and traditions which the Pharisees presumptuously added to the law.[g]

IV. These obscure and unfrequented heretical assemblies were very little detrimental to the Christian cause, which suffered much more from those sects, whose leaders explained the doctrines of Christianity in a manner conformable to the dictates of the oriental philosophy concerning the origin of evil. The oriental doctors, who, before this century, had lived in the greatest obscurity, came forth from their retreat under the reign of Adrian,[h] exposed themselves to public view, and collected, in various provinces, assemblies, whose numbers were very considerable. The ancient records mention a great number of these demi-christian sects, many of which are no farther known than by their distinguishing names: which perhaps, is the only circumstance in which they differ from each other. One division, however, of these oriental Christians, may be mentioned as real and important, since the two branches it produced were considerably superior to the rest in reputation, and made more noise in the world than the other multiplied subdivisions of this pernicious sect. Of this famous division, one branch which arose in Asia, preserved the oriental doctrine concerning the origin of the world, unmixed with other sentiments and opinions; while the other, which was formed in Egypt, made a motley mixture of this philosophy with the tenets and prodigies adopted in the religious system of that superstitious country. The doctrine of the former surpassed in simplicity and perspicuity that of the latter, which consisted of a vast variety of parts, so artfully combined, that the explication of them became exceedingly difficult.

V. Among the doctors of the Asiatic branch, the first place is due to Elxai, who, during the reign of Trajan, is said to have formed the sect of the Elcesaites. This heretic, though a Jew, attached to the worship of one God, and full of veneration for Moses, corrupted the religion of his ancestors, by blending with it a multitude of fictions drawn from the oriental philosophy. Pretending also, after the example of the Essenes, to give a rational explication of the law of Moses, he reduced it to a mere allegory. It is,

[a] See Sulpitius Severus, Hist. Sacr. lib. ii. cap. xxxi.

[b] Epiphanius was the first writer who placed the Nazarenes in the list of heretics. He wrote in the fourth century, but is very far from being remarkable, either for his fidelity or judgment.

☞ [c] This gospel, which was called indiscriminately the gospel of the Nazarenes, or Hebrews, is certainly the same with the gospel of the Ebionites, and that of the twelve apostles, and is probably that which St. Paul refers to, Galatians, ch. i. ver. 6. Dr. Mosheim refers his readers, for an account of this gospel, to Fabricius, in his Codex Apocryph. Nov. Test. tom. i. p. 355, and to a work of his own, entitled Vindiciæ contra Tolandi Nazarenum. The reader will, however, find a still more accurate and satisfactory account of this gospel, in the first volume of the learned and judicious Mr. Jones' incomparable Method of settling the Canonical Authority of the New Testament.

[d] See Mich. le Quien, Adnot. ad Damascenum, tom. i. as also a dissertation of the same author, de Nazarenis et eorum Fide, which is the seventh of those that he has subjoined to his edition of the works of Damascenus.

[e] See Fabric. ad Philostr. de Hæresibus; and Itigius, de Hæresibus Ævi Apostolici.

☞ [f] The learned Mr. Jones looked upon these two sects as differing very little from one another. He attributes to them both much the same doctrines, and alleges, that the Ebionites had only made some small additions to the old Nazarene system.

[g] Irenæus, lib. i. contra Hæres. cap. xxvi. p. 105, edit. Massueti. Epiphanius gives a large account of the Ebionites, Hæres. xxx. But he deserves little credit, since he confesses, (sect. 3, p. 127, and sect. 4, p. 141,) that he had confounded the Sampsæans and Elcesaites with the Ebionites, and also acknowledges that the first Ebionites were strangers to the errors with which he charges them.

[h] Stromata of Clemens Alex. lib. viii. cap. xvii. p. 898. Cypriani epist. lxxv.

at the same time, proper to observe, that some have doubted whether the Elcesaites are to be reckoned among the Christian or the Jewish sects; and Epiphanius, who was acquainted with a certain production of Elxai, expresses his uncertainty in this matter. Elxai, indeed, in that book, mentions Christ with the highest encomiums, without, however, adding any circumstance from which it might be concluded with certainty, that Jesus of Nazareth was the Christ of whom he spoke.[a]

VI. If, then, Elxai be improperly placed among the leaders of the sect now under consideration, we may place at its head Saturninus of Antioch, who is one of the first Gnostic chiefs mentioned in history. He held the doctrine of two principles, from which proceeded all things; one a wise and benevolent deity; and the other, a principle essentially evil, which he supposed to be under the superintendence of a certain intelligence of a malignant nature. "The world and its first inhabitants were (according to the system of this raving philosopher) created by seven angels, who presided over the seven planets. This work was carried on without the knowledge of the benevolent deity, and in opposition to the will of the material principle. The former, however, beheld it with approbation, and honoured it with several marks of his beneficence. He endowed with rational souls the beings who inhabited this new system, to whom their creators had imparted nothing more than the mere animal life; and, having divided the world into seven parts, he distributed them among the seven angelic architects, one of whom was the god of the Jews, and reserved to himself the supreme empire over all. To these creatures, whom the benevolent principle had endowed with reasonable souls, and with dispositions that led to goodness and virtue, the evil being, to maintain his empire, added another kind, whom he formed of a wicked and malignant character; and hence arose the difference observable among men. When the creators of the world fell from their allegiance to the Supreme Deity, God sent from heaven, into our globe, a restorer of order, whose name was Christ. This divine conqueror came clothed with a corporeal appearance, but not with a real body; he came to destroy the empire of the material principle, and to point out to virtuous souls the way by which they must return to God. This way is beset with difficulties and sufferings, since those souls, who propose returning to the Supreme Being after the dissolution of this mortal body, must abstain from wine, flesh, wedlock, and, in short, from every thing that tends to sensual gratification, or even bodily refreshment." Saturninus taught these extravagant doctrines in Syria, but principally at Antioch, and drew after him many disciples by the pompous appearance of an extraordinary virtue.[b]

VII. Cerdo the Syrian, and Marcion, son to the bishop of Pontus, belong to the Asiatic sect, though they began to establish their doctrine at Rome, and, having given a turn somewhat different to the oriental superstition, may themselves be considered as the heads of a new sect, which bears their names. Amidst the obscurity and doubts that render so uncertain the history of these two men, the following fact is incontestable, *viz.* That Cerdo had been spreading his doctrine at Rome before the arrival of Marcion there; and that the latter having, through his own misconduct, forfeited a place to which he aspired in the church of Rome, attached himself through resentment to the impostor Cerdo, and propagated his impious doctrines with an astonishing success throughout the world. "After the example of the oriental doctors, they held the existence of two principles, the one perfectly good, and the other perfectly evil. Between these, they imagined an intermediate kind of deity, neither perfectly good nor perfectly evil, but of a mixed nature (so Marcion expresses it,) and so far just and powerful, as to administer rewards and inflict punishments. This middle deity is the creator of this inferior world, and the god and legislator of the Jewish nation; he wages perpetual war with the evil principle, and one and the other aspire to the place of the Supreme Being, and ambitiously attempt to reduce under their authority all the inhabitants of the world. The Jews are the subjects of that powerful genius, who formed this globe; the other nations, who worship a variety of gods, are under the empire of the evil principle. Both these conflicting powers exercise oppressions upon rational and immortal souls, and keep them in a tedious and miserable captivity. Therefore the Supreme God, in order to terminate this war, and to deliver from their bondage those souls whose origin is celestial and divine, sent to the Jews a being most like to himself, even his son Jesus Christ, clothed with a certain shadowy resemblance of a body, that thus he might be visible to mortal eyes. The commission of this celestial messenger was to destroy the empire both of the evil principle, and of the author of this world, and to bring back wandering souls to God. On this account, he was attacked with inexpressible violence and fury by the prince of darkness, and by the god of the Jews, but without effect, since, having a body only in appearance, he was thereby rendered incapable of suffering. Those who follow the sacred directions of this celestial conductor, mortify the body by fastings and austerities, call off their minds from the allurements of sense, and, renouncing the precepts of the god of the Jews, and of the prince of darkness, turn their eyes toward the Supreme Being, shall, after death ascend to the mansions of felicity and perfection." In consequence of all this, the rule of manners which Marcion prescribed to his followers, was excessively austere, containing an express prohibition of wedlock, of the use of wine, flesh, and of all the external comforts of life. Notwithstanding the rigor of this discipline, great numbers embraced the doctrines of Marcion, of whom Lucan (called also Lucian,) Severus, Blastes, and principally Apelles, are said to have varied, in some things, from the opinions of their master, and to have formed new sects.[c]

VIII. Bardesanes and Tatian are commonly supposed to have been of the school of Valentine, the Egyptian. But this notion is entirely without foundation, since their doctrine differs in many things from that of the Valentinians, approaching nearer to that of the oriental philosophy concerning the two principles. Bardesanes, a native of Edessa, was a man of a very acute genius, and acquired a shining reputation by his writings, which were in great number, and valuable for the profound erudition they con-

[a] Euseb. Hist. Eccles. lib. vi. cap. xxxviii.—Epiphanius, Hæres. xix. sect. iii. Theodoretus, Fabul. Hæret. lib. ii. cap. vii.

[b] Irenæus, lib. i. c. xxiv.—Euseb. Hist. Eccles. lib. iv. cap. vii.—Theodoret. Fabul. Hæret. lib. i. cap. ii.—Epiphan. Hæres. xxxiii.

[c] See Irenæus, Epiphanius, and particularly Tertullian's Five Books against the Marcionites, with his Poem against Marcion, and the Dialogue against the Marcionites, which is generally ascribed to Origen. See also Tillemont's Memo. and Beausobre's Hist. du Manicheisme, tom. ii.

tained. Seduced by the fantastic charms of the oriental philosophy, he adopted it with zeal, but, at the same time, with certain modifications, that rendered his system less extravagant than that of the Marcionites, against whom he wrote a very learned treatise. The sum of his doctrine is as follows: There is a Supreme God, pure and benevolent, absolutely free from all evil and imperfection; and there is also a prince of darkness, the fountain of all evil, disorder and misery. God created the world without any mixture of evil in its composition; he gave existence also to its inhabitants, who came out of his forming hand, pure and incorrupt, endued with subtile etherial bodies, and spirits of a celestial nature. But when, in process of time, the prince of darkness had enticed men to sin, God, permitted them to fall into sluggish and gross bodies, formed of corrupt matter by the evil principle; he permitted also the depravation and disorder which this malignant being introduced, both into the natural and the moral world, designing, by this permission, to punish the degeneracy and rebellion of an apostate race; and hence proceeds the perpetual conflict between reason and passion in the mind of man. It was on this account, that Jesus descended from the upper regions, clothed, not with a real, but with a celestial and aerial body, and taught mankind to subdue that body of corruption which they carry about with them in this mortal life, and, by abstinence, fasting and contemplation, to disengage themselves from the servitude and dominion of that malignant matter which chained down the soul to low and ignoble pursuits. Those, who hear the voice of this divine instructor, and submit themselves to his discipline, shall, after the dissolution of this terrestrial body, mount up to the mansions of felicity, clothed with ethereal vehicles, or celestial bodies." Such was the doctrine of Bardesanes, who afterwards abandoned the chimerical part of this system, and returned to a better mind; though his sect subsisted a long time in Syria.[a]

IX. Tatian, by birth an Assyrian, and a disciple of Justin Martyr, is more distinguished, by the ancient writers, on account of his genius and learning, and the excessive and incredible austerity of his life and manners, than by any remarkable errors or opinions which he taught his followers. It appears, however, from the testimony of credible writers, that Tatian looked upon *matter* as the fountain of all evil, and therefore recommended, in a particular manner, the mortification of the body; that he distinguished the creator of the world from the Supreme Being; denied the reality of Christ's body; and corrupted the Christian religion with several other tenets of the oriental philosophy. He had a great number of followers, who were, after him, called Tatianists,[b] but were, nevertheless, more frequently distinguished from other sects by names relative to the austerity of their manners; for, as they rejected, with a sort of horror, all the comforts and conveniences of life, and abstained from wine with such a rigorous obstinacy, as to use nothing but water even at the celebration of the Lord's Supper; as they macerated their bodies by continual fastings, and lived a severe life of celibacy and abstinence, so they were called Encratites,* Hydroparastates,† and Apotactites.‡

X. Hitherto, we have only considered the doctrine of the Asiatic Gnostics. Those of the Egyptian branch differ from them in general in this, that they blended into one mass the oriental philosophy and the Egyptian theology; the former of which the Asiatics preserved unmixed in its original simplicity. The Egyptians were, moreover, particularly distinguished from the Asiatic Gnostics by the following difference in their religious system, viz. 1. That though, beside the existence of a deity, they maintained that also of an eternal matter, endued with life and motion, yet they did not acknowledge an eternal principle of darkness, or the evil principle of the Persians. 2. They supposed that our blessed Saviour was a compound of two persons, of the man Jesus, and of Christ, the Son of God; that the divine nature entered into the man Jesus, when he was baptized by John in the river Jordan, and departed from him when he was seized by the Jews. 3. They attributed to Christ a real not an imaginary body; though it must be confessed, that they were much divided in their sentiments on this head. 4. Their discipline, with respect to life and manners, was much less severe than that of the Asiatic sect, and seems, in some points, to have been favourable to the corruption and passions of men.

XI. Basilides has generally obtained the first place among the Egyptian Gnostics. "He acknowledged the existence of one Supreme God, perfect in goodness and wisdom, who produced from his own substance seven beings, or æons, of a most excellent nature. Two of these æons called Dynamis and Sophia (power and wisdom), engendered the angels of the highest order. These angels formed a heaven for their habitation, and brought forth other angelic beings, of a nature somewhat inferior to their own. Many other generations of angels followed these, and new heavens were also created, until the number of angelic orders, and of their respective heavens amounted to three hundred and sixty-five, and thus equalled the days of the year. All these are under the empire of an omnipotent Lord, whom Basilides called Abraxas."[c] This word (which was certainly in use among the Egyptians before his time) contains numeral letters to the amount of 365, and thereby expresses the number of hea-

[a] See the writers who have given accounts of the ancient heresies, as also Eusebius, Hist. Eccles. lib. iv. cap. xxx.—Origen, Dial. contra Marcionitas, sect. iii.—F. Strunzius, Hist. Bardesanis.—Beausobre, Hist. du Manich. vol. ii.

[b] We have yet remaining of the writings of Tatian, an Oration addressed to the Greeks. As to his opinions they may be gathered from Clemens Alexandrinus, Stromat. lib. ii. p. 460.—Epiphanius, Hæres. xlvi. cap. i. p. 391. Origen de Oratione, cap. xiii. None, however, of the ancients wrote professedly concerning the doctrine of Tatian.

[c] We have remaining a great number of gems, and receive more from Egypt from time to time, on which, beside other figures of Egyptian taste, we find the word Abraxas engraven. See, for this purpose, a work entitled, Macarii Abraxas, seu de Gemmis Basilidianis Disquisitio, which was published at Antwerp with several improvements, by M. Chifflet, in 1657. See also Montfaucon, Palæograph Græc. lib. ii. cap. viii. All these gems are supposed to come from Basilides, and therefore bear his name. Most of them, however, contain the marks of a superstition too gross to be attributed even to a half-Christian, and bear also emblematic characters of the Egyptian theology. It is not, therefore, just to attribute them all to Basilides (who, though erroneus in many of his opinions, was yet a follower of Christ), but such of them only as exhibit some mark of the Christian doctrine and discipline.——There is no doubt that the old Egyptian word Abraxas was appropriated to the governor or lord of the heavens, and that Basilides, having learned it from the philosophy of his nation, retained it in his religious system. See Beausobre, Hist. du Manicheisme. vol. ii. p. 51., and also Jo. Bapt. Passerius, in his Dissert. de Gemmes Basilidianis, which makes a part of the splendid work that he published at Florence, 1750, de Gemmis steiliferis, tom. ii. p. 221. See also the sentiments of the learned Jablonski, concerning the signification of the word Abraxas, as they are delivered in a dissertation inserted in the seventh volume of the Miscell. Leips. Nova. Passerius affirms, that none of these gems can properly be said to relate to Basilides, but that they concern only magicians, i. e. sorcer-

* Temperate. † Drinkers of water. ‡ Renouncers.

vens and angelic orders above-mentioned. "The inhabitants of the lowest heavens, which touched upon the borders of the eternal, malignant, and self-animated matter, conceived the design of forming a world from that confused mass, and of creating an order of beings to people it. This design was carried into execution, and was approved by the Supreme God, who, to the animal life, with which only the inhabitants of this new world were at first endowed, added a reasonable soul, giving, at the same time, to the angels, the empire over them."

XII. "These angelic beings, advanced to the government of the world which they had created, fell, by degrees, from their original purity, and manifested the fatal marks of their depravity and corruption. They not only endeavoured to efface from the minds of men the knowledge of the Supreme Being, that they might be worshipped in his stead, but also began to war against one another, with an ambitious view to enlarge, every one, the bounds of his respective dominion. The most arrogant and turbulent of all these angelic spirits, was that which presided over the Jewish nation. Hence God, beholding with compassion the miserable state of rational creatures, who groaned under the contests of these jarring powers, sent from heaven his son Nus, or Christ, the chief of the æons, that, joined in a substantial union with the man Jesus, he might restore the knowledge of the Supreme Being, and destroy the empire of those angelic natures which presided over the world, and particularly that of the arrogant leader of the Jewish people. The god of the Jews, alarmed at this, sent forth his ministers to seize the man Jesus, and put him to death. They executed his commands; but their cruelty could not extend to Christ, against whom their efforts were vain.[a] Those souls, who obey the precepts of the Son of God, shall, after the dissolution of their mortal frame, ascend to the Father, while their bodies return to the corrupt mass of matter from which they were formed. Disobedient spirits, on the contrary, shall pass successively into other bodies."

XIII. The doctrine of Basilides, in point of morals, if we may credit the account of most ancient writers, was favorable to the lusts and passions of mankind, and permitted the practice of all sorts of wickedness. But those whose testimonies are the most worthy of regard, give a quite different account of this teacher, and represent him as recommending the practice of virtue and piety in the strongest manner, and as having condemned not only the actual commission of iniquity, but even every inward propensity of the mind to a vicious conduct. It is true there were, in his precepts relating to the conduct of life, some points which gave great offence to all real Christians; for he affirmed it to be lawful for them to conceal their religion, to deny Christ, when their lives were in danger, and to partake of the feasts of the Gentiles that were instituted in consequence of the sacrifices offered to idols. He endeavoured also to diminish the glory of those who suffered martyrdom for the cause of Christ impiously maintaining, that they were more heinous sinners than others, and that their sufferings were to be looked upon as a punishment inflicted upon them by the divine justice. He was led into this enormous error, by an absurd notion that all the calamities of this life were of a penal nature, and that men never suffered but in consequence of their iniquities. This rendered his principles greatly suspected; and the irregular lives of some of his disciples seemed to justify the unfavourable opinion that was entertained of their master.[b]

XIV. But whatever may be said of Basilides, it is certain, that he was far surpassed in impiety by Carpocrates, who was also of Alexandria, and who carried the Gnostic blasphemies to a more enormous degree of extravagance than they had ever been brought by any of that sect. His philosophical tenets agree, in general, with those of the Egyptian Gnostics. He acknowledged the existence of a Supreme God, and of the æons derived from him by successive generations. He maintained the eternity of a corrupt matter, and the creation of the world from it by angelic powers, as also the divine origin of souls unhappily imprisoned in mortal bodies, &c. But, beside these, he propagated sentiments and maxims of a horrid kind. He asserted, that Jesus was born of Joseph and Mary, according to the ordinary course of nature, and was distinguished from the rest of mankind by nothing but his superior fortitude and greatness of soul. His doctrine, also, with respect to practice, was licentious in the highest degree; for he not only allowed his disciples a full liberty to sin, but recommended to them a vicious course of life, as a matter both of obligation and necessity; asserting, that eternal salvation was only attainable by those who had committed all sorts of crimes, and had daringly filled up the measure of iniquity. It is almost incredible, that one who maintained the existence of a Supreme Being, who acknowledged Christ as the Saviour of mankind, could entertain such monstrous opinions. One might infer indeed, from certain tenets of Carpocrates that he adopted the common doctrine of the Gnostics concerning Christ, and acknowledged also the laws which this divine Saviour imposed upon his disciples. Notwithstanding this, it is beyond all doubt, that the precepts and opinions of this Gnostic are full of impiety, since he held, that lusts and passions being implanted in our nature by God himself, were consequently void of guilt, and had nothing criminal in them; that all actions were indifferent in their own nature, and were rendered good or evil only by the opinions of men, or by the laws of the state; that it was the will of God that all things should be possessed in common, the female sex not excepted; but that human laws, by an arbitrary tyranny, branded those as robbers and adulterers, who only used their natural rights. It is easy to perceive, that, by these tenets, all the principles of virtue were destroyed, and a door opened to the most horrid licentiousness, and to the most profligate and enormous wickedness.[c]

XV. Valentine, who was likewise an Egyptian by birth, was eminently distinguished from all his brethren by the

ers, fortune-tellers, and the like adventurers. Here, however, this learned man seems to go too far, since he himself acknowledges (p. 225,) that he had sometimes found, on these gems, vestiges of the errors of Basilides. These famous monuments stand yet in need of an interpreter; but it must be one who can join circumspection to diligence and erudition.

[a] Many of the ancients have, upon the authority of Irenæus, accused Basilides of denying the reality of Christ's body, and of maintaining that Simon the Cyrenian was crucified in his stead. But this accusation is entirely groundless, as may be seen by consulting the Commentar. de rebus Christian. ante Constant. where it is demonstrated, that Basilides considered the divine Saviour as compounded of the man Jesus, and Christ the Son of God. It may be true, indeed, that some of the disciples of Basilides entertained the opinion which is here unjustly attributed to their master.

[b] For a farther account of Basilides, the reader may consult Ren. Massuet, Dissert. in Irenæum, and Beausobre, Hist. du Manicheisme, vol. ii.

[c] See Iren. contra Hæres. cap. xxv Clementis Alex. Stromata, lib. iii. p. 511.

extent of his fame, and the multitude of his followers. His sect, which took rise at Rome, grew up to a state of consistence and vigour in the isle of Cyprus, and spread itself through Asia, Africa, and Europe, with an amazing rapidity. The principles of Valentine were, generally speaking, the same with those of the Gnostics, whose name he assumed; yet, in many points, he entertained opinions that were peculiar to himself. "He placed, for instance, in the *pleroma* (so the Gnostics called the habitation of the Deity) thirty æons, of which the one half were male, and the other female. To these he added four others, which were of neither sex, viz. Horus, who guarded the borders of the pleroma, Christ, the Holy Ghost, and Jesus. The youngest of the æons, called Sophia (i. e. wisdom,) conceiving an ardent desire of comprehending the nature of the Supreme Being, and by force of this propensity, brought forth a daughter, named Achamoth, who, being exiled from the pleroma, fell down into the rude and undigested mass of matter, to which she gave a certain arrangement, and, by the assistance of Jesus, produced the *demiurge*, the lord and creator of all things. This demiurge separated the subtile or animal matter from that of the grosser or more terrestrial kind; out of the former he created the superior world, or the visible heavens; and out of the latter he formed the inferior world, or this terraqueous globe. He also made man, in whose composition the subtile, and also the grosser matter, were both united in equal portions; but Achamoth, the mother of the demiurge, added to these two substances, of which the human race was formed, a spiritual and celestial substance." This is the sum of that intricate and tedious fable, which the extravagant brain of Valentine imposed upon the world for a system of religious philosophy; and from this it appears that, though, he explained the origin of the world, and of the human race, in a more subtile manner than the Gnostics, he did not differ from them in reality. His imagination was more wild and inventive than that of his brethren; and this is manifest in the whole of his doctrine, which is no more than Gnosticism, set out with some supernumerary fringes, as will farther appear from what follows.

XVI. "The Creator of this world, according to Valentine, arrived, by degrees, at such a pitch of arrogance, that he either imagined himself to be God alone, or, at least, was desirous that mankind should consider him as such. For this purpose he sent forth prophets to the Jewish nation, to declare his claim to the honour that is due to the Supreme Being; and in this point the other angels who preside over the different parts of the universe immediately began to imitate his ambition. To chastise this lawless arrogance, and to illuminate the minds of rational beings with the knowledge of the true and Supreme Deity, Christ appeared upon earth, composed of an animal and spiritual substance, and clothed moreover, with an aerial body. This Redeemer, in descending upon earth, passed through the womb of Mary, as the pure water flows through the untainted conduit. Jesus, one of the supreme æons, was substantially united to him, when he was baptized by John in the waters of Jordan. The creator of this world, when he perceived that the foundations of his empire were shaken by this divine man, caused him to be apprehended and nailed to the cross. But before Christ submitted to this punishment, not only Jesus the Son of God, but also the rational soul of Christ ascended on high, so that only the animal soul and the ethereal body suffered crucifixion. Those who abandoning the service of false deities, and the worship of the God of the Jews, live according to the precepts of Christ, and submit the animal and sensual soul to the discipline of reason, shall be truly happy; their rational and also their sensual souls shall ascend to those glorious seats of bliss which border on the pleroma; and when all the parts of the divine nature, or all souls are purified thoroughly, and separated from matter, then a raging fire, let loose from its prison, shall spread its flames throughout the universe, and dissolve the frame of this corporeal world." Such is the doctrine of Valentine and the Gnostics; such also are the tenets of the oriental philosophy, and they may be summed up in the following propositions; "This world is a compound of good and evil. Whatever is good in it, comes down from the Supreme God, the Father of light, and to him it shall return; and then the world shall be entirely destroyed."[a]

XVII. We learn from ancient writers, that the Valentinian sect was divided into many branches. One was the sect of the Ptolemites, so called from their chief Ptolemy, who differed in opinion from his master Valentine, with respect both to the number and nature of the æons, another was the sect of the Secundians, whose chief Secundus, one of the principal followers of Valentine, maintained the doctrine of two eternal principles, viz. *light* and *darkness*, whence arose the good and evil that are observable in the universe. From the same source arose the sect of Heracleon, from whose writings Clemens and Origen have made many extracts; as also that of the Marcosians, whose leaders, Marc and Colarbasus, added many absurd fictions to those of Valentine; though it is certain, at the same time, that many errors were attributed to them, which they did not maintain.[b] I omit the mention of some other sects, to which the Valentinian heresy is said to have given rise. Whether, in reality, they all sprang from this source, is a question of a very doubtful kind, especially if we consider the errors into which the ancients have fallen, in tracing out the origin of the various sects that divided the church.[c]

XVIII. It is not necessary to take any particular notice of the more obscure and less considerable of the Gnostic sects, of which the ancient writers scarcely mention any

[a] It is proper to observe, for the information of those who desire a more copious account of the Valentinian heresy, that many ancient writers have written upon this subject, especially Irenæus, Tertullian, Clemens Alex. &c. Among the moderns, see the dissertation of J. F. Buddeus de hæresi Valentinianâ, which gave occasion to many disputes concerning the origin of this heresy. Some of the moderns have endeavoured to reconcile, with reason, this obscure and absurd doctrine of the Valentinians. See, for this purpose, the following authors: Souverain, Platonisme devoilé, ch. viii. Camp. Vitringa, Observ. Sacr. lib. i. cap. ii. Beausobre, Histoire du Manicheisme, p. 548. Jac. Basnage, Hist. des Juifs, tom. iii. p. 729. Pierre Faydit, Eclaircissemens sur l'Hist. Ecclesiast. des deux premiers Siecles. How vain all such endeavours are, might easily be shown: and Valentine himself has determined the matter, by acknowledging that his doctrine is absolutely and entirely different from that of other Christians.

[b] Marc did not certainly entertain all the opinions that are attributed to him. Those, however, which we are certain that he adopted, are sufficient to convince us that he was out of his senses. He maintained, among other crude fancies, that the plenitude and perfection of truth resided in the Greek alphabet, and alleges that as the reason why Jesus Christ was called the Alpha and the Omega.

[c] Concerning these sects, the reader will find something fuller in Irenæus and the other ancient writers, and a yet more learned and satisfactory account in Græbe's Spicilegium Patr. et Hæreticor. sect. 2. There is an ample account of the Marcosians in Irenæus, contra Hær. lib. i.

thing but the name, and one or two of their distinguishing tenets. Such were the Adamites, who are said to have professed an exact imitation of the primitive state of innocence; the Cainites, who treated as saints, with the utmost marks of admiration and respect, Cain, Cora, Dathan, the inhabitants of Sodom, and even the traitor Judas. Such also were the Abelites, who entered into the bonds of matrimony, but neglected to fulfil its principal end, even the procreation of offspring; the Sethites, who honored Seth in a particular manner, and looked upon him as the same person with Christ; the Florinians, who had Florinus and Blastus for their chiefs,[a] and several others. It is highly probable that the ancient doctors, deceived by the variety of names that distinguished the heretics, may with too much precipitation have divided one sect into many; and it may be farther questioned, whether they have, at all times, represented accurately the nature and true meaning of several opinions concerning which they have written.

XIX. The Ophites, or Serpentinians, a ridiculous sort of heretics, who had for their leader a man called Euphrates, deserve not the lowest place among the Egyptian Gnostics. This sect, which had its origin among the Jews, was of a more ancient date than the Christian religion. A part of its followers embraced the Gospel, while the rest retained their primitive superstition; and hence arose the division of the Ophites into Christian and anti-Christian. The Christian Ophites entertained almost the same fantastic opinions that were holden by the other Egyptian Gnostics, concerning the æons, the eternal matter, the creation of the world in opposition to the will of God, the rulers of the seven planets that presided over this world, the tyranny of the demiurge, and also respecting Christ united to the man Jesus, in order to destroy the empire of this usurper. But, beside these, they maintained the following particular tenet (whence they received the name of Ophites); "That the *serpent*, by which our first parents were deceived, was either Christ himself, or *Sophia*, concealed under the form of that animal;" and, in consequence of this opinion, they are said to have nourished a certain number of serpents, which they looked upon as sacred, and to which they offered a sort of worship, a subordinate kind of divine honours. It was no difficult matter for those, who made a distinction between the Supreme Being and the Creator of the world, and who looked upon every thing as divine, which was in opposition to the demiurge, to fall into these extravagant notions.

XX. The schisms and commotions that arose in the church, from a mixture of the oriental and Egyptian philosophy with the Christian religion, were, in the second century, increased by those Grecian philosophers who embraced the doctrine of Christ. The Christian doctrines concerning the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, and the two natures united in our blessed Saviour, were by no means reconcileable with the tenets of the sages and doctors of Greece, who therefore endeavoured to explain them in such a manner as to render them comprehensible. Praxeas, a man of genius and learning, began to propagate these explications at Rome, and was severely persecuted for the errors they contained. He denied any *real* distinction between the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, and maintained that the Father, sole creator of all things, had united to himself the human nature of Christ. Hence his followers were called Monarchians, because of their denying a plurality of persons in the Deity; and also Patripassians, because, according to Tertullian's account, they believed that the Father was so intimately united with the man Christ, his son, that he suffered with him the anguish of an afflicted life, and the torments of an ignominious death. However ready many may have been to embrace this erroneous doctrine, it does not appear, that this sect formed to itself a separate place of worship, or removed from the ordinary assemblies of Christians.[b]

XXI. An opinion highly resembling that now mentioned, was, about the same time, professed at Rome by Theodotus, who, though a tanner, was a man of profound learning, and also by Artemas, or Artemon, from whom the sect of the Artemonites derived their origin. The accounts given of these two persons, by the ancient writers, are not only few in number, but are also extremely ambiguous and obscure. Their sentiments, however, as far as they can be collected from the best records, amount to this; "That, at the birth of the man Christ, a certain *divine energy*, or portion of the divine nature (and not the *person* of the Father, as Praxeas imagined), united itself to him."

It is impossible to decide with certainty which of the two was the more ancient, Theodotus, or Artemon; as also whether they both taught the same doctrine, or differed in their opinions. One thing, indeed, is certain, that the disciples of both applied the dictates of philosophy, and even the science of geometry, to the explication of the Christian doctrine.

XXII. A like attachment to the dictates of a presumptuous philosophy, induced Hermogenes, a painter by profession, to abandon the doctrine of Christianity concerning the origin of the world, and the nature of the soul, and thus to raise new troubles in the church. Regarding *matter* as the fountain of all evil, he could not persuade himself that God had created it from nothing, by an almighty act of his will; and therefore he maintained, that the world, with whatever it contains, as also the souls of men, and other spirits, were formed by the Deity from an uncreated and eternal mass of corrupt matter. In this doctrine there were many intricate things, and it manifestly jarred with the opinions commonly received among Christians relative to that difficult and almost unsearchable subject. How Hermogenes explained those doctrines of Christianity which opposed his system, neither Tertullian, who refuted it, nor any of the ancient writers, inform us.[c]

XXIII. These sects, which we have now been slightly surveying, may be justly regarded as the offspring of philosophy. But they were succeeded by one in which ignorance reigned, and which was the mortal enemy of philosophy and letters. It was formed by Montanus, an obscure man, without any capacity or strength of judgment, and who lived in a Phrygian village called Pepuza. This

[a] Here Dr. Mosheim has fallen into a slight inaccuracy in confounding the opinions of these two heretics, since it is certain, that Blastus was for restoring the Jewish religion, and celebrating the passover on the fourteenth day; whereas Florinus was a Valentinian, and maintained the doctrine of the two principles, with other Gnostic errors.

[b] Tertulliani lib. contra Praxeam; as also Petri Wesselingii Probabilia, cap. xxvi.

[c] There is yet extant a book written by Tertullian against Hermogenes, in which the opinions of the latter concerning matter, and the origin of the world, are warmly opposed. We have lost another work of the

weak man was so foolish and extravagant as to imagine and pretend, that he was the *paraclete*, or comforter,[a] whom the divine Saviour, at his departure from the earth, promised to send to his disciples to lead them to all truth. He made no attempts upon the peculiar doctrines of Christianity, but only declared, that he was sent with a divine commission, to give, to the moral precepts delivered by Christ and his apostles, the finishing touch that was to bring them to perfection. He was of opinion, that Christ and his apostles made, in their precepts, many allowances to the infirmities of those among whom they lived, and that this condescending indulgence rendered their system of moral laws imperfect and incomplete. He therefore added to the laws of the Gospel many austere decisions; inculcated the necessity of multiplying fasts; prohibited second marriages as unlawful; maintained that the church should refuse absolution to those who had fallen into the commission of enormous sins; and condemned all care of the body, especially all nicety in dress, and all female ornaments. The excessive austerity of this ignorant fanatic did not stop here; he shewed the same aversion to the noblest employments of the mind, that he did to the innocent enjoyments of life; and gave it as his opinion, that philosophy, arts, and whatever savoured of polite literature, should be mercilessly banished from the Christian church. He looked upon those Christians as guilty of a most heinous transgression, who saved their lives by flight, from the persecuting sword, or who ransomed them by money, from the hands of their cruel and mercenary judges. I might mention many other precepts of the same teacher, equal to these in severity and rigour.

XXIV. It was impossible to suffer, within the bounds of the church, an enthusiast, who gave himself out for a communicator of precepts superior in sanctity to those of Christ himself, and who imposed his austere discipline upon Christians, as enjoined by a divine authority, and dictated by the oracle of celestial wisdom, which spoke to the world through him. Besides, his dismal predictions concerning the disasters that were to happen in the empire, and the approaching destruction of the Roman republic, might be expected to render him obnoxious to the governing powers, and also to exite their resentment against the church, which nourished such an inauspicious prophet in its bosom. Montanus, therefore, first by a decree of certain assemblies, and afterwards by the unanimous voice of the whole church, was solemnly separated from the body of the faithful.

It is, however, certain, that the very severity of his doctrines gained him the esteem and confidence of many, who were far from being of the lowest order. The most eminent among these were Priscilla and Maximilla, ladies more remarkable for their opulence than for their virtue, and who fell with a high degree of warmth and zeal into the visions of their fanatical chief, prophesied like him, and imitated the pretended paraclete in all the variety of his extravagance and folly. Hence it became an easy matter for Montanus to erect a new church, which was first established at Pepuza, and afterwards spread abroad through Asia, Africa, and a part of Europe. The most eminent and learned of all the followers of this rigid enthusiast was Tertullian, a man of great learning and genius, but of an austere and melancholy temper. This great man, by adopting the sentiments of Montanus, and maintaining his cause with fortitude, and even vehemence, in a multitude of books written upon that occasion, has exhibited a mortifying spectacle of the deviations of which human nature is capable, even in those in whom it seems to have approached the nearest to perfection.[b]

---

same author, in which he refuted the notion of Hermogenes concerning the soul.

[a] Those are undoubtedly in an error, who have asserted that Montanus gave himself out for the Holy Ghost. However weak he may have been in point of capacity, he was not fool enough to push his pretensions so far. Neither have they, who inform us that Montanus pretended to have received from above the same spirit or paraclete which formerly animated the apostles, interpreted with accuracy the meaning of this heretic. It is, therefore, necessary to observe here, that Montanus made a distinction between the paraclete promised by Christ to his apostles, and the Holy Spirit that was shed upon them on the day of Pentecost; and understood, by the former, a divine teacher pointed out by Christ, as a comforter, who was to perfect the Gospel by the addition of some doctrines omitted by our Saviour, and to cast a full light upon others which were expressed in an obscure and imperfect manner, though for wise reasons which subsisted during the ministry of Christ; and, indeed, Montanus was not the only person who made this distinction. Other Christian doctors were of opinion, that the paraclete promised by Jesus to his disciples, was a divine ambassador, entirely distinct from the Holy Ghost which was shed upon the apostles. In the third century, Manes interpreted the promise of Christ in this manner. He pretended, moreover, that he himself was the paraclete, and that, in his person, the prediction was fulfilled. Every one knows, that Mohammed entertained the same notion, and applied to himself the prediction of Christ. It was, therefore, this divine messenger that Montanus pretended to be, and not the Holy Ghost. This will appear with the utmost evidence, to those who read with attention the account given of this matter by Tertullian, who was the most famous of all the disciples of Montanus, and the most perfectly acquainted with every point of his doctrine.

[b] For an account of the Montanists, see Euseb. Eccles. History, book v. ch. xvi., and all the writers ancient and modern (especially Tertullian) who have professedly written of the sects of the earlier ages. The learned Theophilus Wernsdorff published, in 1751, a most ingenious exposition of whatever regards the sect of the Montanists, under the following title: Commentatio de Montanists Sæculi secundi, vulgo creditis Hæreticis.

THE THIRD CENTURY.

PART I.

THE EXTERNAL HISTORY OF THE CHURCH.

CHAPTER I.

Which contains the prosperous Events that happened to the Church during this Century.

I. That the Christians suffered, in this century, calamities and injuries of the most dreadful kind, is a matter that admits no debate; nor was there, indeed, any period in which they were secure or free from danger. For, not to mention the fury of the people, set in motion so often by the craft and zeal of their licentious priests, the evil came from a higher source; the prætors and magistrates, notwithstanding the ancient laws of the emperors in favor of the Christians, had it in their power to pursue them with all sorts of vexations, as often as avarice, cruelty, or superstition roused up the infernal spirit of persecution in their breasts. At the same time, it is certain that the rights and privileges of the Christians were multiplied, in this century, much more than some are apt to imagine. In the army, at court, and, indeed, in all the orders of the nation, there were many Christians who lived entirely unmolested; and, what is still more, the profession of Christianity was no obstacle to the public preferment under most of the emperors that reigned in this century. It is also certain, that the Christians had, in many places, houses where they assembled for the purposes of divine worship with the knowledge and connivance of the emperors and magistrates. And though it be more than probable, that this liberty was, upon various occasions, and even for the most part, purchased at a high rate, yet it is manifest, that some of the emperors were very favourably inclined toward the Christians, and were far from having any aversion to their religion.

II. Caracalla, the son of Severus, was proclaimed emperor in the year 211, and, during the six years of his government, he neither oppressed the Christians himself, nor permitted any others to treat them with cruelty or injustice. Heliogabalus also, though in other respects the most infamous of all princes,[a] and, perhaps, the most odious of all mortals, shewed no marks of bitterness or aversion to the disciples of Jesus. His successor, Alexander Severus, who was a prince distinguished by a noble assemblage of the most excellent and illustrious virtues, did not, indeed, abrogate the laws that had been enacted against the Christians; and this is the reason why we have some examples of martyrdom under his administration. It is nevertheless certain, that he shewed them, in many ways, and upon every occasion that was offered to him, the most undoubted marks of benignity: he is even said to have gone so far as to pay a certain sort of worship to the divine author of our religion.[b] The friendly inclination of this prince toward the Christians probably arose, at first, from the instructions and counsels of his mother, Julia Mammæa, for whom he had a high degree of love and veneration. Julia had very favourable sentiments of the Christian religion: and, being once at Antioch, sent for the famous Origen from Alexandria, in order to enjoy the pleasure and advantage of his conversation and instructions. Those who assert, that Julia, and her son Alexander, embraced the Christian religion, are by no means furnished with unexceptionable testimonies to confirm this fact, though we may affirm, with confidence, that this virtuous prince looked upon Christianity as meriting, beyond all other religions, toleration and favour from the state, and considered its author as worthy of a place among those who had been distinguished by their sublime virtues, and honoured with a commission from above.[c]

III. Under Gordian, the Christians lived in tranquillity. His successors the Philips, father and son, proved so favourable, and even friendly to them, that these two emperors passed, in the opinion of many, for Christians; and, indeed, the arguments alleged to prove that they embraced, though in a secret and clandestine manner, the religion of Jesus, seem to render this point highly probable. But, as these arguments are opposed by others equally specious, the famous question, relating to the religion of Philip the Arabian and his son, must be left undecided.[d] Neither side offers reasons so victorious and unanswerable, as to produce a full and complete conviction; and this is therefore one of those many cases, where a suspension of judgment is both allowable and wise. With respect to Gallienus, and some other emperors, of this century, if they did not professedly favour the progress of Christianity, they did not oppress its followers, or retard its advancement.

IV. This clemency and benevolence, which the followers of Jesus, experienced from great men, and especially from those of imperial dignity, must be placed, without doubt, among the human means that contributed to multiply the number of Christians, and to enlarge the bounds of the church. Other causes, however, both divine and human must be added here, to afford a complete and satisfactory

[a] Lampridius, Vita Elagabali.

[b] Lamprid. di Vitâ Severi, cap. xxix. Vide Carol. Henr. Zeibichii Dis. de Christo ab Alexandro in larario culto, in Miscellan. Lips. nov. tom. iii.

[c] Vide F. Spanhemii Dis. de Lucii, Britonum Regis, Juliæ Mammææ et Philipporum, conversionibus, tom. ii. op. p. 400. Item, Paul Jablonski, Dis de Alexandro Severo sacris Christianis per Gnosticos initiato, in Miscellan. Lips. nov. tom. iv.

[d] The authors of the Universal History have determined the question which Dr. Mosheim leaves here undecided; and they think it may be affirmed, that Philip and his son embraced the Gospel, since that opinion is built upon such respectable authority as that of Jerom, Chrysostom, Dionysius of Alexandria, Zonaras, Nicephorus, Cedrenus, Ruffinus, Syncellus, Orosius, Jornandes, Ammianus Marcellinus, the learned cardinal Bono, Vincentius Lirinensis, Huetius, and others. Dr. Mosheim refers his readers, for an account of this matter, to the following writers: Spanheim, de Christianismo Philip. tom. ii. op. p. 400.—Entretiens Historiques sur le Christianisme de l'Empereur Philippe, par P. De L. F.—Mammachii Origines et Antiqu. Christianæ, tom. ii. p. 252—Fabric. de Luce Evang. &c. p. 252.

account of this matter. Among the causes which belong to the first of these classes, we not only reckon the intrinsic force of celestial truth, and the piety and fortitude of those who declared it to the world, but also that *especial* and *interposing providence*, which, by such dreams and visions as were presented to the minds of many, who were either inattentive to the Christian doctrine, or its professed enemies, touched their hearts with a conviction of its truth and a sense of its importance, and engaged them, without delay, to profess themselves the disciples of Christ.[a] To this may also be added, the healing of diseases, and other miracles, which many Christians were yet enabled to perform by invoking the name of the divine Saviour.[b] The number of miracles, however, we find to have been much less in this than in the preceding century; nor must this alteration be attributed only to the divine wisdom, which rendered miraculous interpositions less frequent in proportion as they became less necessary, but also to that justice which was provoked to diminish the frequency of gifts, because some did not scruple to pervert them to mercenary purposes.[c]

V. If we turn our view to the human means that contributed, at this time, to multiply the number of Christians, and extend the limits of the church, we shall find a great variety of causes uniting their influence, and contributing jointly to this happy purpose. Among these must be reckoned the translations of the sacred writings into various languages, the zeal and labours of Origen in spreading abroad copies of them, and the different works that were published, by learned and pious men, in defence of the Gospel. We may add to this, that the acts of beneficence and liberality, performed by the Christians, even toward persons whose religious principles they abhorred, had a great influence in attracting the esteem, and removing the prejudices of many, who were thus prepared for examining with candour the Christian doctrine, and, consequently, for receiving its divine light. The adorers of the pagan deities must have been destitute of every generous affection, of every humane feeling, if the view of that boundless charity, which the Christians exercised toward the poor, the love they expressed even to their enemies, the tender care they took of the sick and infirm, the humanity they discovered in the redemption of captives, and the other illustrious virtues, which rendered them so worthy of universal esteem, had not touched their hearts, dispelled their prepossessions, and rendered them more favourable to the disciples of Jesus. If, among the causes of the propagation of Christianity, there is any place due to *pious frauds*, it is certain that they merit a very small part of the honour of having contributed to this glorious purpose, since they were practised by few, and that very rarely.

VI. That the limits of the church were extended in this century, is a matter beyond all controversy. It is not, however, equally certain in what manner, by what persons, or in what parts of the world, this was effected. Origen, invited from Alexandria by an Arabian prince, converted, by his assiduous labours, a certain tribe of wandering Arabs to the Christian faith.[d] The Goths, a fierce and warlike people, who inhabited the countries of Mœsia and Thrace, and who, accustomed to rapine, harassed the neighbouring provinces by perpetual incursions, received the knowledge of the Gospel by the means of certain Christian doctors sent thither from Asia. The holy lives of these venerable teachers, and the miraculous powers with which they were endowed, attracted the esteem, even of a people educated to nothing but plunder and devastation, and absolutely uncivilized by letters or science; and their authority and influence became so great, and produced, in process of time, such remarkable effects, that a great part of this barbarous people professed themselves the disciples of Christ, and put off, in a manner, that ferocity which had been so natural to them.[e]

VII. The Christian assemblies, founded in Gaul by the Asiatic doctors in the preceding century, were few in number, and of very small extent; but both their number and their extent were considerably increased from the time of the emperor Decius. Under his sway, Dionysius, Gatian, Trophimus, Paul, Saturninus, Martial, Stremonius, men of exemplary piety, passed into this province, and, amidst dangers and trials of various kinds, erected churches at Paris, Tours, Arles, and several other places. This was followed by a rapid progress of the Gospel among the Gauls, as the disciples of these pious teachers spread, in a short time, the knowledge of Christianity through the whole country.[f] We must also place in this century the origin of several German churches, such as those of Cologne, Treves, Mentz, and others, of which Eucharius, Valerius, Maternus, and Clemens, were the principal founders[g]. The historians of Scotland inform us, that the light of Christianity arose upon that country during this century; but, though there be nothing improbable in this assertion, yet it is not built upon incontestable authority.[h]

CHAPTER II.

Concerning the calamitous Events which happened to the Church in this Century.

I. IN the beginning of this century, the Christian church suffered calamities of various kinds throughout the provinces of the Roman empire. These sufferings increased in a terrible manner, in consequence of a law made, in the year 203, by the emperor Severus (who, in other respects, was certainly no enemy to the Christians, by which every subject of the empire was prohibited from changing the religion of his ancestors for the Christian or Jewish faith.[i] This law was, in its effects, most prejudicial to the Christians; for, though it did not formally condemn them, and seemed only adapted to put a stop to the progress of the Gospel, yet it induced rapacious and

[a] See, for an account of this matter, the following authors: Origen, lib. i. adv. Celsum, p. 35. Homil. in Lucæ vii. p. 216, tom. ii. op. edit. Basil.—as also Tertullian, de Anima, cap. xiv. and Eusebius, lib. vi. cap. v.

[b] Origen, contra celsum, lib. i. Euseb. lib. v. cap. vii. Cypriani Ep. i. ad Donat. and the notes of Baluze upon that passage.

[c] Spencer, not. in Origen. contra Celsum.

[d] Eusebius; Hist. Eccles. lib. iv. cap. xix. p. 221.

[e] Sozomenus, Hist. Eccles. lib. ii. cap. vi. Paulus Diaconus, Hist. Miscel. lib. ii. cap. xiv. Philostorgius, Hist. Eccles. lib. ii. cap. v. p. 470.

[f] See the history of the Franks by Gregory of Tours, book i. ch. xxviii. Theodor. Ruinart, Acta Martyr. sincera, p. 109.

[g] See Aug. Calmet, Hist. de Lorraine, tom. i. dissert. i. p. 7. Jo. Nicol. ab Hontheim, Historia Trevirensis, tom. i. ubi. Diss. de ærâ fundati Episcopatus Trevirensis.

[h] See Usher and Stillingfleet, Antiquit. et Origin. Ecclesiar. Brit. See also Sir George Mackenzie, de Regali Scotorum prosapiâ, cap. viii. p. 119.

[i] Eusebius, Histor. Eccles. lib. vi. cap. i. Spartianus in Severo, cap. xvi. xvii.

unjust magistrates to persecute even unto death the poorer sort among the Christians, that thus the richer might be led, through fear of the like treatment, to purchase their tranquillity and safety at an expensive rate. Hence many of the disciples of Christ, in several parts of Asia, also in Egypt and other parts of Africa, were put to death in consequence of this law. Among these Leonidas, the father of Origen, Perpetua and Felicitas (those two famous African ladies, whose *acts*[a] are come down to our times,) Potamiena Marcella, and other martyrs of both sexes, acquired an illustrious name by the magnanimity and tranquillity with which they endured the most cruel sufferings.

II. From the death of Severus to the reign of Maximin, the condition of the Christians was, in some places, prosperous, and, in all, supportable. But with Maximin the face of affairs changed. This unworthy emperor, having animated the Roman soldiers to assassinate Alexander Severus, dreaded the resentment of the Christians, whom that excellent prince had favored and protected in a distinguished manner; and, for this reason, he ordered the bishops, whom he knew that Alexander had always treated as his intimate friends, to be seized and put to death[b]. During his reign, the Christians suffered in the most barbarous manner; for, though the edict of this tyrant extended only to the bishops and leaders of the Christian church, yet its shocking effects reached much farther, as it animated the heathen priests, the magistrates, and the multitude, against Christians of every rank and order[c].

III. This storm was succeeded by a calm, in which the Christians enjoyed a happy tranquillity for many years. The accession of Decius Trajan to the imperial throne, in the year 249, raised a new tempest, in which the fury of persecution fell in a dreadful manner upon the church of Christ; for this emperor, either from an ill-grounded fear of the Christians, or from a violent zeal for the superstition of his ancestors, published most terrible and cruel edicts; by which the prætors were ordered, on pain of death, either to extirpate the whole body of Christians without exception, or to force them, by torments of various kinds, to return to the pagan worship. Hence, in all the provinces of the empire, multitudes of Christians were, in the course of two years, put to death by the most horrid punishments[d] which an ingenious barbarity could invent. Of all these cruelties the most unhappy circumstance was, their fatal influence upon the faith and constancy of many of the sufferers; for as this persecution was much more terrible than all those which preceded it, so a great number of Christians, dismayed, not at the approach of death, but at the aspect of those dreadful and lingering torments, which a barbarous magistracy had prepared to combat their constancy, fell from the profession of their faith, and secured themselves from punishment, either by offering sacrifices, or by burning incense, before the images of the gods, or by purchasing certificates from from the pagan priests. Hence arose the opprobrious names of *Sacrificati*, given to those who sacrificed; *Thurificati*, to those who burned incense; and *Libellatici*, to those who produced certificates[e].

IV. This defection of such a prodigious number of Christians under Decius, was the occasion of great commotions in the church, and produced debates of a very difficult and delicate nature; for the lapsed, or those who had fallen from their Christian profession, were desirous of being restored to church-communion, without submitting to that painful course of penitential discipline, which the ecclesiastical laws indispensably required. The bishops were divided upon this matter: some were for shewing the desired indulgence, while others opposed it with all their might[f]. In Africa, many, in order to obtain more speedily the pardon of their apostacy, interested the martyrs in their behalf, and received from them letters of reconciliation and peace, i. e. a formal act, by which they (the martyrs) declared in their last moments, that they looked upon them as worthy of their communion, and desired, of consequence, that they should be restored to their place among the brethren. Some bishops and presbyters re-admitted into the church, with too much facility, apostates and transgressors, who produced such testimonies as these. But Cyprian, bishop of Carthage, a man of severe wisdom and great dignity of character, acted in quite another way. Though he had no intention of derogating from the authority of the venerable martyrs, yet he opposed with vigour this unreasonable lenity, and set limits to the efficacy of these letters of reconciliation and peace. Hence arose a keen dispute between him and the martyrs, confessors, presbyters, and lapsed, seconded by the people: and yet, notwithstanding this formidable multitude of adversaries, the venerable bishop came off victorious[g].

V. Gallus, the successor of Decius, and Volusianus, son of the former, re-animated the flame of persecution, which was beginning to burn with less fury;[h] and, beside the sufferings which the Christians had to undergo in consequence of their cruel edicts, they were also involved in the public calamities that prevailed at this time, and suffered grievously from a terrible pestilence, which spread desolation through many previous of the empire.[i] This pestilence also was an occasion which the pagan priests used with dexterity to renew the rage of persecution against them, by persuading the people that it was on account of the lenity used towards the Christians, that the gods sent down their judgments upon the nations. In

[a] Theod. Ruinart, Acta Martyr. p. 90.

[b] Euseb. Hist. Eccles. lib. vi. cap. xxviii. p. 225. Orosius, Hist. lib. vii. cap. xix. p. 509.

[c] Origen, tom. xxviii. in Matth. op. tom. i. p. 137. See also Firmilianus in Cypriani Epistolis, p. 140.

[d] Eusebius, lib. vi. cap. xxxix. xli. Gregorius Nyss. in vita Thaumaturgi. Cyprianus, de Lapsis.

[e] These certificates were not all equally criminal; nor did all of them indicate a degree of apostacy equally enormous. It is therefore necessary to inform the reader of the following distinctions omitted by Dr. Mosheim; these certificates were sometimes no more than a permission to abstain from sacrificing, obtained by a fee given to the judges, and were not looked upon as an act of apostacy, unless the Christians who demanded them had declared to the judges that they had conformed themselves to the emperor's edicts. But, at other times, they contained a profession of paganism, and were either offered voluntarily by the apostate, or were subscribed by him, when they were presented to him by the persecuting magistrates. Many used certificates, as letters of security, obtained from the priests, at a high rate, and which dispensed them from either professing or denying their sentiments. See Spanheim's Historia Christiana, p. 732. See also Prud. Maranus in vita Cypriani, sect. 6.

[f] Eusebius, lib. vi. cap. xliv. Cypr. Epistolæ.

[g] The whole history of this controversy may be gathered from the epistles of Cyprian. See also Gabr. Albaspinæus, Observat. Eccles. lib i. observ. xx. and Dallæus, de Pœnis et Satisfactionibus humanis, lib. vii cap. xvi.

[h] Euseb. lib. vii. cap. i. Cypriani. Epist, lvii. lviii.

[i] Vid. Cypriani Lib. ad Demetrianum.

the year 254, Valerian, being declared emperor, made the fury of persecution cease, and restored the church to a state of tranquillity.

VI. The clemency and benevolence which Valerian showed to the Christians, continued until the fifth year of his reign. Then the scene began to change, and the change indeed was sudden. Macrianus, a superstitious and cruel bigot to paganism, had gained an entire ascendency over Valerian, and was chief counsellor in every thing that related to the affairs of government. By the persuasion of this imperious minister, the Christians were prohibited from assembling, and their bishops and doctors were sent into banishment. This edict was published in the year 257, and was followed, the year after, by one still more severe; in consequence of which, a considerable number of Christians, in the different provinces of the empire, were put to death; and many of these were subjected to such cruel modes of execution, as were more terrible than death itself. Of those who suffered in this persecution, the most eminent were Cyprian, bishop of Carthage; Sixtus, bishop of Rome; and Laurentius, a Roman deacon, who was barbarously consumed by a slow and lingering fire. An unexpected event suspended, for awhile, the sufferings of the Christians. Valerian was made prisoner in the war against the Persians; and his son Gallienus, in the year 260, restored peace to the church.[a]

VII. The condition of the Christians was rather supportable than happy, under the reign of Gallienus, which lasted eight years; as also under the short administration of his successor Claudius. Nor did they suffer much during the first four years of the reign of Aurelian, who was raised to the empire in the year 270. But the fifth year of this emperor's administration would have proved fatal to them, had not his violent death prevented the execution of his cruel purposes; for while, instigated by the unjust suggestions of his own superstition, or by the barbarous counsels of a bigoted priesthood, he was preparing a formidable attack upon the Christians, he was obliged to march into Gaul, where he was murdered, in the year 275, before his edicts were published throughout the empire.[b] Few, therefore, suffered martyrdom under his reign; and indeed, during the remainder of this century, the Christians enjoyed a considerable measure of ease and tranquillity. They were, at least, free from any violent attacks of oppression and injustice, except in a small number of cases, where the avarice and superstition of the Roman magistrates interrupted their tranquillity.[c]

VIII. While the emperor, and proconsuls employed against the Christians the terror of unrighteous edicts, and the edge of the destroying sword, the Platonic philosophers, who have been described above, exhausted against Christianity all the force of their learning and eloquence, and all the resources of their art and dexterity, in rhetorical declamations, subtile writings, and ingenious stratagems. These artful adversaries were so much the more dangerous and formidable, as they had adopted several of the doctrines and institutions of the Gospel, and, with a specious air of moderation and impartiality, were attempting, after the example of their master Ammonius, to reconcile paganism with Christianity, and form a sort of coalition of the ancient and the new religion. These philosophers had at their head, in this century, Porphyry (a Syrian, or, as some allege, a Tyrian, by birth,) who wrote against the Christians a long and laborious work, which was destroyed afterwards by an imperial edict.[d] He was, undoubtedly, a writer of great dexterity, genius, and erudition, as those of his works which yet remain sufficiently testify. But those very works, and the history of his life, show us, at the same time, that he was a much more virulent, than formidable enemy to the Christians; for by them it appears, that he was much more attentive to the suggestions of a superstitious spirit, and the visions of a lively fancy, than to the sober dictates of right reason and a sound judgment; and it may be more especially observed of the remaining fragments of his work against the Christians, that they are equally destitute of judgment and equity, and are utterly unworthy of a wise and a good man.[e]

IX. Many were the deceitful and perfidious stratagems by which this sect endeavoured to obscure the lustre, and diminish the authority of the Christian doctrine. None of these seemed to be more dangerous than the seducing artifice with which they formed a comparison between the life, actions, and miracles of Christ, and the history of the ancient philosophers, and placed the contending parties in such fallacious points of view, as to make the pretended sages of antiquity appear in nothing inferior to the divine Saviour. With this view, Archytas of Tarentum, Pythagoras, of whom Porphyry wrote the life, Apollonius Tyanæus, a Pythagorean philosopher, whose miracles and peregrinations were highly celebrated by the vulgar, were brought upon the scene, and exhibited as divine teachers, and rivals of the glory of the Son of God. Philostratus, one of the most eminent rhetoricians of this age, composed a pompous history of the life of Apollonius, who was little better than a cunning knave, and did nothing but ape the austerity and sanctity of Pythagoras. This history appears manifestly designed to draw a parallel between Christ and the philosopher of Tyana; but the impudent fictions and ridiculous fables, with which this work is filled, must, one would think, have rendered it incapable of deceiving any who possessed a sound mind; any, but such as, through the corruption of vicious prejudices, were willing to be deceived.[f]

X. But as there are no opinions, however absurd, and

---

[a] Euseb. Hist. Eccles. lib. vii. cap. x. xi. p. 255. Acta Cypriani, as they are to be found in Ruinarti Act. Martyrum, p. 216. Cypriani Epist. lxxvii. lxxxii.

[b] Eusebius, lib. vii. Lactantius, de mortibus Persecuutor.

[c] Among these vexations may be reckoned the cruelty of Galerius Maximiam, who, toward the conclusion of this century, persecuted the ministers of his court, and the soldiers of his army, who had professed Christianity. See Eusebius, lib. viii.

[d] See Holstenius de vitâ Porphyr. cap. xi. Fabric. Lux Evang. p. 154. Buddeus, Isagoge in Theologium, tom. ii.

☞ [e] This work of Porphyry against the Christians was burned, by an edict of Constantine the Great. It was divided into fifteen books, as we find in Eusebius, and contained the blackest calumnies against the Christians. The first book treated of the contradictions which he pretended to have found in the sacred writings. The greatest part of the twelfth is employed in fixing the time when the prophecies of Daniel were written; for Porphyry himself found these predictions so clearly and evidently fulfilled, that, to avoid the force of the argument, thence deducible in favor of Christianity, he was forced to have recourse to the absurd supposition, that these prophecies had been published under the name of Daniel by one who lived in the time of Antiochus, and wrote after the arrival of the events foretold. Methodius, Eusebius, and Apollinaris, wrote against Porphyry; but their refutations have been long since lost.

[f] See Olerius' preface to the Life of Apollonius by Philostratus; as also Mosheim's notes to his Latin translation of Cudworth's Intellectua. System, p. 304, &c.

no stories, however idle and improbable, that a weak and ignorant multitude, more attentive to the pomp of *words* than to the truth of *things*, will not easily swallow; so it happened, that many were ensnared by the absurd attempts of these insidious philosophers. Some were induced by these perfidious stratagems to abandon the Christian religion, which they had embraced. Others, when they were taught to believe that true Christianity (as it was inculcated by Jesus, and not as it was afterwards corrupted by his disciples) differed in few points from the pagan system, properly explained and restored to its primitive purity, determined to remain in the religion of their ancestors, and in the worship of their gods. A third sort were led, by these comparisons between Christ and the ancient philosophers, to form to themselves a motley system of religion composed of the tenets of both parties, whom they treated with the same veneration and respect. Such was, particularly, the method of Alexander Severus, who paid indiscriminately divine honours to Christ and to Orpheus, to Apollonius, and the other philosophers and heroes whose names were famous in ancient times.

XI. The credit and power of the Jews were now too much diminished to render them as capable of injuring the Christians, by their influence over the magistrates, as they had formerly been. This did not, however, discourage their malicious efforts, as the books which Tertullian and Cyprian have written against them abundantly show, with several other writings of the Christian doctors, who complained of the malignity of the Jews, and of their sinister machinations.[a] During the persecution under Severus, a certain person called Dominus, who had embraced Christianity, deserted to the Jews, doubtless to avoid the punishments that were decreed against the Christians; and it was to recall this apostate to his duty and his profession, that Serapion, bishop of Antioch, wrote a particular treatise against the Jews.[b] We may easily conclude, from this instance, that, when the Christians were persecuted, the Jews were treated with less severity and contempt, on account of their enmity against the disciples of Jesus. From the same fact we may also learn, that, though they were in a state of great subjection and abasement, they were not entirely deprived of all power of oppressing the Christians.

[a] Hippolytus, Serm. in Susann. et Daniel. tom. i. op.

[b] Eusebius, Hist. Eccles. lib. vi. cap. xii. p. 213.

PART II.

THE INTERNAL HISTORY OF THE CHURCH.

CHAPTER I.

Concerning the State of Letters and Philosophy during this Century.

I. The arts and sciences, which, in the preceding century, were in a declining state, seemed, in this, ready to expire, and had lost all their vigour and lustre. The celebrated rhetorician Longinus, and the eminent historian Dio Cassius, with a few others, were the last among the Greeks, who stood in the breach against the prevailing ignorance and barbarism of the times. Men of learning and genius were still less numerous in the western provinces of the empire, though there were in several places flourishing schools, appropriated to the advancement of the sciences and the culture of taste and genius. Different reasons contributed to this decay of learning. Few of the emperors patronised the sciences, or encouraged, by the prospect of their favour and protection, that emulation which is the soul of literary excellence. Besides, the civil wars that almost always distracted the empire, were extremely unfavourable to the pursuit of science; and the perpetual incursions of the barbarous nations interrupted that leisure and tranquility which are so essential to the progress of learning and knowledge, and extinguished, among a people accustomed to the din of arms, all desire of literary acquisitions.[a]

II. If we turn our eyes toward the state of philosophy, the prospect will appear somewhat less desolate and comfortless. There were, as yet, in several of the Grecian sects, men of considerable knowledge and reputation, of whom Longinus has mentioned the greatest part.[b] But all these sects were gradually eclipsed by the school of Ammonius, whose origin and doctrines have been considered above. This victorious sect, which was formed in Egypt, issued thence with such a rapid progress, that, in a short time, it extended itself almost throughout the Roman empire, and drew into its *vortex* the greatest part of those who applied themselves, through inclination, to the study of philosophy. This amazing progress was due to Plotinus, the most eminent disciple of Ammonius, a man of a most subtile invention, endowed by nature with a genius capable of the most profound researches, and equal to the investigation of the most abstruse and difficult subjects. This penetrating and sublime philosopher taught publicly, first in Persia, and afterwards at Rome, and in Campania; in all which parts the youth flocked in crowds to receive his instructions. He comprehended the precepts of his philosophy in several books, most of which are yet extant.[c]

III. The number of disciples, formed in the school of Plotinus, is almost beyond credibility. The most famous was Porphyry,[d] who spread abroad through Sicily, and many other countries, the doctrine of his master, revived with great accuracy, adorned with the graces of a flowing and elegant style, and enriched with new inventions and curious improvements.[e] From the time of Ammonius, until the sixth century this was almost the only system of philosophy that was publicly taught at Alexandria. A certain philosopher, whose name was Plutarch, having learned it there, brought it into Greece, and renewed, at Athens, the celebrated Academy, from which issued a set of illustrious philosophers, whom we shall have occasion to mention in the progress of this work.[f]

IV. We have unfolded, above, the nature and doctrines of this philosophy, as far as was compatible with the brevity of our present design. It is, however, proper to add here, that its votaries were not all of the same sentiments, but thought very differently upon a variety of subjects. This difference of opinion was the natural consequence of that fundamental law, which the whole sect was obliged to keep constantly in view, viz. That truth was to be pursued with the utmost liberty, and to be collected from all the different systems in which it lay dispersed. Hence it happened, that the Athenians rejected certain opinions that were entertained by the philosophers of Alexandria: yet none of those who were ambitious to be ranked among these new Platonists, called in question the main doctrines which formed the groundwork of their singular system; those, for example, which regarded the existence of one God, the fountain of all things; the eternity of the world; the dependence of matter upon the Supreme Being; the nature of souls; the plurality of gods; the method of interpreting the popular superstitions, &c.

V. The famous question concerning the excellence and utility of human learning, was now debated with great warmth among the Christians; and the contending parties, in this controversy, seemed hitherto of equal force in point of number, or nearly so. Many recommended the study of philosophy, and an acquaintance with the Greek and Roman literature; while others maintained, that these were pernicious to the interests of genuine Christianity, and the progress of true piety. The cause of letters and philosophy triumphed, however, by degrees; and those who wished well to them, continued to gain ground, till at length the superiority was manifestly decided in their favour. This victory was principally due to the influence and authority of Origen, who, having been early instructed in the new kind of Platonism already mentioned, blended it, though unhappily, with the purer and more sublime tenets of a celestial doctrine, and recommended it, in the warmest manner, to the youth who attended his public lessons. The fame of this philosopher increased daily among the Christians; and, in proportion to his rising credit, his method of proposing and explaining the doctrines of Christianity gained authority, till it be-

[a] See the Literary History of France, by the Benedictine monks, vol. i. part ii.

[b] In his life of Plotinus, epitomised by Porphyry, ch. xx.

[c] See Porphyrii vita Plotini, of which Fabricius has given an edition in his Bibliotheca Græca, tom. iv.—Bayle's Diction. tom. iii.—and Brucker's Historia Critica Philosophiæ.

[d] Porphyry was first the disciple of Longinus, author of the justly celebrated Treatise on the Sublime; but, having passed from Greece to Rome, where he heard Plotinus, he was so charmed with the genius and penetration of this philosopher, that he attached himself entirely to him. See Plotin. vit. p. 3. Eunap. c. ii. p. 17.

[e] Holstenius, vit. Porphyrii, republished by Fabricius.

[f] Marini vita Procli, cap. xi. xii.

came almost universal. Besides, some of the disciples of Plotinus having embraced Christianity, on condition that they should be allowed to retain such of the opinions of their master as they thought of superior excellence and merit,[a] this must also have contributed, in some measure, to turn the balance in favour of the sciences. These Christian philosophers, preserving still a fervent zeal for the doctrines of their Heathen chief, would naturally embrace every opportunity of spreading them abroad, and instilling them into the minds of the ignorant and the unwary.

CHAPTER II.

Respecting the Doctors and Ministers of the Church, and its Form of Government, during this Century.

I. THE form of ecclesiastical government that had been adopted by Christians in general, had now acquired greater degrees of stability and force, both in particular churches, and in the general society of Christians. It appears incontestable, from the most authentic records and the best histories of this century, that, in the larger cities, there was, at the head of each church, a person to whom was given the title of *bishop*, who ruled this sacred community with a certain sort of authority, in concert, however, with the body of presbyters, and consulting, in matters of moment, the opinions and the voices of the whole assembly.[b] It is also equally evident, that, in every province, *one* bishop was invested with a certain superiority over the rest, in point of rank and authority. This was necessary to the maintenance of that association of churches which had been introduced in the preceding century; and it contributed to facilitate the holding of general councils, and to give a certain degree of order and consistency to their proceedings. It must, at the same time, be carefully observed, that the rights and privileges of these primitive bishops were not every where accurately fixed, nor determined in such a manner as to prevent encroachments and disputes; nor does it appear, that the chief authority in the province was always conferred upon that bishop who presided over the church established in the metropolis. It may also be noticed, as a matter beyond all dispute, that the bishops of Rome, Antioch, and Alexandria, considered as rules of primitive and apostolic churches, had a kind of pre-eminence over all others, and were not only consulted frequently in affairs of a difficult and momentous nature, but were also distinguished by peculiar rights and privileges.

II. With respect, particularly, to the bishop of Rome, he is supposed by Cyprian to have had, at this time, a certain pre-eminence in the church;[c] nor does he stand alone in this opinion. But it ought to be observed, that even those, who, with Cyprian, attributed this pre-eminence to the Roman prelate, insisted, at the same time, with the utmost warmth, upon the *equality*, in point of *dignity* and *authority*, that subsisted among all the members of the episcopal order. In consequence of this opinion of an equality among all Christian bishops, they rejected, with contempt, the judgment of the bishop of Rome, when they thought it ill-founded or unjust, and followed their own sense of things with a perfect independence. Of this Cyprian himself gave an eminent example, in his famous controversy with Stephen bishop of Rome, concerning the baptism of heretics, in which he treated the arrogance of that imperious prelate with a noble indignation, and also with a perfect contempt. Whoever, therefore, compares these particulars, will easily perceive, that the only dignity which the bishop of Rome could justly claim was a pre-eminence of *order* and *association*,[d] not of *power* and *authority*. Or to explain the matter yet more clearly, the pre-eminence of the bishop of Rome, in the universal church, was such as that of Cyprian, bishop of Carthage, was in the African churches; and every one knows, that the precedency of this latter prelate diminished in nothing the equality that subsisted among the African bishops, and invalidated in no instance their rights and liberties, but gave only to Cyprian, as the president of their general assemblies, a power of calling councils, of presiding in them, of admonishing his brethren in a mild and fraternal manner, and of executing, in short, such offices as the order and purposes of these ecclesiastical meetings necessarily required.[e]

III. The face of things began now to change in the Christian church. The ancient method of ecclesiastical government seemed, in general, still to subsist, while, at the same time, by imperceptible steps, it varied from the primitive rule, and degenerated toward the form of a religious monarchy; for the bishops aspired to higher degrees of power and authority than they had formerly possessed, and not only violated the rights of the people, but also made gradual encroachments upon the privileges of the presbyters; and that they might cover these usurpations with an air of justice, and an appearance of reason, they published new doctrines concerning the nature of the church, and of the episcopal dignity, which, however, were in general so obscure, that they themselves seemed to have understood them as little as those to whom they were delivered. One of the principal authors of this change, in the government of the church, was Cyprian, who pleaded for the power of the bishops with more zeal and vehemence than had ever been hitherto employed in that cause, though not with an unshaken constancy and perseverance; for, in difficult and perilous times, necessity sometimes obliged him to yield, and to submit several things to the judgment and authority of the church.

IV. This change in the form of ecclesiastical government, was soon followed by a train of vices, which dishonored the character and authority of those to whom the administration of the church was committed; for, though several yet continued to exhibit to the world illustrious examples of primitive piety and Christian virtue, yet many were sunk in luxury and voluptuousness,

[a] Augustinus, Epistola lvi. ad Dioscor. p. 260, tom. ii. op.

[b] A satisfactory account of this matter may be seen in Blondelli Apologia pro Sententiâ Hieronymi de Episcopis et Presbyteris, p. 136, as that author has collected all the testimonies of the ancients relative to that subject.

[c] Cyprian, Ep. lv. et lxxiii. etiam de Unitate Ecclesiæ, p. 195, edit. Baluzii.

[d] So I have translated *Principatus ordinis et consociationis*, which could not be otherwise rendered without a long circumlocution The pre-eminence here mentioned, signifies the right of convening councils, of presiding in them, of collecting voices, and such other things as were essential to the order of these assemblies.

[e] See Steph. Baluzii adnot. ad Cypriani Epistolas, p. 387, 389, 400. Consult particularly the seventy-first and seventy-third epistles of Cyprian, and the fifty-fifth, addressed to Cornelius, bishop of Rome, in which letters the Carthaginian prelate pleads with warmth and vehemence for the equality of all Christian bishops.

puffed up with vanity, arrogance, and ambition, possessed with a spirit of contention and discord, and addicted to many other vices that cast an undeserved reproach upon the holy religion, of which they were the unworthy professors and ministers. This is testified in such an ample manner, by the repeated complaints of many of the most respectable writers of this age,[a] that truth will not permit us to spread the veil, which we should otherwise be desirous to cast over such enormities among an order so sacred. The bishops assumed, in many places, a princely authority, particularly those who had the greatest number of churches under their inspection, and who presided over the most opulent assemblies. They appropriated to their evangelical function the splendid ensigns of temporal majesty; a throne, surrounded with ministers, exalted above his equals the servant of the meek and humble Jesus; and sumptuous garments dazzled the eyes and the minds of the multitude into an ignorant veneration for this usurped authority. An example which ought not to have been followed, was ambitiously imitated by the presbyters, who, neglecting the sacred duties of their station, abandoned themselves to the indolence and delicacy of an effeminate and luxurious life. The deacons, beholding the presbyters thus deserting their functions, boldly invaded their rights and privileges; and the effects of a corrupt ambition were spread through every rank of the sacred order.

V. From what has been now observed, we may come, perhaps, at the true origin of minor or inferior orders, which were, in this century, added every where to those of the bishops, presbyters, and deacons; for, certainly, the titles and offices of *subdeacons*, *acolythi*, *ostiarii*, or door-keepers, *readers*, *exorcists*, and *copiatæ*, would never have been heard of in the church, if its rulers had been assiduously and zealously employed in promoting the interests of truth and piety, by their labours and their example. But, when the honors and privileges of the bishops and presbyters were augmented, the deacons also began to extend their ambitious views, and to despise those lower functions and employments which they had hitherto exercised with such humility and zeal. The additional orders that were now created to diminish the labours of the present rulers of the church, had functions allotted to them, which their names partly explain.[b] The institution of *exorcists* was a consequence of the doctrine of the New Platonists, which the Christians adopted, and which taught, that the evil *genii*, or spirits, were continually hovering over human bodies, toward which they were carried by a natural and vehement desire; and tha vicious men were not so much impelled to sin by an innate depravity, or by the seduction of example, as by the internal suggestions of some evil dæmon. The *copiatæ* were employed in providing for the decent interment of the dead.

VI. Marriage was permitted to all the various ranks and orders of the clergy. Those, however, who continued in a state of celibacy, obtained by this abstinence a higher reputation of sanctity and virtue than others. This was owing to an almost general persuasion, that they, who took wives, were of all others the most subject to the influence of malignant dæmons.[c] And as it was of infinite importance to the interests of the church, that no impure or malevolent spirit should enter into the bodies of such as were appointed to govern, or to instruct others, so the people were desirous that the clergy should use their utmost efforts to abstain from the pleasures of the conjugal life. Many of the sacred order, especially in Africa, consented to satisfy the desires of the people, and endeavoured to do this in such a manner as not to offer an entire violence to their own inclinations. For this purpose, they formed connexions with those women who had made vows of perpetual chastity; and it was an ordinary thing for an ecclesiastic to admit one of these fair saints to the participation of his bed; but still under the most solemn declarations, that nothing passed in this commerce that was contrary to the rules of chastity and virtue.[d] These holy concubines were called, by the Greeks, Συνεισάκτοι; and by the Latins, *Mulieres subintroductæ*. This indecent custom alarmed the zeal of the more pious among the bishops, who employed the utmost efforts of their severity and vigilance to abolish it, though it was a long time before they entirely effected this laudable purpose.

VII. Thus we have given a short, though not a very pleasing view of the rulers of the church during this century; and we ought now to mention the principal writers who distinguished themselves in it by their learned and pious productions. The most eminent of these, whether we consider the extent of his fame, or the multiplicity of his labors, was Origen, a presbyter and catechist of Alexandria, a man of vast and uncommon abilities, and the greatest luminary of the Christian world that this age exhibited to view. Had the soundness of his judgment been equal to the immensity of his genius, the fervour of his piety, his indefatigable patience, his extensive erudition, and his other eminent and superior talents, all encomiums must have fallen short of his merit. Yet such as he was,

---

[a] Origen. Comm. in Matthæum, par. i. op. p. 420, 441. Eusebius, Hist. Eccles. lib. viii. cap. i.

☞ [b] The sub-deacons were designed to ease the deacons of the meanest part of their work. Their office, consequently, was to prepare the sacred vessels of the altar, and to deliver them to the deacons in time of divine service; to attend the doors of the church during the communion service; to go on the bishop's embassies, with his letters or messages to foreign churches. In a word, they were so subordinate to the superior rulers of the church, that by a canon of the council of Laodicea, they were forbidden to sit in the presence of a deacon without his leave. The order of *acolythi* was peculiar to the Latin church; for there was no such order in the Greek church, during the four first centuries. Their name signifies *attendants;* and their principal office was to light the candles of the church, and to attend the ministers with wine for the eucharist. The ostiarii, or door-keepers, were appointed to open and shut the doors, as officers and servants under the deacons and subdeacons; to give notice of the times of prayer and church assemblies, which, in time of persecution, required a private signal for fear of discovery; and that, probably, was the first reason for instituting this order in the church of Rome, whose example, by degrees, was soon followed by other churches.—The *readers* were those who were directed to read the scripture in that part of divine service to which the catechumens were admitted.—The *exorcists* were appointed to drive out evil spirits from the bodies of persons possessed; they had been long known in the church, but were not erected into an ecclesiastical order before the latter end of the third century.—The *copiatæ*, or *fossarii*, were an order of the inferior clergy, whose business it was to take care of funerals, and to provide for the decent interment of the dead. In vain have Baronius and other Romish writers asserted, that these inferior orders were of apostolical institution. The contrary is evidently proved, since these offices are not mentioned by authentic writers as having taken place before the third century, and the origin can be traced no higher than the fourth.

[c] Porphyrius, περὶ ἀποχῆς, lib. iv. p. 417.

[d] *Credat Judæus Apella.* See however Dodwell, Diss. tertia Cyprianica, and Lud. An. Muratorius, Diss. de Synisactis et Agapetis, in his Anecdot. Græc. p. 218; as also Baluzius ad Cypriani Epistol.

his virtues and his labors deserve the admiration of all ages; and his name will be transmitted with honor through the annals of time, as long as learning and genius shall be esteemed among men.[a]

The second in renown, among the writers of this censury, was Julius Africanus, a native of Palestine, a man of the most profound erudition, but the greatest part of whose learned labors are unhappily lost.

Hippolytus, whose history is much involved in darkness,[b] is also esteemed among the most celebrated authors and martyrs of this age; but those writings which at present bear his name, are justly looked upon by many as either extremely corrupted, or entirely spurious.

Gregory, bishop of New-Cæsarea, acquired, at this time, the title of *Thaumaturgus*, i. e. wonder-worker, on account of the variety of great and signal miracles, which he is said to have wrought during the course of his ministry. Few of his works have come down to our times, and his miracles are called in question by many, as unsupported by sufficient evidence.[c]

It is to be wished that we had more of the writings of Dionysius, bishop of Alexandria, than those which have survived the ruins of time, since the few remaining fragments of his works display the most consummate wisdom and prudence, and the most amiable spirit of moderation and candor, and thus abundantly vindicate from all suspicion of flattery, the ancients who mentioned him under the title of Dionysius the Great.[d]

Methodius appears to have been a man of great piety, and highly respectable on account of his eminent virtue; but those of his works which are yet extant, evince no great degree of penetration and acuteness in handling controversy and weighing opinions.

VIII. Cyprian, bishop of Carthage, a man of the most eminent abilities and flowing eloquence, stands foremost in the list of Latin writers. His letters, and indeed the greater part of his works breathe such a noble and pathetic spirit of piety, that it is impossible to read them without the warmest feelings of enthusiasm. We must however observe, that he would have been a better writer, had he been less attentive to the ornaments of rhetoric; and a better bishop, had he been able to restrain the vehemence of his temper, and to distinguish with greater acuteness, between truth and falsehood.

The dialogue of Minucius Felix, which bears the title of *Octavius*, effaces with such judgment, spirit and force, the calumnies and reproaches that were cast upon the Christians by their adversaries, that it deserves an attentive perusal from those who are desirous of knowing the state of the church during this century.

The seven books of Arnobius, the African, written against the Gentiles, form a still more copious and ample defence of the Christians, and, though obscure in several places, may yet be read with pleasure and with profit. It is true, that this rhetorician, too little instructed in the Christian religion, when he wrote this work, has mingled great errors with solemn and important truths, and has exhibited Christianity under a certain philosophical form, very different from that in which it is commonly received.

We refer our readers, for an account of the authors of inferior note, who lived in this century, to those who have professedly given histories or enumerations of the Christian writers.

CHAPTER III.

Concerning the Doctrine of the Christian Church in this Century

I. THE principal doctrines of Christianity were now explained to the people in their native purity and simplicity, without any mixture of abstract reasonings or subtile inventions; nor were the feeble minds of the multitude loaded with a great variety of precepts.[e] But the Christian doctors who had applied themselves to the study of letters and philosophy, soon abandoned the frequented paths, and wandered in the devious wilds of fancy. The Egyptians distinguished themselves in this new method of explaining the truth. They looked upon it as a noble and a glorious task to bring the doctrines of celestial wisdom into a certain subjection to the precepts of their philosophy, and to make deep and profound researches into the intimate and hidden nature of those truths which the divine Saviour had delivered to his disciples. Origen was at the head of this speculative tribe. This great man, enchanted by the charms of the Platonic philosophy, set it up as the test of all religion, and imagined that the reasons of each doctrine were to be found in that favorite philosophy, and their nature and extent to be determined by it.[f] It must be confessed that he handled this matter with modesty and caution; but he still gave an example to his disciples, the abuse of which could not fail to be pernicious, and under the authority of which, they would naturally indulge themselves without restraint in every wanton fancy. And so, indeed, the case was; for the disciples of Origen, breaking forth from the limits fixed by their master, interpreted, in the most licentious manner, the divine truths of religion according to the tenor of the Platonic philosophy. From these teachers the philosophical, or *scholastic theology*, as it is called, derived its origin; and, proceeding hence, passed through various forms and modifications according to the genius, turn, and erudition of those who embraced it.

II. The same principles gave rise to another species of theology, which was called *mystic*. And what must seem at first sight surprising here, is, that this mystic theology, though formed at the same time, and derived from the same source with the scholastic, had a natural tendency to overturn and destroy it. The authors of this mystic science are not known; but the principles from which it sprang are manifest. Its first promoters argued from that known doctrine of the Platonic school, which also was adopted by Origen and his disciples, that the divine nature was diffused through all human souls; or in other words that the

[a] See a very learned and useful work of the famous Huet, bishop of Avranches, entitled, Origeniana. See also, Doucin, Histoire d'Origene et des Mouvemens arrivés dans l'Eglise au sujet de sa Doctrine; and Bayle's Dictionary.

[b] The benedictine monks have, with great labor and erudition, endeavoured to dispel this darkness in their Histoire Literaire de la France, tom. i. p. 361.

[c] See Van-Dale's preface to his Latin treatise concerning Oracles.

[d] The history of Dionysius is particularly illustrated by Jaques Basnage, in his Histoire de l'Eglise, tom. i.

[e] See Origen, in Præf. Libro. de Principiis, tom. i. op. p. 49, and lib. i. de Principiis, cap. ii. See also the Expositio Fidei by Gregorius Neocæsariensis.

[f] This is manifest from what remains of his Stromata; as also from his books de Principiis, which are still preserved in a Latin translation of them by Rufinus.

faculty of reason, from which the health and vigour of the mind proceed, was an emanation from God into the human soul, and comprehended in it the principles and elements of all truth, human and divine. They denied that men could, by labour or study, excite this celestial flame in their breasts; and, therefore, they highly disapproved the attempts of those who, by definitions, abstract theorems, and profound speculations, endeavoured to form distinct notions of truth, and to discover its hidden nature. On the contrary, they maintained, that silence, tranquillity, repose, and solitude, accompanied with such acts of mortification as might tend to extenuate and exhaust the body, were the means by which the internal word was excited to produce its latent virtues, and to instruct men in the knowledge of divine things. For thus they reasoned: "They who behold with a noble contempt all human affairs, they who turn away their eyes from terrestrial vanities, and shut all the avenues of the outward senses against the contagious influences of a material world, must necessarily return to God, when the spirit is thus disengaged from the impediments that prevented that happy union; and in this blessed frame, they not only enjoy inexpressible raptures from their communion with the Supreme Being, but are also invested with the inestimable privilege of contemplating truth, undisguised and uncorrupted, in its native purity, while others behold it in a vitiated and delusive form."

III. This method of reasoning produced strange effects, and drove many into caves and deserts, where they macerated their bodies with hunger and thirst, and submitted to all the miseries of the severest discipline that a gloomy imagination could prescribe; and it is not improbable, that Paul, the first hermit, was rather engaged by this fanatical system, than by the persecution under Decius, to fly into the most solitary deserts of Thebais, where he led, during the space of ninety years, a life more worthy of a savage animal than of a rational being.[a] It is, however, to be observed, that though Paul is placed at the head of the order of Hermits, yet that insocial manner of life was very common in Egypt, Syria, India, and Mesopotamia, not only long before his time, but even before the coming of Christ; and it is still practised among the Mohammedans, as well as the Christians, in those arid and burning climates;[b] for the glowing atmosphere, that surrounds these countries, is a natural cause of that love of solitude and repose, of that indolent and melancholy disposition, which are remarkably common among their languid inhabitants.

IV. But let us turn away our eyes from these scenes of fanaticism, which are so opprobrious to human nature, and consider some other circumstances that belong more or less to the history of the Christian doctrine during this century. And here it is proper to mention the useful labours of those who manifested their zeal for the holy scriptures by the care they took to have accurate copies of them multiplied every where, and offered at such moderate prices, as rendered them of easy purchase; as also to have them translated into various languages, and published in correct editions. Many of the more opulent among the Christians generously contributed a great part of their substance to the prosecution of these pious and excellent undertakings. Pierius and Hesychius in Egypt, and Lucian at Antioch, employed much pains in correcting the copies of the Septuagint, and Pamphilus of Cæsarea laboured with great diligence and success in works of the same nature, until a glorious martyrdom finished his course. But Origen surpassed all others in diligence and assiduity; and his famous Hexapla, though almost entirely destroyed by the waste of time, will, even in its fragments, remain an eternal monument of the incredible application with which that great man laboured to remove those obstacles which retarded the progress of the Gospel.[c]

V. After the encomiums we have given to Origen, who has an undoubted right to the first place among the interpreters of the Scriptures in this century, it is not without a deep concern that we are obliged to add, that he also, by an unhappy method, opened a secure retreat for all sorts of errors that a wild and irregular imagination could bring forth. Having entertained a notion that it was extremely difficult, if not impossible, to defend every thing contained in the sacred writings from the cavils of heretics and infidels, so long as they were explained *literally*, according to the real import of the terms, he had recourse to the fecundity of a lively imagination, and maintained, that they were to be interpreted in the same *allegorical* manner in which the Platonists explained the history of the gods. In consequence of this pernicious rule of interpretation, he alleged, that the words of Scripture were, in many places, absolutely void of sense; and that though in others there were, indeed, certain notions conveyed under the outward terms according to their literal force and import yet it was not in these that the true meanings of the sacred writers were to be sought, but in a mysterious and hidden sense arising from the nature of the things themselves.[d] This hidden sense he endeavours to investigate throughout his commentaries, neglecting and despising, for the most part, the outward letter; and in this devious path he displays the most ingenious strokes of fancy, though generally at the expense of truth, whose divine simplicity is rarely discernible through the cobweb veil of allegory.[e] Nor did the inventions of Origen end here. He divided this hidden sense, which he

[a] The life of this hermit was written by Jerome.

[b] See the travels of Lucas, in 1714, vol. ii.

[c] The fragments that yet remain of Origen's Hexapla, were collected and published, by the learned Montfaucon, in folio, at Paris, in 1713. See also upon this head Buddei Isagoge in Theolog. tom. ii. and Carpzovii Critic. Sacr. Veter. Testam. p. 574.

[d] For a farther illustration of this matter, the reader may consult the excellent preface of M. de la Rue, to the second volume of the works of Origen, published at Paris in 1733. An accurate and full account of Origen's method of interpreting the Scripture may be found in the work entitled Commentar. de rebus Christian. ante Constantinum M. p. 629; where the philosophy and theology of that great man, and his controversy with Demetrius bishop of Alexandria, are treated of professedly, and at large.

[e] Origen, in his Stromata, book x., expresses himself in the following manner: "The source of many evils lies in adhering to th carnal or external part of Scripture. Those who do so, shall not attain to the kingdom of God. Let us, therefore, seek after the spirit and the substantial fruit of the word, which are hidden and mysterious. And again, "The Scriptures are of little use to those who understand them as they are written." One would think it impossible that such expressions should drop from the pen of a wise man. But the philosophy, which this great man embraced with such zeal, was one of the sources of his delusion. He could not find in the Bible the opinions he had adopted, as long as he interpreted that sacred book according to its literal sense. But Plato, Aristotle, Zeno, and, indeed, the whole philosophical tribe, could not fail to obtain, for their sentiments, a place in the Gospel, when it was interpreted by the wanton inventions of fancy, and upon the supposition of a hidden sense, to which it was possible to give all sorts of forms. Hence all who desired to model Christianity according to their fancy, or their favorite system of philosophy, embraced Origen's method of interpretation.

pursued with such eagerness into *moral* and *mystical*, or *spiritual*. The moral sense of Scripture displays those doctrines that relate to the inward state of the soul and the conduct of life. The mystical or spiritual sense represents the nature, the laws, and the history of the spiritual or mystical world. We are not yet at the end of the labyrinth; for he subdivided this mystical world of his own creation into two distinct regions, one of which he called the superior, i. e. heaven, and the other the inferior, by which he meant the church. This led to another division of the mystical sense into an earthly or allegorical sense, adapted to the inferior world, and a celestial or analogical one, adapted to the superior region. This chimerical method of explaining the Scripture was, before Origen, received by many Christians, who were deluded into it by the example of the Jews. But, as this learned man reduced it into a system, and founded it upon fixed and determined rules, he is, on that account, commonly considered as its principal author.

VI. A prodigious number of interpreters, both in this and the succeeding ages, followed the method of Origen, though with some variations; nor could the few, who explained the sacred writings with Judgment and a true spirit of criticism, oppose with success the torrent of allegory that was overflowing the church. The commentaries of Hippolytus, which are yet extant, show manifestly, that this good man was entirely addicted to the system of Origen, and the same judgment may be hazarded concerning Victorinus' explications of certain books of the Old and New Testament, though these explications are, long since, lost. The translation of the Ecclesiastes by Gregory Thaumaturgus, which is yet remaining, is not chargeable with this reproach, notwithstanding the tender and warm attachment of its author to Origen. The book of Genesis and the Song of Solomon were explained by Methodius, whose work is lost; and Ammonius composed a Harmony of the Gospels.

VII. The doctrinal part of theology employed the pens of many learned men in this century. In his Stromata, and his four books of Elements, Origen illustrated the greatest part of the doctrines of Christianity, or, to speak more properly, rather disguised them under the lines of a vain philosophy. These books of elements, or principles, were the first sketch that appeared of the scholastic or philosophical theology. Something of the same nature was attempted by Theognostus, in his seven books of Hypotyposes, which are only known at present by the extracts of them in Photius, who represents them as the work of one who was infected with the notions of Origen. Gregory Thaumaturgus drew up a brief summary of the Christian religion, in his Exposition of the Faith; and many treated, in a more ample manner, particular points of doctrine in opposition to the enemies and corruptors of Christianity. Thus Hippolytus wrote of the Deity, the resurrection, Anti-Christ, and the end of the world; Methodius, of free-will; and Lucian, of faith. It is doubtful in what class these productions are to be placed, as most of them have perished among the ruins of time.

VIII. Among the moral writers, the first place, after Tertullian, of whom we have already spoken, is due to Cyprian, a prelate of eminent merit, who published several treatises concerning patience, mortality, works, alms, as also an exhortation to martyrdom. In these dissertations, there are many excellent things; but they are destitute of order, precision, and method; nor do we always find solid proofs in favour of the decisions they contain.[a] Origen has written many treatises of this kind, and, among others, an *exhortation* to suffer martyrdom for the truth; a subject handled by many authors in this century, but with unequal eloquence and penetration. Methodius treated of chastity, in a work entitled, *Symposium Virginum*, or, the Feast of Virgins: but this treatise is full of confusion and disorder. Dionysius handled the doctrine of penance and temptations. The other moral writers of this period are too obscure and trivial to render the mention of them necessary.

IX. The controversial writers were exceedingly numerous in this century. The Pagans were attacked, in a victorious manner, by Minucius Felix, in his dialogue called Octavius; by Origen; in his writings against Celsus; by Arnobius in his seven books against the Gentiles; and by Cyprian, in his treatise concerning the vanity of idols. The chronicle of Hippolytus in opposition to the Gentiles, and the work of Methodius against Porphyry, that bitter adversary of the Christians, are both lost.

We may also reckon, in the number of the polemic writers, those who wrote against the philosophers, or who treated any subjects that were disputed between different sects. Such was Hippolytus, who wrote against Plato, and who also treated the nicest, the most difficult, and the most controverted subjects, such as fate, free-will, and the origin of evil, which exercised, likewise, the pens of Methodius and other acute writers. What Hippolytus wrote against the Jews, has not reached our times; but the work of Cyprian, upon that subject, yet remains.[b] Origen, Victorinus, and Hippolytus, attacked, in general, the various sects and heresies that divided the church; but their labours in that immense field have entirely disappeared; and as to those who only turned their controversial arms against some few sects and particular doctrines, we think it not necessary to enumerate them here.

X. It is, however, proper to observe, that the methods now used of defending Christianity, and attacking Judaism and idolatry, degenerated much from the primitive simplicity, and the true rules of controversy. The Christian doctors, who had been educated in the schools of the rhetoricians and sophists, rashly employed the arts and evasions of their subtile masters in the service of Christianity; and, intent only upon defeating the enemy, they were too little attentive to the means of victory, indifferent whether they acquired it by artifice or plain dealing. This method of disputing, which the ancients called *œconomical*,[c] and which had victory for its object, rather than truth, was in consequence of the prevailing taste for rhetoric and sophistry, almost universally approved. The Platonists contributed to the support and encouragement of this ungenerous method of disputing, by that maxim which asserted the innocence of defending the truth by artifice and falsehood. This will appear manifest to those who have read, with any manner of penetration and judgment, the argu-

[a] See Barbbeyrac, de la Morale des Peres, chap. viii.

☞ [b] This work is entitled, Testimonia contra Judæos.

[c] Souverain, Platonisme devoilé, p. 244. Daille, de vet, usu Patrum, lib. i. p. 160. Jo. Christ. Wolfii Casaubon. p. 100. With regard to the famous rule, *to do a thing*, κατ' οἰκονομίαν, or *œconomically*, see particularly the ample illustrations of Gataker, ad Marc. Antoninum. lib. xi.

ments of Origen against Celsus, and those of the other Christian disputants against the idolatrous Gentiles. The method of Tertullian, who used to plead prescription against erroneous doctrines, was not, perhaps, unfair in this century; but they must be unacquainted both with the times, and, indeed, with the nature of things, who imagine that it is always allowable to employ this method.[a]

XI. This disingenuous and vicious method of surprising their adversaries by artifice, and striking them down, as it were, by lies and fictions, produced among other disagreeable effects, a great number of books, which were falsely attributed to certain great men, in order to give these spurious productions more credit and weight; for, as the greatest part of mankind are less governed by reason than by authority, and prefer, in many cases, the decisions of fallible mortals to the unerring dictates of the divine word, the disputants, of whom we are now speaking, thought they could not serve the truth more effectually than by opposing illustrious names and respectable authorities to the attacks of its adversaries. Hence arose the book of *canons*, which certain artful men ascribed falsely to the apostles; hence, the *apostolical constitutions*, of which Clement, bishop of Rome, is said to have formed a collection; hence the *recognitions* and the *Clementina*, which are also attributed to Clement,[b] and many other productions of that nature, which, for a long time, were too much esteemed by credulous men.

Nor were the managers of controversy the only persons who employed these stratagems; the Mystics had recourse to the same pious frauds to support their sect. And accordingly, when they were asked from what chief their establishment took its rise, to get clear of this perplexing question, they feigned a chief, and chose, for that purpose, Dionysius the Areopagite, a man of almost apostolical weight and authority, who was converted to Christianity, in the first century, by the preaching of St. Paul at Athens. To render this fiction more specious, they attributed to this great man various treatises concerning the monastic life, the mystic theology, and other subjects of that nature, which were the productions of some senseless and insipid writers of after-times. Thus it happened, through the pernicious influence of human passions, which too often mingle themselves with the execution of the best purposes and the most upright intentions, that they, who were desirous of surpassing all others in piety, looked upon it as lawful, and even laudable, to advance the cause of piety by artifice and fraud.

XII. The most famous controversies that divided the Christians during this century, were those concerning the *Millennium*, or reign of a thousand years; the baptism of heretics, and the doctrine of Origen.

Long before this period, an opinion had prevailed, that Christ was to come and reign a thousand years among men, before the entire and final dissolution of this world. This opinion, which had hitherto met with no opposition, was variously interpreted by different persons: nor did all promise themselves the same kind of enjoyments in that future and glorious kingdom.[c] But, in this century, its credit began to decline, principally through the influence and authority of Origen, who opposed it with the greatest warmth, because it was incompatible with some of his favourite sentiments.[d] Nepos, an Egyptian bishop, endeavoured to restore this opinion to its former credit, in a book written against the *Allegorists*, for so he called, by way of contempt, the adversaries of the Millennarian system. This work, and the hypothesis it defended, were exceedingly well received by great numbers in the canton of Arsinoe; and among others by Coracion, a presbyter of no mean influence and reputation. But Dionysius of Alexandria, a disciple of Origen, stopped the growing progress of this doctrine by his private discourse, and also by two learned and judicious dissertations concerning the divine promises.[e]

XIII. The disputes concerning the baptism of heretics were not carried on with that amiable spirit of candour, moderation, and impartiality, with which Dionysius opposed the doctrine of the Millennium. The warmth and violence that were exerted in this controversy, were far from being edifying to such as were acquainted with the true genius of Christianity, and with that meekness and forbearance that should particularly distinguish its doctors.

As there was no express law which determined the manner and form, according to which those who abandoned the heretical sects were to be received into the communion of the church, the rules practised in this matter were not the same in all Christian churches. Many of the Oriental and African Christians placed recanting heretics in the rank of catechumens, and admitted them, by baptism, into the communion of the faithful; while the greatest part of the European churches, considering the baptism of heretics as valid, used no other form in their reception than the imposition of hands, accompanied with solemn prayer. This diversity prevailed for a long time without exciting contentions or animosities. But, at length, charity waxed cold, and the fire of ecclesiastical discord broke out. In this century, the Asiatic Christians came to a determination in a point that was hitherto, in some measure undecided; and in more than one council established it as a law, that all heretics were to be re-baptised before their admission to the communion of the true church.[f] When Stephen bishop of Rome, was informed of this determination, he behaved with the most unchristian violence and arrogance toward the Asiatic Christians, broke communion with them, and excluded them from the communion of the church of Rome. These haughty proceedings made no impression upon Cyprian bishop of Carthage, who, notwithstanding the menaces of the Roman pontiff, assembled a council on this occasion, adopted with the rest of

☞ [a] We scarcely know any case in which the plea of *prescription* can be admitted as a satisfactory argument, in favor of religious tenets, or articles of faith, unless by prescription be meant, a doctrine's being established in the time, and by the authority of the apostles. In all other cases, prescription is no argument at all: it cannot recommend error, and truth has no need of its support.

☞ [b] It is not with the utmost accuracy that Dr. Mosheim places the recognitions among the spurious works of antiquity, since they are quoted by Origen, Epiphanius, and Rufinus, as the work of Clement. It is true, indeed, that these writers own them to have been altered in several places and falsified by the heretics; and Epiphanius particularly, tells us, that the Ebionites scarcely left any thing sound in them. As to the Clementina, they were undoubtedly spurious.

☞ [c] See the learned *Treatise concerning the true Millennium* which Dr. Whitby has subjoined to the second volume of his Commentary upon the New Testament. See also, for an account of the doctrine of the ancient Millennarians, the fourth, fifth, seventh, and ninth volumes of Lardner's Credibility, &c.

[d] See Origen, de Principiis, lib. ii. cap. xi. p. 104. tom. i. op.

[e] See Eusebius. Hist. Eccles. lib. vii. cap. xxiv. p. 271, as also Gennadius, de dogmatibus Ecclesiasticis, cap. lv. p. 32. edit. Elmenhorst.

[f] Euseb. lib. vii. cap. v. vii. Firmilianus, Epistol. ad Cyprianum, printed among Cyprian's Letters.

the African bishops, the opinion of the Asiatics, and gave notice thereof to the imperious Stephen. The fury of the latter was redoubled at this notification, and produced many threatenings and invectives against Cyprian, who replied with great force and resolution, and in a second council holden at Carthage, declared the baptism, administered by heretics, void of all efficacy and validity. Upon this the wrath of Stephen was inflamed beyond measure; and, by a decree full of invectives, which was received with contempt, he excommunicated the African bishops, whose moderation on the one hand, and the death of their imperious antagonist on the other, put an end to the violent contest.[a]

XIV. The controversy concerning Origen was set in motion by Demetrius, bishop of Alexandria, animated as some say, by a principle of envy and hatred against that learned man, with whom he had formerly lived in an intimate friendship. The assertion, however of those who attribute the opposition of Demetrius to this odious principle, appears more than doubtful; for, in the whole of his conduct toward Origen, there are no visible marks of envy though many indeed of passion and arrogance, of violence and injustice. The occasion of all this was as follows. In the year 228, Origen having set out for Achaia, was in his journey thither, received with singular marks of affection and esteem by the bishops of Cæsarea and Jerusalem, who ordained him presbyter by imposition of hands. This proceeding gave high offence to Demetrius, who declared Origen unworthy of the priesthood, because he had castrated himself, and maintained, at the same time, that it was not lawful to advance, to a higher dignity, the principal of the Alexandrian school, which was under his episcopal inspection, without his knowledge and approbation. A conclusion, however was put to these warm debates, and Origen returned to Alexandria. This calm was indeed, but of short duration, being soon succeeded by a new breach between him and Demetrius, the occasion of which is not known, but which grew to such a height as obliged Origen, in the year 231, to abandon his charge at Alexandria and retire to Cæsarea. His absence, however, did not appease the resentment of Demetrius, who continued to persecute him with the utmost violence. To satisfy fully his vengeance against Origen, he assembled two councils, in the first of which he condemned him unheard, and deprived him of his office, and, in the second, procured his degradation from the sacerdotal dignity. It is probable, that in one of these councils, especially the latter, Demetrius accused him of erroneous sentiments in matters of religion; for it was about this time that Origen published his Book of Principles, containing several opinions of a dangerous tendency.[b] The greatest part of the Christian bishops approved the proceedings of the Alexandrian council, against which the bishops of the churches of Achaia, Palestine, Phœnicia, and Arabia, declared at the same time the highest displeasure.[c]

CHAPTER IV.

Concerning the Rites and Ceremonies used in the Church during this Century.

I. ALL the records of this century mention the multiplication of rites and ceremonies in the Christian church. Several of the causes that contributed to this, have been already pointed out; to which we may add, as a principal one, the passion which now reigned for the Platonic philosophy, or, rather, for the popular Oriental superstition concerning demons, adopted by the Platonists, and borrowed from them, unhappily, by the Christian doctors. For there is not the least doubt, that many of the rites, now introduced into the church, derived their origin from the reigning opinions concerning the nature of demons, and the powers and operations of invisible beings. Hence arose the use of exorcisms and spells, the frequency of fasts, and the aversion to wedlock; hence the custom of avoiding all connexion with those who were not as yet baptised, or who lay under the penalty of excommunication, as persons supposed to be under the dominion of some malignant spirit; and hence the rigour and severity of the penance imposed upon those who had incurred by their immoralities, the censures of the church.[d]

II. In most of the provinces there were, at this time, some fixed places set apart for public worship among the Christians as will appear evident to every impartial inquirer into these matters. Nor is it absolutely improbable, that these churches were, in several places, embellished with images and other ornaments.

With respect to the form of divine worship, and the times appointed for its celebration, there were few innovations made in this century. Two things, however, deserve to be noticed here: the first is, that the discourses, or sermons, addressed to the people, were very different from those of the earlier times of the church, and degenerated much from the ancient simplicity; for, not to say any thing of Origen, who introduced long sermons, and was the first who explained the Scriptures in his discourses, several bishops, who had received their education in the schools of the rhetoricians, were exactly scrupulous in adapting their public exhortations and discourses to the rules of Grecian eloquence; and this method gained such credit, as to be soon almost universally followed. The second thing that we proposed to mention as worthy of notice, is, that about this time, the use of incense was introduced, at least into many churches. This has been denied by some men of eminent learning; the fact, however, is rendered evident by the most unexceptionable testimonies.[e]

---

[a] Cyprian, Epist. lxx. lxxiii.—Augustin, de Baptismo contra Donatistas, lib. v. vii. tom. ix. op. where are to be found the acts of the council of Carthage, A. D. 256.—Prud. Marani vita Cypriani, p. 107.

☞ [b] This work, which was a sort of introduction to theology, has only come down to us in the translation of Rufinus, who corrected and maimed it, in order to render it more conformable to the orthodox doctrine of the church than Origen had left it. It contains, however, even in its present form, several bold and singular opinions, such as the pre-existence of souls, and their fall into mortal bodies, in consequence of their deviation from the laws of order in their first state, and the final restoration of all intelligent beings to order and happiness. Rufinus, in his apology for Origen, alleges, that his writings were maliciously falsified by the heretics; and that, in consequence thereof, many errors were attributed to him which he did not adopt; as also, that the opinions, in which he differed from the doctrines of the church, were only proposed by him as curious conjectures.

[c] The accounts here given of the persecution of Origen, are drawn from the most early and authentic sources,—from Eusebius' History, the Bibliotheca of Photius, Jerome's Catalogue of Ecclesiastical Authors, and Origen himself; and they differ in some respects from those which common writers, such as Doucin, Huet, and others, give of this matter.

[d] For a more ample account of this matter, the reader may consult Porphyry's treatise concerning abstinence, and compare what that writer has said on the subject, with the customs received among the Christians. Several curious things are also to be found in Theodoret and Eusebius upon this head.

[e] See Bishop Beverege ad Canon. iii. Apostol. p. 461; as also

III. Several alterations were now introduced in the celebration of the Lord's supper, by those who had the direction of divine worship. The prayers, used upon this occasion, were lengthened; and the solemnity and pomp, with which this important institution was celebrated, were considerably increased; no doubt, with a pious intention to render it still more respectable. Those who were in a penitential state and those also who had not received the sacrament of baptism, were not admitted to this holy supper; and it is not difficult to perceive, that these exclusions were an imitation of what was practised in the heathen mysteries. We find, by the accounts of Prudentius[a] and others, that gold and silver vessels were now used in the adminstration of the Lord's supper; nor is there any reason why we should not adopt this opinion, since it is very natural to imagine, that those churches, which were composed of the most opulent members, would readily indulge themselves in this piece of religious pomp. As to the time of celebrating this solemn ordinance, it must be carefully observed, that there was a considerable variation in different churches, arising from their different circumstances, and founded upon reasons of prudence and necessity. In some, it was celebrated in the morning; in others, at noon; and in others, in the evening. It was also more frequently repeated in some churches, than in others; but was considered in all as of the highest importance, and as essential to salvation; for which reason it was even thought proper to administer it to infants. The sacred feasts, which accompanied this venerable institution, preceded its celebration in some churches, and followed it in others.

IV. There were, twice a year, stated times when baptism was administered to such as, after a long course of trial and preparation, offered themselves as candidates for the profession or Christianity. This ceremony was performed only in the presence of such as were already initiated into the Christian mysteries. The remission of sin was thought to be its immediate and happy fruit; while the bishop, by prayer and the imposition of hands, was supposed to confer those sanctifying gifts of the Holy Ghost, which are necessary to a life of righteousness and virtue.[b] We have already mentioned the principal rites that were used in the administration of baptism; and we have only to add, that no persons were admitted to this solemn ordinance, until, by the menacing and formidable shouts and declamation of the exorcist, they had been delivered from the dominion of the prince of darkness, and consecrated to the service of God. The origin of this superstitious ceremony may be easily traced, when we consider the prevailing opinions of the times. The Christians, in general, were persuaded, that rational souls, deriving their existence from God, must consequently be in themselves pure, holy, and endowed with the noble principles of liberty and virtue. But, upon this supposition, it was difficult to account for the corrupt propensities and actions of men in any other way, than by attributing them either to the malignant nature of *matter*, or the influence and impulse of some *evil spirit*, who was perpetually compelling them to sin. The former opinion was embraced by the Gnostics, but was rejected by true Christians, who denied the eternity of matter, considered it as a creature of God, and therefore adopted the latter notion, that in all vicious persons there was a certain evil being, the author and source of their corrupt dispositions and their unrighteous deeds.[c] The expulsion of this demon was now considered as an essential preparation for baptism, after the adminstration of which, the candidates returned home, adorned with crowns, and arrayed in white garments, as sacred emblems; the former, of their victory over sin and the world; the latter, of their inward purity and innocence.

V. Fasting began now to be held in more esteem than it had formerly been; a high degree of sanctity was attributed to this practice, and it was even looked upon as of indispensable necessity, from a notion that the demons directed their stratagems principally against those who pampered themselves with delicious fare, and were less troublesome to the lean and hungry, who lived under the severities of a rigorous abstinence.[d] The Latins, contrary to the general custom, fasted on the seventh day of the week; and, as the Greeks and Orientals refused to follow their example in this respect, a new subject of contention arose between them.

The Christians offered up their ordinary prayers at three stated times of the day, *viz.* at the *third*, the *sixth*, and the *ninth hour*, according to the custom observed among the Jews. But, beside these stated devotions, true believers were assiduous in their addresses to the Supreme Being, and poured forth frequently their vows and supplications before his throne, because they considered prayer as the most essential duty, as well as the noblest employment, of a sanctified nature. At those festivals, which recalled the memory of some joyful event, and were to be celebrated with expressions of thanksgiving and praise, they prayed standing, as they thought that posture the fittest to express their joy and their confidence. On days of contrition and fasting, they presented themselves upon their knees before the throne of the Most High, to express their profound humiliation and self-abasement. Certain forms of prayer were, undoubtedly, used in many places both in public and in private; but many also expressed their pious feeling in the natural effusions of an unpremeditated eloquence.

The sign of the cross was supposed to administer a victorious power over all sorts of trials and calamities, and was more especially considered as the surest defence against the snares and stratagems of malignant spirits; and, hence it was, that no Christian undertook any thing of moment, without arming himself with the influence of this triumphant sign.

another work of the same author, entitled, Codex Canon. vindicatus, p. 78. [a] Περὶ στεφαν. Hymn ii. p. 60, edit, Heinsii.

[b] That such was the notion prevalent at this time, is evident from testimonies of sufficient weight. And as this point is of great consequence, in order to our understanding the theology of the ancients, which differs from ours in many respects, we shall mention one of these testimonies, even that of Cyprian, who, in his 73d letter, expresses himself thus: "It is manifest where, and by whom the remission of sin, conferred in baptism, is administered.—They who are presented to the rulers of the church, obtain, by our prayers and imposition of hands, the Holy Ghost." See also Euseb. lib. vii. cap. viii.

[c] It is demonstrably evident, that *exorcism* was added to the other baptismal rites in the third century, after the introduction of the Platonic philosophy into the church; for, before this time, we hear no mention made of it. Justin Martyr, in his second apology, and Tertullian, in his book concerning the military crown, give us an account of the ceremonies used in baptism during the second century, without any mention of exorcism. This is a very strong argument of its being posterior to these two great men; and is every way proper to persuade us, that it made its entrance into the Christian church in the third century, and probably first in Egypt.

[d] Clementin. Homil. ix. sect. 9. Porphyr. de abstinentia, lib. iv.

CHAPTER V.

Concerning the Divisions and Heresies that troubled the Church during this Century.

I. THE same sects that, in the former ages, had produced such disorder and perplexity in the Christian church, continued, in this, to create new troubles, and to foment new divisions. The Montanists, Valentinians, Marcionites, and the other Gnostics, continued still to draw out their forces, notwithstanding the repeated defeats thay had met with; and their obstinacy remained even when their strength was gone, as it often happens in religious controversy. Adelphius and Aquilinus, who were of the Gnostic tribe, endeavoured to insinuate themselves and their doctrine into the esteem of the public, at Rome, and in other parts of Italy.[a] They were, however, ckecked, not only by the Christians, but also by Plotinus, the greatest Platonic philosopher of this age, who, followed by a numerous train of disciples, opposed these two chimerical teachers, and others of the same kind, with as much vigour and success as the most enlightened Christians could have done. The philosophical opinions which this faction entertained concerning the Supreme Being, the origin of the world, the nature of evil, and several other subjects, were entirely opposite to the doctrines of Plato. Hence the disciples of Jesus, and the followers of Plotinus, united their efforts against the progress of Gnosticism: and there is no doubt that their conjunct force soon destroyed the credit and authority of this fantastic sect, and rendered it contemptible in the estimation of the wise.[b]

II. While the Christians were struggling with these corruptors of the truth, and upon the point of obtaining a complete and decisive victory, a new enemy, mere vehement and odious than the rest, started up suddenly, and engaged in the contest. This was Manes (or Manichæus, as he sometimes is called by his diciples,) by birth a Persian; educated among the Magi, and himself one of that number, before he embraced the profession of Christianity. Instructed in all those arts and sciences, which the Persians, and the neighbouring nations, held in the highest esteem, he had penetrated into the depths of astronomy in the midst of a rural life; studied the art of healing, and applied himself to painting and philosophy. His genius was vigorous and sublime, but redundant and ungoverned; and his mind, destitute of a proper temperature, seemed to border on fanaticism and madness. He was so adventurous as to attempt an amalgamation of the doctrine of the Magi with the Christian system, or rather the explication of one by the other; and, in order to succeed in this audacious enterprise, he affirmed that Christ had left the doctrine of salvation unfinished and imperfect, and that he was the *comforter* whom the departing Seviour had promised to his disciples to lead them into all truth. Many were deceived by the eloquence of this enthusiast, by the gravity of his countenance, and the innocence and simplicity of his manners; so that, in a short time, he formed a sect not utterly inconsiderable in point of number. He was put to death by Varanes I. king of the Persians; though historians are not agreed with respect to the cause, time, and manner, of his execution.[c]

III. The doctrine of Manes was a motley mixture of the tenets of Christianity with the ancient philosophy of the Persians, in which he had been instructed during his youth. He combined these two systems, and applied and accommodated to Jesus Christ the characters and actions which the Persians attributed to the god Mithras. The principal doctrines of Manes are comprehended in the following summary:

"There are two principles from which all things proceed; the one is a most pure and subtile matter, called *Light;* and the other a gross and corrupt substance, called *Darkness.* Both are subject to the dominion of a superintending being, whose existence is from all eternity The being who presides over the light, is called God; he that rules the land of darkness, bears the title of Hyle or Demon. The ruler of the light is supremely happy; and, in consequence thereof, benevolent and good; the prince of darkness is unhappy in himself; and, desiring to render others partakers of his misery, is evil and malignant. These two beings have produced an immense multitude of creatures, resembling themselves, and distributed them through their respective provinces."

IV. "The prince of darkness knew not, for a long series of ages, that light existed in the universe; and he no sooner perceived it, by the means of a war that was kindled in his dominions, than he bent his endeavours toward the subjection of it to his empire. The ruler of the light opposed to his efforts an army commanded by the first man, but not with the highest success; for the generals of the prince of darkness seized a considerable portion of the celestial elements, and of the light itself, and mingled them in the mass of corrupt matter. The second general of the ruler of the light, whose name was the *living spirit*, made war with greater success against the prince of darkness, but could not entirely disengage the pure particles of the celestial matter, from the corrupt mass through which they had been dispersed. The prince of darkness, after his defeat, produced the first parents of the human race. The beings engendered from this original stock, consists of a body formed out of the corrupt matter of the kingdom of darkness, and of two souls; one of which is sensitive and lustful, and owes its existence to the evil principle; the other rational and immortal, a particle of that divine light, which was carried away by the army of darkness, and immersed into the mass of malignant matter."

V. "Mankind being thus formed by the prince of dark-

[a] Porphyr. vita Plotini, cap. xvi. p. 118.

[b] Plotinus' book against the Gnostics is extant in his work, Ennead. ii. lib. ix.

☞ [c] Some allege, that Manes, having undertaken to cure the son of the Persian monarch of a dangerous disease, by his medicinal art or his miraculous power, failed in the attempt, precipitated the death of the prince, and, thus incurring the indignation of the king his father, was put to a cruel death. This account is scarcely probable, as it is mentioned by none of the Oriental writers cited by M. d'Herbelot, and as Bar-Hebræus speaks of it in terms which shew that it was only an uncertain rumor. The death of Manes is generally attributed to another cause by the Oriental writers. They tell us, that (after having been protected in a singular manner by Hormizdas, who succeeded Sapor on the Persian throne, but who was not able to defend him, at length, against the united hatred of the Christians, the Magi, the Jews, and the Pagans) he was shut up in a strong castle, which Hormizdas had erected between Bagdad and Susa, to serve him as a refuge against those who persecuted him on account of his doctrine. They add, that after the death of Hormizdas, Varanes I., his successor, first protected Manes, but afterwards gave him up to the fury of the Magi, whose resentment against him arose from his having adopted the Sadducean principles, as some say, while others attributed it to his having mingled the tenets of the Magi with the doctrines of Christianity.

ness, and those minds which were the productions of the eternal light, being united to their mortal bodies, God created the earth out of the corrupt mass of matter, by that living spirit, who had vanquished the prince of darkness. The design of this creation was to furnish a dwelling for the human race, to deliver, by degrees, the captive souls from their corporeal prisons, and to extract the celestial elements from the gross substance in which they were involved. In order to carry this design into execution, God produced two beings of eminent dignity from his own substance, who were to lend their auspicious succour to imprisoned souls; of these sublime entities one was Christ; and the other, the Holy Ghost. Christ is that glorious intelligence which the Persians called *Mithras:* he is a most splendid substance, consisting of the brightness of the eternal light; subsisting in and by himself, endowed with life, and enriched with infinite wisdom; and his residence is in the sun. The Holy Ghost is also a luminous and animated body, diffused throughout every part of the atmosphere which surrounds this terrestrial globe. This genial principle warms and illuminates the minds of men, renders also the earth fruitful, and draws forth gradually from its bosom the latent particles of celestial fire, which it wafts up on high to their primitive station.

VI. "When the Supreme Being had, for a long time, admonished and exhorted the captive souls, by the ministry of the angels, and of the holy men, appointed for that purpose, he ordered Christ to leave the solar regions, and to descend upon earth, in order to accelerate the return of those imprisoned spirits to their celestial country. In obedience to this divine command, Christ appeared among the Jews, clothed with the shadowy form of a human body, and not with the real substance. During his ministry, he taught mortals how to disengage the rational soul from the corrupt body, and to conquer the violence of malignant matter; and he demonstrated his divine mission by stupendous miracles. On the other hand, the prince of darkness used every method to inflame the Jews against this divine messenger, and incited them at length to put him to death with ignominy upon a cross; which punishment, however he suffered not in reality, but only in appearance, and in the opinion of men. When Christ had fulfilled the purposes of his mission he returned to his throne in the sun, and appointed a certain number of chosen apostles to propagate through the world the religion he had taught during the course of his ministry. But before his departure, he promised, that, at a certain time, he would send an apostle superior to all others in eminence and dignity, whom he called the *paraclete* or comforter, who should add many things to the precepts he had delivered, and dispel all the errors under which his servants laboured concerning divine things. This comforter, thus expressly promised by Christ, is Manes, the Persian, who, by the order of the Most High, declared to mortals the whole doctrine of salvation, without exception, and without concealing any of its truths under the veil of metaphor or any other covering.

VII. "Those souls, who believe Jesus Christ to be the Son of God, who renounce the worship of the God of the Jews (the prince of darkness,) obey the laws delivered by Christ as they are enlarged and illustrated by the *comforter*, Manes, and combat, with persevering fortitude, the lusts and appetites of a corrupt nature, derive from this faith and obedience the inestimable advantage of being gradually purified from the contagion of matter. The total purification of souls cannot, indeed be accomplished during this mortal life. Hence it is, that the souls of men after death, must pass through two states more of probation and trial, by water and fire, before they can ascend to the regions of light. They mount, therefore, first into the moon, which consists of benign and salutary water; whence, after a lustration of fifteen days, they proceed to the sun, whose purifying fire entirely removes their corruption, and effaces all their stains. The bodies, composed of malignant matter, which they have left behind them, return to their first state, and enter into their original mass.

VIII. "On the other hand, those souls who have neglected the salutary work of their purification, pass, after death, into the bodies of animals, or other natures, where they remain until they have expiated their guilt, and accomplished their probation. Some, on account of their peculiar obstinacy and perverseness, pass through a severer course of trial, being delivered over, for a certain time, to the power of aerial spirits, who torment them in various ways. When the greatest part of the captive souls are restored to liberty, and to the regions of light, then a devouring fire shall break forth at the divine command, from the caverns in which it is at present confined, and, shall destroy and consume the frame of the world. After this tremendous event, the prince and powers of darkness shall be forced to return to their primitive seats of anguish and misery, in which they shall dwell for ever; for, to prevent their ever renewing this war in the regions of light, God shall surround the mansions of darkness with an invincible guard, composed of those souls who have fallen irrecoverably from the hopes of salvation, and who, set in array, like a military band, shall surround those gloomy seats of woe, and hinder any of their wretched inhabitants from coming forth again to the light."

IX. In order to remove the strongest obstacles that lay against the belief of this monstrous system, Manes rejected almost all the sacred books into which Christians look for the sublime truths of their holy religion. He affirmed, in the first place, that the Old Testament was not the word of God, but of the prince of darkness, who was substituted by the Jews in the place of the true God. He maintained farther that the Four Gospels, which contain the history of Christ, were not written by the apostles, or, at least, that they were corrupted and interpolated by designing and artful men, and were augmented with Jewish fables and fictions. He therefore supplied their place by a gospel which he said was dictated to him by God himself, and which he distinguished by the title of *Erteng*. He rejected also the Acts of the Apostles; and though he acknowledged the *epistles*, that are attributed to St. Paul, to be the productions of that divine apostle, yet he looked upon them as grossly corrupted and falsified in a variety of passages. We have not any certain account of the judgment which he formed concerning the other books of the New Testament.

X. The rules of life and manners that Manes prescribed to his disciples were extravagantly rigorous and austere. He commanded them to mortify and macerate the body, which he looked upon as intrinsically evil, and essentially corrupt; to deprive it of all those objects which

could contribute either to its conveniency or delight; to extirpate all those desires that lead to the pursuit of external objects; and to divest themselves of all the passions and instincts of nature. Such were the unnatural rules of practice which this absurd fanatic prescribed to his followers; but foreseeing, at the same time, that his sect could not become numerous, if this severe manner of living should be imposed without distinction upon all his adherents, he divided his disciples into two classes; one of which comprehended the perfect Christians, under the name of the *elect;* and the other, the imperfect and feeble, under the title of *hearers.* The *elect* were bound to rigorous and entire abstinence from flesh, eggs, milk, fish, wine, all intoxicating drink, wedlock, and all amorous gratifications, and were required to live in a state of the sharpest penury, nourishing, their shrivelled and emaciated bodies with bread, herbs, pulse, and melons, and depriving themselves of all the comforts that arise from the moderate indulgence of natural passions, and also from a variety of innocent and agreeable pursuits. The discipline appointed for the *hearers*, was of a milder nature. They were allowed to possess houses, lands, and wealth, to feed upon flesh, and to enter into the bonds of conjugal tenderness; but this liberty was granted to them with many limitations, and under the strictest conditions of moderation and temperance.

The general Manichean assembly was headed by a president, who represented Jesus Christ. There were joined to him twelve rulers, or masters, who were designed to represent the twelve apostles; and these were followed by seventy-two bishops, the images of the seventy-two disciples of our Lord. These bishops had presbyters and deacons under them, and all the members of these religious orders were chosen out of the class of the elect.[a]

XI. The sect of the Hieracites was formed in Egypt, toward the conclusion of this century, by Hierax of Leontium, a bookseller by profession, distinguished eminently, by his extensive learning, and a venerable air of sanctity and virtue. Some have considered this as a branch of the Manichean sect, but without foundation; since, notwithstanding the agreement of Manes and Hierax in some points of doctrine, it is certain that they differed in many respects. Hierax maintained, that the principal object of Christ's office and ministry was the promulgation of a new law, more severe and perfect than that of Moses; and hence he concluded, that the use of flesh and wine, wedlock, and other things agreeable to the outward senses, which had been permitted under the Mosiac dispensation, were absolutely prohibited and abrogated by Christ. If, indeed we look attentively into his doctrine, we shall find that, like Manes, he did not think that these austere acts of self-denial were imposed by Christ indiscriminately upon all, but on such only as were ambitious of aspiring to the highest summit of virtue. To this leading error he added some others, which were partly the consequences of this illusion, and were, in part, derived from other sources. He excluded, for example, from the kingdom of heaven, children who died before they had arrived at the use of reason, upon the supposition that God was bound to administer the rewards of futurity to those only who had fairly finished their victorious conflict with the body and its lusts. He maintained also, that Melchizedec, king of Salem, who blessed Abraham, was the Holy Ghost; denied the resurrection of the body; and cast a cloud of obscurity over the sacred scriptures, by his allegorical fictions.[b]

XII. The controversies relating to the divine Trinity, which took their rise in the former century, from the introduction of the Grecian philosophy into the Christian church, were now spreading with considerable vigour, and produced various methods of explaining that inexplicable doctrine. One of the first who engaged in this idle and perilous attempt of explaining what every mortal must acknowledge to be incomprehensible, was Noetus of Smyrna, an obscure man, and of mean abilities. He affirmed that the supreme God, whom he called the Father, and considered as absolutely indivisible, united himself to the man Christ, whom he called the Son, and was born, and crucified with him. From this opinion, Noetus and his followers were distinguished by the title of Patripassians, i. e. persons who believe that the Supreme Father of the universe, and not any other divine person, had expiated the guilt of the human race; and, indeed this appellation belongs to them justly, if the accounts which ancient writers give us of their opinions be accurate and impartial.[c]

XIII. About the middle of this century arose Sabellius, an African bishop or presbyter, who in Pentapolis, a province of Cyrenaica, and in Ptolemais or Barce, its principal city, explained, in a manner very little different from that of Noetus, the doctrine of Scripture concerning the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. This dogmatist had a considerable number of followers, who adhered to him, notwithstanding that his opinions were refuted by Dionysius, bishop of Alexandria. His sentiments were, in some respects, different from those of Noetus; for the latter was of opinion, that the *person* of the Father had assumed the human nature of Christ; whereas Sabellius maintained, that a certain *energy* only, proceeding from the Supreme Parent, or a certain portion of the divine nature, was united to the Son of God, the man Jesus; and he considered, in the same manner, the Holy Ghost, as a portion of the everlasting Father.[d] Hence it appears, that the Sabellians, though they might with justice be called Patripassians, were yet called so by the ancients in a different sense from that in which this name was given to the Noetians.

XIV. At this same period, Beryllus an Arabian, bishop of Bozrah, and a man of eminent piety and learning, taught that Christ, before his birth, had no proper subsistence, nor any other divinity, than that of the Father; which opinion, when considered with attention, amounts to this: that Christ did not exist before Mary, but that a *spirit* issuing from God himself, and therefore superior to all human souls, as being a portion of the divine nature, was united to him, at the time of his birth. Beryllus, however, was refuted by Origen, with such a victorious

[a] See all this amply proved in the work entitled Commentarii de rebus Christianorum ante Constantinum Magnum.

[b] Epiphan. Hæres. lxvii. Hieracitarum, p. 710, &c.

[c] See the Discourse of Hippolytus against the Heresy of Noetus, in the second volume of his works, published by Fabricius; as also Epiphan. Hæres. lvii. tom. i.; and Theodoret. Hæret. Fabul. lib. iii. cap. iii.

[d] Almost all the historians, who give accounts of the ancient heresies, have made particular mention of Sabellius. Among others, see Euseb. Hist. Eccles. lib. vi. cap. vi. p. 252. Athanas. Lib. de sententia Dionysii. All the passages of the ancient authors, relating to Sabellius, are carefully collected by the learned Christopher Wormius, in his Historia Sabelliana.

power of argument and zeal, that he yielded up the cause, and returned into the bosom of the church.[a]

XV. Paul of Samosata, bishop of Antioch, and also a magistrate, or civil judge, was very different from the pious and candid Beryllus, both in point of morals and doctrine. He was a vain and arrogant man, whom riches had rendered insolent and self-sufficient.[b] He introduced great confusion and trouble into the eastern churches, by his new explication of the doctrine of the Gospel concerning the nature of God and Christ, and left behind him a sect, that assumed the title of Paulians, or Paulianists. As far as we can judge of his doctrine, by the accounts of it that have been transmitted to us, it seems to have amounted to this: "That the Son and the Holy Ghost exist in God, in the same manner as the faculties of reason and activity do in man; that Christ was born a mere man; but that the reason or wisdom of the Father descended into him, and by him wrought miracles upon earth, and instructed the nations; and finally, that, on account of this union of the divine word with the man Jesus, Christ might, though improperly, be called God."

Such were the real sentiments of Paul. He involved them, however, in such deep obscurity, by the ambiguous forms of speech with which he affected to explain and defend them, that, in several councils convoked for an inquiry into his errors, he could not be convicted of heresy. At length, however, a council was assembled in the year 269, in which Malchion, the rhetorician, drew him forth from his obscurity, detected his evasions, and exposed him in his true colors; in consequence of which he was degraded from the episcopal order.[c]

XVI. It was not only in the point now mentioned, that the doctrine of the Gospel suffered, at this time from the erroneous fancies of wrong headed doctors; for there sprang up now, in Arabia, a certain sort of minute philosophers, the disciples of a master, whose obscurity has concealed him from the knowledge of after-ages, who denied the immortality of the soul, and believed that it perished with the body; but maintained, at the same time, that it was to be recalled to life with the body, by the power of God. The philosophers, who held this opinion, were denominated Arabians from their country. Origen was called from Egypt, to make head against this rising sect, and disputed against them, in a full council, with such remarkable success, that they abandoned their erroneous sentiments, and returned to the received doctrine of the church.

XVII. Among the sects that arose in this century, we place that of the Novatians the last. This sect cannot be charged with having corrupted the doctrine of Christianity by their opinions; their crime was, that, by the unreasonable severity of their discipline, they gave occasion to the most deplorable divisions, and made an unhappy schism in the church. Novatian, a presbyter of the church of Rome, a man of uncommon learning and eloquence, but of an austere and rigid character, entertained the most unfavourable sentiments of those who had been separated from the communion of the church. He indulged his inclination to severity so far, as to deny that such as had fallen into the commission of grievous transgressions, especially those who had apostatised from the faith, under the persecution set on foot by Decius, were to be again received into the bosom of the church. The greatest part of the presbyters were of a different opinion in this matter, especially Cornelius, whose credit and influence were raised to the highest pitch by the esteem and admiration which his eminent virtues so naturally excited. Hence it happened, that when a bishop was to be chosen, in the year 250, to succeed Fabianus in the see of Rome, Novatian opposed the election of Cornelius, with the greatest activity and bitterness. His opposition, however, was in vain; for Cornelius was chosen to that eminent office of which his distinguished merit rendered him so highly worthy. Novatian, upon this, separated himself from the jurisdiction of Cornelius, who, in his turn, called a council at Rome, in the year 251, and cut off Novatian and his partisans from the communion of the church. This turbulent man, being thus excommunicated, erected a new society, of which he was the first bishop; and, which, on account of the severity of its discipline, was followed by many, and flourished, until the fifth century, in the greatest part of those provinces which had received the Gospel. The chief person who assisted him in this enterprise was Novatus, a Carthaginian presbyter, a man of no sound principles, who, during the heat of this controversy, had come from Carthage to Rome, to escape the resentment and excommunication of Cyprian, his bishop, with whom he was highly at variance.

XVIII. There was no difference, in point of doctrine, between the Novatians and other Christians. What peculiarly distinguished them, was their refusing to re-admit, to the communion of the church, those who, after baptism, had fallen into the commission of heinous crimes, though they did not pretend, that even such were excluded from all possibility or hopes of salvation. They considered the Christian church as a society where virtue and innocence reigned universally, and none of whose members, from their entrance into it, had defiled themselves with any enormous crime; and, in consequence, they looked upon every society, which re-admitted heinous offenders to its communion, as unworthy of the title of a true Christian church. For that reason, also, they assumed the title of *Cathari*, i. e. the *pure;* and what showed a still more extravagant degree of vanity and arrogance, they obliged such as came over to them from the general body of Christians, to submit to be baptized a second time, as a necessary preparation for entering into their society; for such deep root had their favourite opinion concerning the irrevocable rejection of heinous offenders taken in their minds, and so great was its influence upon the sentiments they entertained of other Christian societies, that they considered the baptism administered in those churches, which received the lapsed to their communion, even after the most sincere and undoubted repentance, as absolutely divested of the power of imparting the remission of sins.[d]

[a] Euseb. lib. vi. cap. xx. xxxiii. Hieronym. Catalog. Scriptor. Eccles. cap. lx. Socrates, Hist. Eccles. lib. iii. cap. vii.; and, among the moderns, le Clerc, Ars Critica, vol. i. part ii. sect. i. cap. xiv. Chauffepied, Nouveau Diction. Hist. et Crit. tom. i.

[b] Euseb. lib. vii. cap. xxx.

[c] Epistol. Concil. Antioch. ad Paulum in Bibliotheca Patrum, tom. xi. p. 302. Dionysii Alex. Ep. ad Paulum. Decem Pauli Samosateni Quæstiones.

[d] Eusebius, lib. vi. cap. xliii. Cyprianus, in variis Epistolis, xlix., &c. Albaspinæus, Observat, Eccles. lib. ii. cap. xx. xxi. Jos. Aug. Orsi, de Criminum capital. inter veteres Christianos Absolutione, p. 254. Kenckel, de Hæresi Novatiana.

AN

ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY;

BOOK THE SECOND:

CONTAINING THE

STATE OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH

FROM THE TIME OF

CONSTANTINE THE GREAT TO CHARLEMAGNE.

THE FOURTH CENTURY.

PART I.

THE EXTERNAL HISTORY OF THE CHURCH.

CHAPTER I.

Concerning the prosperous and calamitous Events which happened to the Church during this Century.

I. That I may not separate facts, which are intimately connected with each other, I have judged it expedient to combine, in the same chapter, the prosperous and calamitous events that happened to the church during this century, instead of treating them separately, as I have hitherto done. This combination, which presents things in their natural relations, as causes or effects, is undoubtedly the principal circumstance that renders history truly interesting. In following, however, this plan, the order of time shall also be observed with as much accuracy as the combination of events will allow.

In the beginning of the century, the Roman empire was under the dominion of four chiefs, of whom two, Diocletian and Maximian Herculius, were of superior dignity, and were severally distinguished by the title of Augustus; while the other two, Constantius Chlorus and Maximian Galerius, were in a certain degree of suborbination to the former, and were honoured with the appellation of Cæsars. Under these four emperors, the church enjoyed an agreeabl. calm.[a] Diocletian, though much addicted to superstition, did not entertain any aversion to the Christians; and Constantius Chlorus, who, following the dictates of reason alone in the worship of the Deity, had abandoned the absurdities of polytheism, treated them with condescension sion and benevolence. This alarmed the pagan priests, whose interests were so closely connected with the continuance of the ancient superstitions, and who apprehended, not without cause, that to their great detriment the Christian religion would become daily more general and triumphant throughout the empire. Under these anxious fears of the downfall of their authority, they addressed themselves to Diocletian, whom they knew to of be a timorous and credulous disposition, and by fictitious oracles, and other perfidious stratagems, endeavoured to engage him to persecute the Christians.[b]

II. Diocletian, however, stood for some time unmoved by the treacherous arts of these selfish and superstitious priests, who, when they perceived the ill success of their cruel efforts, addressed themselves to Maximian Galerius, one of the Cæsars, and also son-in-law to Diocletian, in order to accomplish their unrighteous purposes. This prince, whose gross ignorance of every thing but military affairs was accompanied with a fierce and savage temper, was a proper instrument for executing their designs. Set on, therefore, by the malicious insinuations of the heathen priests, the suggestions of a superstitious mother, and the ferocity of his own natural disposition, he solicited Diocletian, with such urgent and indefatigable importunity, for an edict against the Christians, that he at length, obtained his horrid purpose; for in the year 303, when this emperor was at Nicomedia, an order was obtained from him to pull down the churches of the Christians, to burn all their books and writings, and to take from them all their civil rights and privileges, and render them incapable of any honours or civil promotion.[c] This first edict, though rigorous and severe, extended not to the lives of the Christians, for Diocletian was extremely averse to slaughter and bloodshed; it was, however, destructive to many of them, particularly to those who refused to deliver the sacred books into the hands of the magistrates.[d] Many Christians, therefore, and among them several bishops and presbyters, seeing the consequences of this refusal, delivered up all the religious books, and other sacred things that were in their possession, in order to save their lives. This conduct was highly condemned by the most steady and resolute Christians, who looked upon this compliance as sacrilegious, and branded those who were guilty of it with the ignominious appellation of *traditors*.[e]

III. Not long after the publication of this first edict against the Christians, a fire broke out twice in the palace of Nicomedia, where Galerius lodged with Diocletian. The Christians were accused, by their enemies, as the authors of this conflagration;[f] and the credulous Diocletian, too easily persuaded of the truth of this charge, caused vast numbers of them to suffer, at Nicomedia, the punishment of incendiaries, and to be tormented in the most inhuman and infamous manner.[g] About the same time, there arose tumults and seditions in Armenia and in Syria, which were also attributed to the Christians by their irreconcileable enemies, who took advantage of those disturbances to inflame the emperor's fury. And, accordingly, Diocletian, by a new edict, ordered all the bishops and ministers of the Christian church to be thrown into prison. Nor did his inhuman violence end here: for a third edict was soon issued, by which it was ordered, that all sorts of torments should be employed, and the most insupportable punishments invented, to force these venerable captives to renounce their profession, by sacri-

[a] Eusebius, lib. viii. cap. i. p. 291, &c.

[b] Eusebius, de vita Constantini, lib. ii. cap. i. p. 467. Lactantii Institut. divin. lib. iv. cap. xxvii. et. de Mortibus Persequutorum, cap. x.

[c] Lactantius, de Mortibus Persequutorum, c. xi. Eusebius, lib. viii. cap. ii.

[d] Augustinus, Brev. collat. cum Donatistis, cap. xv. xvii. Baluzii Miscellan. tom. ii.

[e] Optatus Milevit. de Schismate Donatistarum, lib. i. sect. xiii.

☞ [f] Lactantius assures us, that Galerius caused fire to be privately set to the palace, that he might lay the blame of it upon the Christians, and thus incense Diocletian still more against them; in which horrid stratagem he succeeded; for never was any persecution so bloody and inhuman, as that which this credulous emperor now set on foot against them.

[g] Euseb. Hist. Eccles. lib. viii. cap. vi. Lactant. de Mortibus Persequut. cap. xix. Constant. Mag. Oratio ad sanctor. Cœtum, cap. xxv.

ficing to the heathen gods;[a] for it was hoped, that, if the bishops and doctors of the church could be brought to yield, their respective flocks would be easily induced to follow their example. An immense number of persons, illustriously distinguished by their piety and learning, became the victims of this cruel stratagem through the whole Roman empire, Gaul excepted, which was under the mild and equitable dominion of Constantius Chlorus.[b] Some were punished in such a shameful manner, as the rules of decency oblige us to pass in silence; some were put to death after having had their constancy tried by tedious and inexpressible tortures; and some were sent to the mines to draw out the remains of a miserable life in poverty and bondage.

IV. In the second year of this horrible persecution, the 304th of the Christian æra, a fourth edict was published by Diocletian, at the instigation of Galerius and the other inveterate enemies of the Christian name. By it the magistrates were ordered and commissioned to force all Christians, without distinction of rank, or sex, to sacrifice to the gods, and were authorised to employ all sorts of torments, in order to drive them to this act of apostasy.[c] The diligence and zeal of the Roman magistrates, in the execution of this inhuman edict, nearly proved fatal to the Christian cause.[d]

Galerius now made no longer a mystery of the ambitious project which he had been revolving his mind. Finding his scheme ripe for execution, he obliged Diocletian and Maximian Herculius to resign the imperial dignity, and declared himself emperor of the east; leaving in the west Constantius Chlorus, with the ill state of whose health he was well acquainted. He chose colleagues according to his own fancy; and rejecting the proposal of Diocletian, who recommended Maxentius and Constantine (the son of Constantius) to that dignity, he made of Severus and Daza, his sister's son, to whom he had a little before given the name of Maximin.[e] This revolution restored peace to those Christians who lived in the western provinces, under the administration of Constantius;[f] while those of the east, under the tyranny of Galerius, had their sufferings and calamities dreadfully augmented.[g]

V. The divine providence, however, was preparing more serene and happy days for the church. In order to this, it confounded the schemes of Galerius, and brought his counsels to nothing. In the year 306, Constantius Chlorus dying in Britain, the army saluted, with the title of Augustus, his son Constantine, surnamed afterwards the Great on account of his illustrious exploits, and forced him to accept the purple. This proceeding, which must have stung the tyrant Galerius to the heart, he was, nevertheless, obliged to bear with patience, and even to confirm with the outward marks of his approbation. Soon after a civil war broke out, the occasion of which was as follows; Maximian Galerius, inwardly enraged at the election of Constantine by the soldiers, sent him, indeed, the purple, but gave him only the title of Cæsar, and created Severus emperor. Maxentius, the son of Maximian Herculius, and son-in-law to Galerius, provoked at the preference given to Severus, assumed the imperial dignity, and found the less difficulty in making good this usurpation, as the Roman people hoped, by his means, to deliver themselves from the insupportable tyranny of Galerius. Having caused himself to be proclaimed emperor, he chose his father Maximian for his colleague, who receiving the purple from the hands of his son, was universally acknowledged in that character by the senate and the people. Amidst all these troubles and commotions, Constantine, beyond all human expectation, made his way to the imperial throne.

The western Christians, those of Italy and Africa excepted,[h] enjoyed some degree of tranquillity and liberty during these civil tumults. Those of the east seldom continued for any considerable time in the same situation. They were subject to various changes and revolutions; their condition was sometimes adverse and sometimes tolerably easy, according to the different scenes that were presented by the fluctuating state of publick affairs. At length, however, Maximian Galerius, who had been the author of their heaviest calamities, being brought to the brink of the grave by a most dreadful and lingering disease,[i] whose complicated horrors no language can express, published, in the year 311, a solemn edict, ordering the persecution to cease, and restoring freedom and repose to the Christians, against whom he had exercised such horrible cruelties.[k]

VI. After the death of Galerius, his dominions fell into the hands of Maximin and Licinius, who divided between them the provinces he had possessed. At the same time, Maxentius, who had usurped the government of Africa and Italy, determined to make war upon Constantine (who was now master of Spain and Gaul,) with the ambitious view of reducing, under his dominion the whole western empire. Constantine, apprised of this design, marched with a part of his army into Italy, gave battle to Maxentius at a small distance from Rome, and totally defeated that abominable tyrant, who, in his precipitate flight, fell into the Tiber and was drowned. After this victory, which happened in the year 312, Constantine, and his colleague Licinius, immediately granted to the Christians a full power of living according to their own laws and institutions; which power was specified still more clearly in another edict, drawn up at Milan, in the following year.[l] Maximin, indeed, who ruled in the east, was preparing calamities for the Christians, and threatening also with destruction the western emperors. But his projects were disconcerted by the victory which Licinius gained over his army, and, through distraction and despair, he ended his life by poison, in the year 313.

VII. About the same time, Constantine the Great, who had hitherto manifested no religious principles of any kind, embraced Christianity, in consequence, as it is said of a *miraculous cross*, which appeared to him in the air, as he was marching toward Rome to attack Maxentius.

---

[a] Euseb. Hist. Eccles. lib. viii. cap. vii. et de Martyribus Palæstinæ.
[b] Lactantius, cap. xv.—Euseb. Hist. Eccles. lib. viii. cap. xiii. xviii.
[c] Eusebius, de Martyribus Palæstinæ, cap. iii.
[d] Lactantius, *Institut. divin.* lib. v. cap. xi.
[e] Lactant. de Mortibus Persequut. cap. xvii. xx. Euseb. de Martyribus Palæstinæ, cap. xiii.
[f] Lactant. cap. xxi.

☞ [h] The reason of this exception is, that the provinces of Italy and Africa, though nominally under the government of Severus, were yet in fact ruled by Galerius with an iron sceptre.

☞ [i] See a lively description of the disease of Galerius in the Universal History.

[k] Euseb. lib. viii. cap. xvi. Lactantius, cap. xxxiii.
[l] Euseb. lib. x. cap. v.—Lactant. cap. xlviii.

But that this extraordinary event was the reason of his conversion, is a matter that has never yet been placed in such a light, as to dispel all doubts and difficulties. For the first edict of Constantine in favor of the Christians, and many other circumstances that might be here alleged, show, indeed, that he was well-disposed to them and to their worship, but are no proof that he looked upon Christianity as the only true religion; which, however, would have been the natural effect of a miraculous conversion. It appears evident, on the contrary, that this emperor considered the other religions, and particularly that which was handed down from the ancient Romans, as also true and useful to mankind; and declared it to be his intention and desire, that they should all be exercised and professed in the empire, leaving to each individual the liberty of adhering to that which he thought the best. It is true that he did not remain always in this state of indifference. In process of time, he acquired more extensive views of the excellence and importance of the Christian religion, and gradually arrived at an entire persuasion of its bearing alone the sacred marks of celestial truth and a divine origin. He was convinced of the falsehood and impiety of all other religious institutions; and, acting in consequence of this conviction, he exhorted earnestly all his subjects to embrace the Gospel, and at length employed all the force of his authority in the abolition of the ancient superstition. It is not, indeed, easy, nor perhaps is it possible, to fix precisely the time when the religious sentiments of Constantine were so far changed, as to render all religions but that of Christ, the objects of his aversion. All that we know, with certainty, concerning this matter is, that this change was first published to the world by the laws and edicts[a] which he issued in the year 324, when, after the defeat and death of Licinius, he reigned as the sole lord of the Roman empire. His designs, however, with respect to the abolition of the ancient religion of the Romans, and the toleration of no other form of worship than the Christian, were only made known toward the latter end of his life, by his edicts for destroying the heathen temples, and prohibiting sacrifices.[b]

VIII. The sincerity of Constantine's zeal for Christianity can scarcely be doubted, unless it be maintained that the outward actions of men are, in no degree, a proof of their inward sentiments. It must, indeed, be confessed, that the life and actions of this prince were not such as the Christian religion demands from those who profess to believe its sublime doctrines. It is also certain, that, from his conversion to the last period of his life, he continued in the state of a catechumen, and was not received by baptism into the number of the faithful, until a few days before his death, when that sacred rite was administered to him at Nicomedia, by Eusebius, bishop of that place.[c] But these circumstances are not sufficient to prove that he doubted the divinity of the Christian religion, or that his profession of the Gospel was an act of mere dissimulation; for it was a custom with many in this century, to put off their baptism to the last hour, that thus immediately after their receiving by this rite the remission of their sins, they might ascend pure and spotless to the mansions of life and immortality.

Nor are the crimes of Constantine any proof of the insincerity of his profession, since nothing is more evident, though it be strange and unaccountable, than that many who believe, in the firmest manner, the truth and divinity of the Gospel, violate its laws by repeated transgressions, and live in contradiction to their own inward principles.

Another question of a different nature might be proposed here, viz. Whether motives of a worldly kind did not contribute, in a certain measure to give Christianity, in the esteem of Constantine, a preference to all other religious systems? It is indeed probable, that this prince perceived the admirable tendency of the Christian doctrine and precepts to promote the stability of government, by preserving the citizens in their obedience to the reigning powers, and in the practice of those virtues which render a state happy; and he must naturally have observed, how defective the Roman superstition was in this important point.[d]

IX. The doubts and difficulties that naturally arise in the mind, concerning the *miraculous cross* that Constantine solemnly declared he had seen, about noon, in the air, are many and considerable. It is easy, indeed, to refute the opinion of those who look upon this prodigy as a cunning fiction, invented by the emperor to animate his troops in the ensuing battle, or who consider the narration as wholly fabulous.[e] The sentiment also of those, who imagine that this pretended cross was no more than a natural phenomenon in a solar halo, is, perhaps, more ingenious, than solid and convincing.[f] Nor, in the third place, do we think it sufficiently proved, that the divine power interposed here to confirm the wavering faith of Constantine by a stupendous miracle. The only hypothesis, then,[g] which remains

[a] Eusebius, de vita Constant. lib. ii. cap. xx., xliv.

[b] See Godofred ad Codic. Theodosian. tom. vi. part i.

[c] Eusebius, de vita Constantini, lib. iv. cap. lxi. lxii. Those who, upon the authority of certain records (whose date is modern, and whose credit is extremely dubious) affirm, that Constantine was baptized in the year 324, at Rome, by Sylvester, the bishop of that city, are evidently in an error. Those, even of the Romish church, who are the most eminent for their learning and sagacity, reject this notion. See Noris, Hist. Donatist. tom. iv. op. p. 650. Thom. Mariæ Mamachii Origin. et Antiquit. Christian. tom. ii. p. 282.

[d] Eusebius, de vita Constant. lib. i. cap. xxvii. ☞ It has been sometimes remarked by the more eminent writers of the Roman history, that the superstition of that people, contrary to what Dr. Mosheim here observes, had a great influence in keeping them in their subordination and allegiance. It is more particularly observed, that in no other nation was the solemn obligation of an oath treated with such respect, or fulfilled with such a religious circumspection, and such an inviolable fidelity. But, notwithstanding all this, it is certain, that superstition, if it may be dexterously turned to good purposes, may be equally employed to bad. The artifice of an augur could have rendered superstition as useful to the infernal designs of a Tarquin and a Catiline, as to the noble and virtuous purposes of a Publicola, or a Trajan. But true Christianity can animate or encourage to nothing except what is just and good. It tends to support government by the principles of piety and justice, and not by the ambiguous flight of birds, or the like delusions.

[e] Hornbeck. Comment. ad Bullam Urbani viii. de Imagin. cultu, p. 182. Oiselius, Thesaur. Numism. Antiq. p. 463. Tollius, Preface to the French Translation of Longinus, as also his Adnot. ad Lactantium de Mort. Persequut. cap. xliv. Christ. Thomasius, Observat. Hallens. tom. i. p. 380.

[f] Jo. And. Schmidius, Disser. de luna in Cruce visa. Jo. Alb. Fabricius, Disser. de Cruce a Constantino visa.

☞ [g] This hypothesis of Dr. Mosheim is not more credible than the real appearance of a cross in the air.—Both events are recorded by the same authority; and, if the veracity of Constantine or of Eusebius be questioned with respect to the appearance of a cross in the day, they can scarcely be confided in with respect to the truth of the nocturnal vision. It is very surprising to see the learned authors of the Universal History adopt, without exception, all the accounts of Eusebius, concerning this cross, which are extremely liable to suspicion, which Eusebius himself seems to have believed but in part, and for the truth of all which he is careful not to make himself answerable. (See that author's Life of Constantine, lib. ii. cap. ix.)

This whole story is attended with difficulties which render it, both as

is, that we consider this famous cross as a vision represented to the emperor in a dream, with the remarkable inscription, Hac vince, *i. e. In this conquer*; and this opinion is maintained by authors of considerable weight.[a]

X. The joy with which the Christians were elated on account of the favorable edicts of Constantine and Licinius, was soon interrupted by the war which broke out between these princes. Licinius, being defeated in a pitched battle, in the year 314, concluded a treaty of peace with Constantine, and observed it during the space of nine years. But his turbulent spirit rendered him an enemy to repose; and his natural violence, seconded and still farther incensed, by the suggestions of the heathen priests, armed him against Constantine, in the year 324, for the second time. During this war he endeavoured to engage in his cause all who remained attached to the ancient superstition, that thus he might oppress his adversary with numbers; and in order to this, he persecuted the Christians in a cruel manner, and put to death many of their bishops, after trying them with torments of the most barbarous nature.[b] But all his enterprises proved abortive; for, after several unsucessful battles, he was reduced to the necessity of throwing himself at the victor's feet, and imploring his clemency; which, however, he did not long enjoy; for he was strangled, by the order of Constantine, in the year 325. After the defeat of Licinius, the empire was ruled by Constantine alone until his death; and the Christian cause experienced, in its happy progress, the effects of his auspicious administration. This zealous prince employed all the resources of his genius, all the authority of his laws, and all the engaging charms of his munificence and liberality, to efface, by degrees, the superstitions of Paganism, and to propagate Christianity in every corner of the Roman empire. He had learned, no doubt, from the disturbances continually excited by Licinius, that neither himself nor the empire could enjoy a fixed state of tranquillity and safety as long as the ancient superstitions subsisted; and therefore, from this period, he openly opposed the sacred rites of Paganism, as a religion detrimental to the interests of the state.

XI. After the death of Constantine, which happened in the year 337, his three sons, Constantine II. Constantius, and Constans, were, in consequence of his appointment, put in possession of the empire, and were all saluted as emperors and *Augusti* by the Roman senate. There were yet living two brothers of the late emperor, namely Constantius Dalmatius and Julius Constantius, and they had many sons. These the sons of Constantine ordered to be put to death, lest their ambitious views should excite troubles in the empire;[c] and they all fell victims to this barbarous order, except Gallus and Julian, the sons of Julius Constantius, the latter of whom rose afterwards to the imperial dignity. The dominions allotted to Constantine were Britain, Gaul, and Spain; but he did not possess them long; for, when he had made himself master, by force, of several places belonging to Constans, this occasioned a war between the brothers, in the year 340, in which Constantine lost his life. Constans, who had received at first, for his portion, Illyricum, Italy, and Africa, added now the dominions of the deceased prince to his own, and thus became sole master of all the western provinces. He remained in possession of this vast territory until the year 350, when he was cruelly assassinated by the order of Magnentius, one of his commanders, who had revolted and declared himself emperor. Magnentius, in his turn, met with the fate he deserved: transported with rage and despair at his ill success in the war against Constantius, and apprehending the most terrible and ignominious death from the just resentment of the conqueror, he laid violent hands upon himself. Thus Constantius, who had, before this, possessed the provinces of Asia Minor, Syria, and Egypt, became, in the year 353, sole lord of the Roman empire, which he ruled until the year 361, when he died at Mopsucrene, on the borders of Cilicia, as he was marching against Julian. None of these three brothers possessed the spirit and genius of their father. They all, indeed, followed his example, in continuing to abrogate and efface the ancient superstitions of the Romans and other idolatrous nations, and to accelerate the progress of the Christian religion throughout the empire. This zeal was, no doubt, laudable; its end was excellent; but, in the means used to accomplish it, there were many things not altogether laudable.

XII. This flourishing progress of the Christian religion was greatly interrupted, and the church reduced to the brink of destruction, when Julian, the son of Julius Constantius, and the only remaining branch of the imperial family, was placed at the head of affairs. This active and

a miracle and as a fact, extremely dubious, to say no more.—It will necessarily be asked, whence it comes to pass, that the relation of a fact, which is said to have been seen by the whole army, is delivered by Eusebius, upon the sole credit of Constantine? This is the more unaccountable, as Eusebius lived and conversed with many who must have been spectators of this event, had it really happened, and whose unanimous testimony would have prevented the necessity of Constantine's confirming it to him by an oath. The sole relation of one man, concerning a public appearance, is not sufficient to give complete conviction; nor does it appear, that this story was generally believed by the Christians, or by others, since several ecclesiastical historians, who wrote after Eusebius, particularly Rufin and Sozomen, make no mention of this appearance of a cross in the heavens. The nocturnal *vision* was, it must be confessed, more generally known and believed; upon which Dr. Lardner makes this conjecture, that when Constantine first informed the people of the reason that induced him to make use of the sign of the cross in his army, he alleged nothing but a dream for that purpose; but that, in the latter part of his life, when he was acquainted with Eusebius, he added the other particular, of a *luminous cross*, seen *somewhere* by him and his army in the day-time (for the place is not mentioned;) and that, the emperor having related this in the most solemn manner, Eusebius thought himself obliged to mention it.

[a] All the writers, who have given any accounts of Constantine the Great, are carefully enumerated by J. A. Fabricius, in his Lux. Salut. Evang. toti. Orbi exor. cap. xii. p. 260. who also mentions, cap. xiii. p. 237, the laws concerning religious matters, which were enacted by this emperor, and digested into four parts. For a full account of these laws, see Jac. Godofred. Adnotat. ad Codic. Theodos., and Balduinus in his Constantin. Magn. seu de Legibus Constantini eccles. et civilibus, lib. ii.

[b] Eusebius, Hist. Eccles. lib. x. cap. viii. *et de vita Constantini*, lib. i. cap. xlix. Julian himself, whose bitter aversion to Constantine gives a singular degree of credibility to his testimony in this matter, could not help confessing that Licinius was an infamous tyrant and a profligate, abandoned to all sorts of wickedness. See the Cæsars of Julian. And here I beg leave to make a remark which has escaped the learned. Aurelius Victor, in his book de Cæsaribus, cap. xli. has mentioned the persecution under Licinius in the following terms; "Licinio ne insontium quidem ac nobilium philosophorum servili more cruciatus adhibiti modum fecere." The philosophers, whom Licinius is here said to have tormented, were, doubtless, the Christians, whom many, through ignorance, looked upon as a philosophical sect. This passage of Aurelius has not been touched by the commentators, who are generally more intent upon the knowledge of words than of things.

☞ [c] It is more probable that the principal design of this massacre was to recover the provinces of Thrace, Macedon, and Achaia, which, in the division of the empire, Constantine the Great had given to young Dalmatius, son to his brother of the same name; and also Pontus and Cappadocia, which he had granted to Annibalianus, the brother of young Dalmatius. Be that as it will, Dr. Mosheim has attributed this massacre equally to the three sons of Constantine; whereas almost all authors agree that neither young Constantine, nor Constans, had any concern in it.

adventurous prince, after having been declared emperor by the army, in the year 360, in consequence of his exploits among the Gauls, was, upon the death of Constantius, in the following year, confirmed in the undivided possession of the empire. No event could be less favourable to the Christians; for, though he had been educated in the principles of Christianity, he apostatised from that divine religion, and employed all his efforts to restore the expiring superstitions of polytheism to their former vigour, credit, and lustre. His apostasy was imputable, partly to his aversion to the Constantine family, who had murdered his father, brother, and kinsman; and partly to the artifices of the Platonic philosophers, who abused his credulity, and flattered his ambition, by fictitious miracles, and pompous predictions. It is true, this prince seemed averse to the use of violence, in propagating superstition, and suppressing the truth: indeed, he carried the appearances of moderation and impartiality so far, as to allow his subjects a full power of judging for themselves in religious matters, and of worshipping the Deity in the manner they thought the most rational. But, under this mask of moderation, he attacked Christianity with the utmost bitterness, and, at the same time, with the most consummate dexterity. By art and stratagem he undermined the church, annulling the privileges which had been granted to Christians and their spiritual rulers; shutting up the schools in which they taught philosophy and the liberal arts; encouraging the sectaries and schismatics, who brought dishonour upon the Gospel by their divisions; composing books against the Christians, and using a variety of other means to bring the religion of Jesus to ruin and contempt. Julian extended his views yet farther, and was meditating projects of a still more formidable nature against the Christian church, which would have felt, no doubt, the fatal or ruinous effects of his inveterate hatred if he had returned victorious from the Persian war, into which he entered immediately after his accession to the empire. But in this war, which was rashly undertaken and imprudently conducted, he fell by the lance of a Persian soldier, and expired in his tent in the 32d year of his age, having reigned alone, after the death of Constantius, twenty months.[a]

XIII. It is to me a just matter of surprise, to find Julian placed, by many learned and judicious writers,[b] among the greatest heroes that shine forth in the annals of time, and even exalted above all the princes and legislators who have been distinguished by the wisdom of their government. Such writers must either be too far blinded by prejudice, to perceive the truth; or they cannot have perused, with any degree of attention, those works of Julian which are still extant; or, if neither of these be their case, they must, at least, be ignorant of that which constitutes true greatness. The real character of Julian has a few lines of that uncommon merit which has been attributed to it; for, if we set aside his genius, of which his works give no very high idea; if we except, moreover, his military courage, his love of letters, and his acquaintance with that vain and fanatical philosophy which was known by the name of modern Platonism, we shall find nothing remaining, that is in any measure worthy of praise, or productive of esteem. Besides, the qualities now mentioned, were, in him, counterbalanced by the most opprobrious defects. He was a slave to superstition, than which nothing is a more evident mark of a narrow soul, of a mean and abject spirit. His thirst of glory and eagerness for popular applause were excessive, even to puerility; his credulity and levity surpass the powers of description; a low cunning, and a profound dissimulation and duplicity, had acquired, in his mind, the force of predominant habits; and all this was accompanied with a total ignorance of true philosophy:[c] so that, though, in some things, Julian may be allowed to have excelled the sons of Constantine the Great, yet it must be granted, on the other hand, that he was, in many respects, inferior to Constantine himself, whom upon all occasions, he loads with the most licentious invectives, and treats with the utmost disdain.

XIV. As Julian affected, in general, to appear moderate in religious matters, unwilling to trouble any on account of their faith, or to seem averse to any sect or party, so to the Jews, in particular, he extended so far the marks of his indulgence, as to permit them to rebuild the temple of Jerusalem. The Jews set about this important work; from which, however, they were obliged to desist, before they had even begun to lay the foundations of the sacred edifice; for, while they were removing the rubbish, formidable balls of fire, issuing out of the ground with a dreadful noise, dispersed both the works and the workmen, and repeated earthquakes filled the spectators of this phenomenon with terror and dismay. This signal event is attested in a manner that renders its evidence irresistible,[d] though, as usually happens in cases of that nature, the Christians have embellished it by augmenting rashly the number of the miracles which are supposed to have been wrought upon that occasion. The causes of this phenomenon may furnish matter of dispute; and learned men have, in effect, been divided upon that point. All, however, who consider the matter with attention and impartiality, will perceive the strongest reasons for embracing the opinion of those who attribute this event to the almighty interposition of the Supreme Being; nor do the arguments offered by some, to prove it the effect of natural causes, or those alleged by others to persuade us that it was the result of artifice and imposture, contain any thing that may not be refuted with the utmost facility.[e]

XV. Upon the death of Julian, the suffrages of the army were united in favour of Jovian, who, accordingly, succeeded him in the imperial dignity. After a reign of seven

[a] For a full account of this emperor, it will be proper to consult (beside Tillemont and other common writers) La Vie de Julien, par l'Abbé Bleterie, which is a most accurate and elegant production. See also the Life and character of Julian, illustrated in seven Dissertations by Des-Voeux; Ezech. Spanheim, Præfat. et adnot. ad op. Juliani; and Fabricius, Lux Evangel. toti orbi exoriens, cap. xiv. p. 294.

[b] Montesquieu, in chap. x. of the twenty-fourth book of his work, entitled, L'Esprit des Loix, speaks of Julian in the following terms: "Il n'y a point eu apres lui de prince plus digne de gouverner des hommes."

[c] Nothing can afford a more evident proof of Julian's ignorance of the true philosophy, than his known attachment to the study of magic, which Dr. Mosheim has omitted in his enumeration of the defects and extravagances of this prince.

[d] See Jo. Alb. Fabricii Lux Evang. toti orbi exoriens, p. 124, where all the testimonies of this remarkable event are carefully assembled; see also Moyle's Posthumous works.

[e] The truth of this miracle is denied by the famous Basnage, Histoire des Juifs, tom. iv., against whom Cuper has taken the affirmative, and defended it in his Letters published by Bayer. A most ingenious discourse was published, in defence of this miracle, by the learned Dr. Warburton, under the title of Julian, or a Discourse concerning the Earthquake and Fiery Eruption, &c. in which the objections of Basnage are particularly examined and refuted.

months, Jovian died in the year 364, and, therefore, had not time to execute any thing of importance.[a] The emperors who succeeded him, in this century, were Valentinian I., Valens, Gratian, Valentinian II., and Honorius, who professed Christianity, promoted its progress, and endeavoured, though not all with equal zeal, to root out entirely the Gentile superstitions. In this they were all surpassed by the last of the emperors who reigned in this century, viz. Theodosius the Great, who began to reign in the year 379, and died in 395. As long as this prince lived, he exerted himself, in the most vigorous and effectual manner, for the extirpation of the pagan superstitions throughout all the provinces, and enacted severe laws and penalties against such as adhered to them. His sons, Arcadius and Honorius, pursued with zeal, and not without success, the same end; so that, toward the conclusion of this century, the Gentile religion declined apace, and had also no prospect left of recovering their primitive authority and splendour.

XVI. It is true, that, notwithstanding all this zeal and severity of the Christian emperors, there still remained in several places, and especially in the remoter provinces, temples and religious rites, consecrated to the service of the pagan deities. And, indeed, when we look attentively into the matter, we shall find, that the execution of those rigourous laws, which were enacted against the worshippers of the gods, was rather levelled at the multitude, than at persons of eminence and distinction; for it appears, that, both during the reign, and after the death of Theodosius, many of the most honourable and important posts were filled by persons, whose aversion to Christianity and attachment to Paganism were sufficiently known.

The example of Libanius alone is an evident proof of this, since, notwithstanding his avowed and open enmity to the Christians, he was raised by Theodosius himself to the high dignity of præfect, or chief of the Prætorian guards. It is extremely probable, therefore, that, in the execution of the severe laws enacted against the Pagans, there was an exception made in favour of philosophers, rhetoricians, and military leaders, on account of the important services which they were supposed to render to the state, and that they of consequence enjoyed more liberty in religious matters, than the inferior orders of men.

XVII. This peculiar regard shown to the philosophers and rhetoricians will, no doubt, appear surprising when it is considered, that all the force of their genius, and all the resources of their art, were employed against Christianity; and that those very sages, whose schools were reputed of such utility to the state, were the very persons who opposed the progress of the truth with the greatest vehemence and contention of mind. Hierocles, the great ornament of the Platonic school, wrote in the beginning of this century two books against the Christians, in which he went so far as to draw a parallel between Jesus Christ and Apollonius Tyanæus. This presumption was chastised with great spirit, by Eusebius, in a treatise written expressly in answer to Hierocles. Lactantius takes notice of another philosopher, who composed three books to detect the pretended errors of the Christians,[b] but does not mention his name. After the time of Constantine the Great, beside the long and laborious work which Julian wrote against the followers of Christ, Himerius[c] and Libanius, in their public harangues, and Eunapius, in his lives of the philosophers, exhausted all their rage and bitterness in their efforts to defame the Christian religion, while the calumnies that abounded in the discourses of the one, and the writings of the other, passed unpunished.

XVIII. The prejudice which the Christian cause received in this century, from the stratagems of these philosophers and rhetoricians, who were elated with a presumptuous notion of their knowledge, and prepossessed with a bitter aversion to the Gospel, was certainly very considerable. Many examples concur to prove this point; and particularly that of Julian, who was seduced by the artifices of these corrupt sophists. The effects of their disputes and declamations were not, indeed, the same upon all; some who assumed the appearance of superior wisdom, and who, either from moderation or indifference, professed to pursue a middle way in these religious controversies, composed matters in the following manner: they so far listened to the interpretations and discourses of the rhetoricians, as to form to themselves a middle kind of religion, between the ancient theology and the new doctrine that was now propagated in the empire; and they persuaded themselves, that the same truths which Christ taught, had been for a long time concealed by the priests of the gods, under the veil of ceremonies, fables, and allegorical representations.[d] Of this number were Ammianus Marcellinus, a man of singular merit; Themistius, an orator highly distinguished by his uncommon eloquence and the eminence of his station: Chalcidius, a philosopher, and others, who were all of opinion, that the two religions, when properly interpreted and understood, agreed perfectly well in the main points, and that, therefore, neither the religion of Christ, nor that of the gods, ought to be treated with contempt.

XIX. The zeal and diligence with which Constantine and his successors exerted themselves in the cause of Christianity, and in extending the limits of the church, prevent our surprise at the number of barbarous and uncivilized nations, which received the Gospel.[e] It appears highly probable, from many circumstances, that both the Major and the

[a] See Bleterie, Vie de Jovien, vol. ii. in which the Life of Julian, by the same author, is farther illustrated, and some productions of that emperor are translated into French.

[b] Institut. Divin. lib. v. cap. ii. p. 535.

[c] See Photius, Biblioth. Cod. cap. lxv. p. 355.

[d] This notion, absurd as it is, has been revived, in the most extravagant manner, in a work published at Harderwyk, in 1757, by Mr. Struchtmeyer, professor of eloquence and languages in that university. In this work, which bears the title of the Symbolical Hercules, the learned but wrong-headed author maintains (as he had also done in a preceding work, entitled, An Explication of the Pagan Theology,) that all the doctrines of Christianity were emblematically represented in the Heathen mythology; and not only so, but that the inventors of that mythology knew that the Son of God was to descend upon earth; believed in Christ as the only fountain of salvation; were persuaded of his future incarnation, death, and resurrection; and had acquired all this knowledge and faith by the perusal of a Bible much older than either the time of Moses or Abraham, &c. The pagan doctors, thus instructed (according to Mr. Struchtmeyer) in the mysteries of Christianity, taught these truths under the veil of emblems, types, and figures. Jupiter represented the true God; Juno, who was obstinate and ungovernable, was the emblem of the ancient Israel; the chaste Diana was a type of the Christian church; Hercules was the figure or fore-runner of Christ; Amphitryon was Joseph; the two Serpents, killed by Hercules in his cradle, were the Pharisees and Sadducees, &c. Such are the principal lines of Mr. Struchtmeyer's system, which shows the sad havock that a warm imagination, undirected by a just and solid judgment, makes in religion. It is, however, honorable perhaps to the present age, that a system, from which Ammianus Marcellinus and other ancient philosophers derived applause, will be generally looked upon, at present, as entitling its restorer to a place in Bethlehem hospital.

[e] Gaudent. vita Philastrii, sect. 3. Philast. de hæres. Præf. Socrat. Hist. Eccles. lib. i, cap. xix. Georg. Cedren. Chronograph.

Minor Armenia were enlightened with the knowledge of the truth, not long after the promulgation of Christianity. The Armenian church was not, however, completely formed and established before this century; in the commencement of which, Gregory, the son of Anax, who is commonly called the *Enlightener*, from his having dispelled the darkness of the Armenian superstitions, converted to Christianity Tiridates, king of Armenia, and all the nobles of his court. In consequence of this, Gregory was consecrated bishop of the Armenians, by Leontius, bishop of Cappadocia; and his ministry was crowned with such success, that the whole province was soon converted to the Christian faith.[a]

XX. Toward the middle of this century, a certain person, named Frumentius, went from Egypt to Abyssinia or Ethiopia, whose inhabitants derived the name of Axumitæ from Axuma, the capital city of that country. He made known among this people the Gospel of Christ, and administered the sacrament of baptism to their king, and to several persons of the first distinction at his court. As he was returning into Egypt, he received consecration, as the first bishop of the Axumitæ, or Ethiopians, from Athanasius; and this is the reason why the Ethiopian church has, even to our times, been considered as the daughter of the Alexandrian, from which it also receives its bishop.[b]

The light of the Gospel was introduced into Iberia, a province of Asia (now called Georgia), in the following manner: a certain woman was carried into that country as a captive, during the reign of Constantine; and by the grandeur of her miracles, and the remarkable sanctity of her life and manners, she made such an impression upon the king and queen, that they abandoned their false gods, embraced the faith of the Gospel, and sent to Constantinople for proper persons to give them and their people a more satisfactory and complete knowledge of the Christian religion.[c]

XXI. A considerable part of the Goths, who had inhabited Thrace, Mœsia, and Dacia, had received the knowledge and embraced the doctrines of Christianity before this century; and Theophilus, their bishop, was present at the council of Nice. Constantine, after having vanquished them and the Sarmatians, engaged great numbers of them to become Christians:[d] yet a large body continued in their attachment to their ancient superstition until the time of the emperor Valens. This prince permitted them, indeed, to pass the Danube, and to inhabit Dacia, Mœsia, and Thrace; but it was on condition that they should live in subjection to the Roman laws, and embrace the profession of Christianity;[e] which stipulations were accepted by their king Fritigern. The celebrated Ulphilas, bishop of those Goths who dwelt in Mœsia, lived in this century, and distinguished himself by his genius and piety. Among other eminent services which he rendered to his country, he invented a set of letters for their peculiar use, and translated the Scriptures into the Gothic language.[f]

XXII. There remained still, in the European provinces an incredible number of persons who adhered to the worship of the Gods; and though the Christian bishops continued their pious efforts to gain them over to the Gospel, yet the success was, by no means, proportionable to their diligence and zeal, and the work of conversion went on but slowly. In Gaul, the great and venerable Martin, bishop of Tours, set about this important work with tolerable success; for, in his various journeys among the Gauls, he converted many, every where, by the energy of his discourses, and by the power of his miracles, if we may rely upon the testimony of Sulpitius Severus. He destroyed also the temples of the gods, pulled down their statues,[g] and on all these accounts merited the high and honourable title of Apostle of the Gauls.

XXIII. There is no doubt that the victories of Constantine, the fear of punishment, and the desire of pleasing this mighty conqueror and his imperial successors, were the weighty arguments that moved whole nations, as well as particular persons, to embrace Christianity. None, however, that have any acquaintance with the transactions of his period of ime, will attribute the whole progress of Christianity to these causes; for it is undeniably manifest that the indefatigable zeal of the bishops and other pious men, the innocence and sanctity which shone forth with such lustre in the lives of many Christians, the translations that were published of the sacred writings, and the intrinsic beauty and excellence of the Christian religion, made as strong and deep impressions upon some, as worldly views and selfish considerations did upon others.

As to the miracles attributed to Antony, Paul the Hermit, and Martin. I give them up without the least difficulty, and join with those who treat these pretended prodigies with the contempt they deserve.[h] I am also willing to grant, that many events have been rashly deemed miraculous, which were the result of the ordinary laws of nature; and also, that pious frauds were sometimes used, for the purpose of giving new degrees of weight and dignity to the Christian cause. But I cannot, on the other hand, assent to the opinions of those who maintain, that in this century, miracles had entirely ceased; and that at this period, the Christian church was not favoured with any extraordinary or supernatural mark of a divine power engaged in its cause.[i]

XXIV. The Christians, who lived under the Roman government, were not afflicted with any severe calamities from the time of Constantine, except those which they suffered during the troubles and commotions raised by Lici-

[a] Narratio de rebus Armeniæ in Franc. Comdefisii Auctario Biblioth. Patrum Græcor. tom. ii. p. 287. Mich. Lequien, Oriens Christianus, tom. i. p. 419. 1356. Jo. Joach. Schrod. Thesaur. linguæ Armenicæ, p. 149.

[b] Athanasius, Apolog. ad Constantium, tom. i. op. part ii. p. 315, edit. Benedict. Socrates et Sozomen, Hist. Eccles. book i. chap. xix. of the former, book ii. ch. xxiv. of the latter. Theodoret. Hist. Eccles. lib. i. cap. xxiii. p. 54. Ludolf, Comment. ad Hist. Æthiopic. p. 281. Hier. Lobo, Voyage d'Abyssinie, tom. ii. p. 13. Justus Fontaninus, Hist. Liter. Aquileiæ, p. 174.

[c] Rufinus, Hist. Eccles. lib. i. cap. x. Sozomen, Hist. Eccles. lib. ii. cap. v. Lequien, Oriens Christ. tom. i. p. 1333.

[d] Socrat. Hist. Eccles. lib. i. cap. xviii.

[e] Socrat. Hist. Eccles. lib. iv. cap. xxxiii. Lequien, Oriens Christ. tom. i. p. 1240. Eric. Benzelius, Præf. ad Quatuor Evangelia Gothica, quæ Ulphilæ tribuuntur, cap. v. p. 18, published at Oxford, in 1750.

[f] Jo. Jac. Mascovii Historia Germanorum, tom. i. p. 317; tom. ii. not. p. 49. Acta SS. Martii, tom. iii. p. 619. Benzelius, cap. viii.

[g] See Sulpit. Severus, Dial. i. de Vita Martini, cap. xiii. xv. xvii. et Dial. ii.

[h] Hier. a Prato, in his Preface to Sulpitius Severus, disputes warmly in favor of the miracles of Martin, and also of the other prodigies of this century.

[i] See Eusebius' book against Hierocles, chap. iv. and Henry Dodwell's Diss. ii. in Irenæum, sect. 55, p. 195. ☞ See Dr. Middleton's Free Inquiry into the Miraculous Powers which are said to have subsisted in the Christian Church, &c. in which a very different opinion is maintained. See, however, on the other side, the answers of Church and Dodwell to Middleton's Inquiry.

nius, and under the transitory reign of Julian. Their tranquillity, however, was, at different times, disturbed in several places. Among others, Athanaric, king of the Goths, persecuted for some time, with great bitterness, that part of the Gothic nation which had embraced Christianity.[a] In the remoter provinces, the Pagans often defended their ancient superstitions by the force of arms, and massacred the Christians who, in the propagation of their religion, were not always sufficiently attentive, either to the rules of prudence or the dictates of humanity.[b] The Christians who lived beyond the limits of the Roman Empire, had a harder fate; Sapor II., king of Persia, vented his rage against those of his dominions, in three dreadful persecutions. The first of these happened in the eighteenth year of the reign of that prince; the second, in the 30th; and the third in the 31st year of the same reign. This last was the most cruel and destructive of the three; it carried off an incredible number of Christians, and continued during the space of forty years, having commenced in the year 330, and ceased only in 370. It was not, however, the religion of the Christians, but the ill-grounded suspicion of their treasonable designs against the state, that drew upon them this terrible calamity; for the Magi and the Jews persuaded the Persian monarch, that all the Christians were devoted to the interest of the Roman emperor, and that Simeon, archbishop of Seleucia and of Ctesiphon, sent to Constantinople intelligence of all that passed in Persia.[c]

[a] See Acta Martyr. sincera, published by Ruinart, and (in that collection,) Acta S. Sabæ, p. 598.

[b] See Ambrosius, de Officiis, lib. i. cap. xlii. sect. 17.

[c] See Sozomen. Hist. Eccles. lib. ii. cap. i. xiii. There is a particular and express account of this persecution in the Bibliothec. Oriental. Clement. Vatican. tom. i. p. 6, 16, 181; tom. iii. p. 52; with which it will be proper to compare the preface to the Acta Martyrum Orientalium et Occidentalium, by the learned Assemani, who has published the Persian Martyrology in Syriac, with a Latin translation, and enriched this valuable work with many excellent observations.

PART II.

THE INTERNAL HISTORY OF THE CHURCH.

CHAPTER I.

Which contains the History of Learning and Philosophy.

I. PHILOLOGY, eloquence, poetry, and history, were the branches of learning particularly cultivated at this time by those among the Greeks and Latins, who were desirous of acquiring fame. But, though several persons of both nations obtained reputation by their literary pursuits, they came all far short of the summit of fame. The best poets of this period, such as Ausonius, appear insipid, harsh, and inelegant, when compared with the sublime bards of the Augustan age. The rhetoricians, departing now from the noble simplicity and majesty of the ancients, instructed the youth in the fallacious art of pompous declamation; and the majority of historical writers were more intent upon embellishing their narrations with vain and tawdry ornaments, than upon rendering them interesting by their order, perspicuity, and truth.

II. Almost all the philosophers of this age were of that sect which we have already distinguished by the title of Modern Platonists. It is not therefore surprising, that we find the principles of Platonism in all the writings of the Christians. Of these philosophers, however the number was not so considerable in the west as in the eastern countries. Jamblichus of Chalcis explained, in Syria, the philosophy of Plato, or rather propagated his own particular opinions under that respectable name. He was an obscure and credulous man, and his turn of mind was highly superstitious and chimerical, as his writings abundantly testify.[a] His successors were, Ædesius, Maximus, and others, whose follies and puerilities are exposed at length by Eunapius. Hypatia, a female philosopher of distinguished merit and learning, Isadorus, Olympiodorus, Synesius, afterwards a Semi-Christian, with others of inferior reputation, were the principal persons concerned in propagating this new modification of Platonism.

III. As the emperor Julian was passionately attached to this sect, (which his writings abundantly prove,) he employed every method to increase its authority and lustre; and, for that purpose, engaged in its cause several men of learning and genius, who vied with each other in exalting its merit and excellence.[b] But, after his death, a dreadful storm of persecution arose, in the reign of Valentinian, against the Platonists; many of whom, being accused of magical practices, and other heinous crimes, were capitally convicted. During these commotions, Maximus, the master and favourite of Julian, by whose persuasions this emperor had been engaged to renounce Christianity, and to apply himself to the study of magic, was put to death with several others.[c] It is probable, indeed, that the friendship and intimacy that had subsisted between the apostate emperor and these pretended sages, were greater crimes, in the eye of Valentinian, than either their philosophical system or their magic arts; and hence it happened, that such of the sect as lived at a distance from the court, were not involved in the dangers or calamities of this persecution.

IV. From the time of Constantine the Great, the Christians applied themselves with greater zeal and diligence to the study of philosophy and of the liberal arts, than they had formerly done. The emperors encouraged this taste for the sciences, and left no means unemployed to excite and maintain a spirit of literary emulation among the professors of Christianity. For this purpose, schools were established in many cities; libraries were also erected, and men of learning and genius were nobly recompensed by the honours and advantages that were attached to the culture of the sciences and arts.[d] All this was indispensably necessary to the successful execution of the scheme that was laid for abrogating, by degrees, the worship of the gods; for the ancient religion was maintained, and its credit supported by the erudition and talents which distinguished in so many places the sages of Paganism; and there was just reason to apprehend, that the truth might suffer, if the Christian youth, for want of proper masters and instructors of their own religion, should have recourse, for their education, to the schools of the pagan philosophers and rhetoricians.

V. From what has been here said concerning the state of learning among the Christians, let not any reader conclude that an acquaintance with the sciences had become universal in the church of Christ; for, as yet, there was no law enacted, which excluded the ignorant and illiterate from ecclesiastical preferments and offices, and it is certain that the greatest part, both of the bishops and presbyters, were men entirely destitute of learning and education. Besides, that savage and illiterate party, who looked upon all sorts of erudition, particularly that of a philosophical kind, as pernicious, and even destructive of true piety and religion, increased both in number and authority. The ascetics, monks, and hermits, augmented the strength of this barbarous faction; and not only the women, but also all who took solemn looks, sordid garments, and a love of solitude, for real piety, (and in this number we comprehend the generality of mankind,) were vehemently prepossessed in their favour.

CHAPTER II.

Concerning the Government of the Church, and the Christian Doctors, during this Century.

I. CONSTANTINE the Great made no essential alterations in the form of government that took place in the Christian church before his time; he only corrected it in

[a] Doctor Mosheim speaks here of only one Jamblichus, though there were three persons who bore that name. It is not easy to determine which of them wrote the works that have reached our times under the name of Jamblichus; but, whoever it was, he does not certainly deserve so mean a character as our learned historian here gives him.

[b] See the learned Spanheim's Preface to the works of Julian; and hat also which he has prefixed to his French translation of Julian's Cæsars, and his Annotations to the latter; see also Bleterie, Vie de l'Empereur Julien, lib. i. p. 26.

[c] Ammian. Marcellin. Hist. lib. xxix. cap. i. p. 556. edit. Valesii. Bleterie, Vie de Julien, p. 30—155, 159, and Vie de Jovien, tom. i. p. 194.

[d] See Godofred. ad Codicis Theodos. titulos de Professoribus et Artibus Liberalibus. Franc. Balduinus in Constantino M. p. 122. Herm. Conring. Dissert. de Studiis Romæ et Constantinop. at the end of his Antiquitates Academicæ.

some particulars, and gave it a greater extent. Although he permitted the church to remain a body-politic, distinct from that of the state, as it had formerly been, yet he assumed to himself the supreme power over this sacred body, and the right of modelling and governing it in such a manner as should be most conducive to the public good. This right he enjoyed without any opposition, as none of the bishops presumed to call his authority in question. The people therefore continued, as usual, to choose freely their bishops and their teachers. The bishop governed the church, and managed the ecclesiastical affairs of the city or district, where he presided in council with the presbyters, not without a due regard to the suffrages of the whole assembly of the people. The provincial bishops also deliberated together upon those matters which related to the interests of the churches of a whole province, as also concerning religious controversies, the forms and rites of divine service, and other things of like moment. To these minor councils, which were composed of the ecclesiastical deputies of one or more provinces, were afterwards added *œcumenical councils*, consisting of commissioners from all the churches in the Christian world, and which, consequently, represented the church universal. These were established by the authority of the emperor, who assembled the first of these councils at Nice. This prince thought it equitable, that questions of superior importance, and such as intimately concerned the interests of Christianity in general, should be examined and decided in assemblies that represented the whole body of the Christian church; and in this it is highly probable, that his judgment was directed by that of the bishops. There were never, indeed, any councils holden, which could, with strict propriety, be called *universal*; those, however, whose laws and decrees were approved and admitted by the universal church, or the greatest part of that sacred body, are commonly called *œcumenical* or *general* councils.

II. The rights and privileges of the several ecclesiastical orders were, however, gradually changed and diminished, from the time that the church began to be torn with divisions, and agitated with those violent dissensions and tumults, to which the elections of bishops, the diversity of religious opinions, and other things of a like nature, too frequently gave rise. In these religious quarrels, the weaker generally fled to the court for protection and succour; and thereby furnished the emperors with opportunities of setting limits to the power of the bishops, of infringing the liberties of the people, and of modifying, in various ways, the ancient customs according to their pleasure. And, indeed, even the bishops themselves, whose opulence and authority were considerably increased since the reign of Constantine, began to introduce innovations into the forms of ecclesiastical discipline, and to change the ancient government of the church. Their first step was an entire exclusion of the people from all part in the administration of ecclesiastical affairs; and, afterwards, they by degrees divested even the presbyters of their ancient privileges, and their primitive authority, that they might have no importunate protesters to control their ambition, or oppose their proceedings; and, principally, that they might either engross to themselves, or distribute as they thought proper, the possessions and revenues of the church. Hence, at the conclusion of this century, there remained no more than a mere shadow of the ancient government of the church. Many of the privileges which had formerly belonged to the presbyters and people, were usurped by the bishops; and many of the rights, which had been formerly vested in the universal church, were transferred to the emperors, and to subordinate officers and magistrates.

III. Constantine, in order to prevent civil commotions, and to fix his authority upon solid and stable foundations, made several changes, not only in the laws of the empire, but also in the form of the Roman government;[a] and as there were many important reasons, which induced him to suit the administration of the church to these changes in the civil constitution, this necessarily introduced, among the bishops, new degrees of eminence and rank. Three prelates had, before this, enjoyed a certain degree of pre-eminence over the rest of the episcopal order, *viz.* the bishops of Rome, Antioch, and Alexandria; and to these the bishop of Constantinople was added, when the imperial residence was transferred to that city. These four prelates answered to the four Prætorian præfects created by Constantine; and it is possible that, in this very century, they were distinguished by the Jewish title of patriarchs. After these, followed the exarchs, who had the inspection over several provinces, and answered to the appointment of certain civil officers who bore the same title. In a lower class were the metropolitans, who had only the government of one province; under whom were the archbishops, whose inspection was confined to certain districts. In this gradation, the bishops brought up the rear; the sphere of their authority was not, in all places, equally extensive; being in some considerably ample, and in others confined within narrow limits. To these various ecclesiastical orders, we might add that of the *chorediscopi*, or superintendants of the country churches; but this order was, in most places, suppressed by the bishops, with a design to extend their own authority, and enlarge the sphere of their power and jurisdiction.[b]

IV. The administration of the church was divided, by Constantine himself, into an *external* and an *internal* inspection.[c] The latter, which was committed to bishops and councils, related to religious controversies, the forms of divine worship, the offices of the priests, the vices of the ecclesiastical orders, &c. The external administration of the church, the emperor assumed to himself. This comprehended all those things which relate to the outward state and discipline of the church; it likewise extended to all contests and debates that might arise among the ministers of the church, superior as well as inferior, concerning their possessions, their reputation, their rights and privileges, their offences against the laws and things of a like nature;[d] but no controversies that related to matters purely religious were cognizable by this external inspection. In consequence of this artful division of the ecclesiastical government, Constantine and his successors called councils, presided in

[a] See Bos. Histoire de la Monarchie Françoise, tom. 1. p. 64. Giannone, Historia di Napoli, vol. i.

[b] This appears from several passages in the useful work of Lud. Thomassinus, entitled, Disciplina Ecclesiæ vet. et novæ circa Beneficia, tom. i.

[c] Euseb, de vita Constantini, lib. iv. cap. xxiv. p. 536.

[d] See the imperial laws both in Justinian's Code, and in the Theodosian; as also Godofred. ad Codic. Theodos. tom. vi.

them, appointed the judges of religious controversies, terminated the differences which arose between the bishops and the people, fixed the limits of the ecclesiastical provinces, took cognisance of the civil causes that subsisted between the ministers of the church, and punished the crimes committed against the laws by the ordinary judges appointed for that purpose; leaving all causes purely ecclesiastical to the cognisance of bishops and councils. But this famous division of the administration of the church was never explained with perspicuity, or determined with a sufficient degree of accuracy and precision; so that, both in this and the following centuries, we find many transactions that seem absolutely inconsistent with it. We find the emperors, for example, frequently determining matters purely ecclesiastical, which belonged to the internal jurisdiction of the church; and, on the other hand, nothing is more frequent than the decisions of bishops and councils concerning things that relate merely to the external form and government of the church.

V. In the episcopal order, the bishop of Rome was the first in rank, and was distinguished by a sort of pre-eminence over all other prelates. Prejudices, arising from a great variety of causes, contributed to establish this superiority; but it was chiefly owing to certain circumstances of grandeur and opulence, by which mortals, for the most part, form their ideas of pre-eminence and dignity, and which they generally confound with the reasons of a just and legal authority. The bishop of Rome surpassed all his brethren in the magnificence and splendour of the church over which he presided; in the riches of his revenues and possessions; in the number and variety of his ministers; in his credit with the people; and in his sumptuous and splendid manner of living.[a] These dazzling marks of human power, these seeming proofs of true greatness and felicity, had such a mighty influence upon the minds of the multitude, that the see of Rome became, in this century, a most seducing object of sacerdotal ambition. Hence it happened, that when a new pontiff was to be elected by the suffrages of the presbyters and the people, the city of Rome was generally agitated with dissensions, tumults, and cabals, whose consequences were often deplorable and fatal. The intrigues and disturbances that prevailed in that city in the year 366, when, upon the death of Liberius, another pontiff was to be chosen in his place, are a sufficient proof of what we have now advanced. Upon this occasion, one faction elected Damasus to that high dignity, while the opposite party chose Ursicinus, a deacon of the vacant church, to succeed Liberius. This double election gave rise to a dangerous schism, and even to a civil war within the city of Rome, which was carried on with the utmost barbarity and fury, and produced the most cruel massacres and desolation. This inhuman contest ended in the victory of Damasus; but whether his cause was more just than that of Ursicinus, is a question not so easy to determine.[b] To neither, indeed, can we attribute such principles as constitute a good Christian, much less that exemplary virtue which should distinguish a Christian bishop.

VI. Notwithstanding the pomp and splendour that surrounded the Roman see, it is certain that the bishops of that city had not acquired, in this century, that pre-eminence of power and jurisdiction in the church which they afterwards enjoyed. In the ecclesiastical common wealth, they were, indeed, the most eminent order of citizens; but still they were citizens, as well as their brethren and subject, like them, to the edicts and laws of the emperors. All religious causes of extraordinary importance were examined and determined, either by judges appointed by the emperors, or in councils assembled for that purpose while those of inferior moment were decided, in each district, by its respective bishop. The ecclesiastical laws were enacted, either by the emperor, or by councils. None of the bishops acknowledged that they derived their authority from the permission and appointment of the bishop of Rome, or that they were created bishops by the favour of the apostolic see. On the contrary, they all maintained, that they were the ambassadors and ministers of Jesus Christ, and that their authority was derived from above.[c] It must, however, be observed, that, even in this century, several of those steps were laid, by which the bishops of Rome mounted afterwards to the summit of ecclesiastical power and despotism. These steps were partly laid by the imprudence of the emperors, partly by the dexterity of the Roman prelates themselves, and partly by the inconsiderate zeal and precipitate judgment of certain bishops.[d] [e] The fourth canon of the council, holden at Sardis in the year 347, is considered, by the votaries of the Roman pontiff, as the principal step to his sovereignty in the church; but, in my opinion, it ought by no means to be looked upon in this point of view; for, not to insist upon the reasons that prove the authority of this council to be extremely dubious, or upon those which have induced some to regard its laws as grossly corrupted, and others, to consider them as entirely fictitious and spurious,[e] it will be sufficient to observe the impossibility of proving, by the canon in question, that the bishops of Sardis were of opinion, that, in all cases, an appeal might be made to the bishop of Rome, in quality of supreme judge:[f] but if we suppose, for a moment, that this was their opinion, what would follow? Surely that pretext for assuming a supreme authority, must be very slender, which arises only from the decree of one obscure council.

---

[a] Ammianus Marcellinus gives a striking description of the luxury in which the bishops of Rome lived. See his Hist. lib. xxvii. cap. iii.

[b] Among the other writers of the papal history, see Bower's History of the Popes, vol. i.

[c] Those who desire a more ample account of this matter, may consult Pet. de Marca, de Concordia Sacerdotii et Imperii: Du Pin, de antiqua Ecclesiæ disciplina; and the very learned and judicious work of Blondel, de la Primauté dans l'Eglise.

☞ [d] The imprudence of the emperor, and the precipitation of the bishops, were singularly discovered in the following event, which favoured extremely the rise and the ambition of the Roman pontiff. About the year 372, Valentinian enacted a law, empowering the occupant of the see of Rome to examine and judge other bishops, that religious disputes might not be decided by profane or secular judges. The bishops assembled in council at Rome in 378, not considering the fatal consequences that must arise from this imprudent law, both to themselves and to the church, declared their approbation of it in the strongest terms, and recommended the execution of it in an address to the emperor Gratian. —Some think, indeed, that this law authorised the Roman prelate to judge only the bishops within the limits of his jurisdiction, *i. e.* those of the suburbicarian provinces. Others are of opinion, that this power was given only for a time, and extended to those bishops alone, who were concerned in the present schism. The latter notion seems probable: but still this privilege was an excellent instrument in the hands of sacerdotal ambition.

[e] See Mich. Geddes, Diss. de Canonibus Sardicensibus among his Miscellaneous Tracts, tom. ii.

☞ [f] The fourth canon of the council of Sardis, supposing it genuine and authentic, related only to the particular case of a bishop's being deposed by the neighboring prelates, and demanding permission to make his defence. In that case, this canon prohibited the election of a successor to the deposed individual, before the pontiff had examined the cause and pronounced sentence.

VII. Constantine the Great, by removing the seat of the empire to Byzantium, and building the city of Constantinople, raised up, in the bishop of this new metropolis, a formidable rival to the Roman pontiff, and a bulwark which menaced his growing authority with vigorous opposition; for, as the emperor, in order to render Constantinople a second Rome, enriched it with all the rights and privileges, honours and ornaments, of the ancient capital of the world; so its bishop, measuring his own dignity and rank by the magnificence of the new city, and by its eminence, as the august residence of the emperor, assumed an equal degree of dignity with the bishop of Rome, and claimed a superiority over all the rest of the episcopal order. Nor did the emperors disapprove these high pretensions, since they considered their own dignity as connected, in a certain measure, with that of the bishop of their imperial city. Accordingly, in a council convoked at Constantinople in the year 381, by the authority of Theodosius the Great, the bishop of that city was, during the absence of the bishop of Alexandria, and against the consent of the Roman prelate, placed, by the third canon of that council, in the first rank after the bishop of Rome, and, consequently, above those of Alexandria and Antioch. Nectarius was the first who enjoyed these new honours accumulated upon the see of Constantinople. His successor, the celebrated John Chrysostom, extended the privileges of that see, and subjected to its jurisdiction all Thrace, Asia Minor, and Pontus;[a] nor were the succeeding bishops of that imperial city destitute of a fervent zeal for the augmentation of their privileges and the extension of their dominion.

This sudden revolution in the ecclesiastical government, and this unexpected promotion of the bishop of Byzantium to a higher rank, to the detriment of other prelates of the first eminence in the church, were productive of the most disagreeable effects; for this promotion not only filled the bishops of Alexandria with the bitterest aversion to those of Constantinople, but also excited those deplorable contentions and disputes between the latter and the Roman pontiffs, which were carried on, for many ages, with such various success, and concluded, at length, in the entire separation of the Latin and Greek churches.

VIII. The additions made by the emperors and others to the wealth, honours, and advantages of the clergy, were followed by a proportionable augmentation of vices and luxury, particularly among those of that sacred order, who lived in great and opulent cities; and that many such additions were made to that order after the time of Constantine, is a matter that admits no dispute. The bishops, on one hand, in the most scandalous manner, mutually disputed the extent of jurisdiction; while, on the other, they trampled upon the rights of the people, violated the privileges of the inferior ministers, and imitated, in their conduct and in their manner of living, the arrogance, voluptuousness, and luxury of magistrates and princes.[b] This pernicious example was soon imitated by the several ecclesiastical orders. The presbyters, in many places, assumed an equality with the bishops in point of rank and authority. We find also many complaints made, at this time, of the vanity and effeminacy of the deacons. Those presbyters and deacons, more particularly, who filled the first stations of these orders, carried their pretensions to an extravagant length, and were offended at the notion of being placed upon an equal footing with their colleagues. For this reason, they not only assumed the titles of archpresbyters and archdeacons, but also claimed a degree of authority and power much superior to that which was vested in the other members of their respective orders.

IX. Several writers of great reputation lived in this century, and were shining ornaments to the countries to which they belonged. Among those who flourished in Greece, and in the eastern provinces, the following seem to deserve the first rank.

Eusebius Pamphilus, bishop of Cæsarea in Palestine, was a man of immense reading, justly famous for his profound knowledge of ecclesiastical history, and singularly versed in other branches of literature, more especially in all the different parts of sacred erudition. These eminent talents and acquisitions were, however, accompanied with errors and defects, and he is said to have inclined toward the sentiments of those, who looked upon the three person in the Godhead as different from each other in rank and dignity. Some have represented this learned prelate as a thorough Arian, but without foundation, if by an Arian be meant one who embraces the doctrine taught by Arius, presbyter of Alexandria.[c]

Peter of Alexandria is mentioned by Eusebius with the highest encomiums.[d]

Athanasius, patriarch of Alexandria, is celebrated on account of his learned and pious labours, and particularly famous for his warm and vigorous opposition to the Arians.[e]

Basil, surnamed the Great, bishop of Cæsarea, in point of genius, controversial skill, and a rich and flowing eloquence, was surpassed by very few in this century.[f]

Cyril, bishop of Jerusalem, left some catechetical discourses, which he delivered in that city; he has been accused by many of intimate connexions with the Semi-Arians.[g]

John, surnamed Chrysostom on account of his extraordinary eloquence, a man of a noble genius, governed successively the churches of Antioch and Constantinople,[h] and left several monuments of his profound and extensive eru-

[a] See Pet. de Marca, Diss. de Constantinop. Patriachatus Institutione, subjoined to his book de Concordiâ Sacerdoiti et Imperii; and Mich. Lequien, Oriens Christianus, tom. I. See also an Account of the Government of the Christian Church for the first six hundred years, by Dr. Parker, bishop of Oxford.

[b] See Sulpit. Sever. Hist. Sacr. lib. i. cap. xxiii. lib. ii. cap. xxxii. Dialog. i. cap. xxi. Add to this the account given by Clarkson (in his Discourse upon Liturgies) of the corrupt and profligate manners of the clergy, and, particularly, of the unbounded ambition of the prelates, to enlarge the sphere of their influence and authority.

[c] No writer has accused Eusebius of Arianism, with more bitterness and erudition, than le Clerc, in the second of his Epist. Eccles. et Crit. and Natalis Alexander, Hist. Eccles, Nov. T. Sæc. iv. All, however, hat these writers prove, is, that Eusebius maintained that a certain disparity and subordination subsisted between the persons of the Godhead. If we suppose this to have been his opinion, it will not thence follow that he was an Arian, unless that word be taken in a very extensive and improper sense. Nothing is more common than the abusive application of this term to persons, who have entertained opinions opposite to those of Arius, though perhaps they may have erred in other respects.

[d] Hist. Eccles. lib. ix. cap. vi.

[e] Eusebius Renaudot, in his History of the Patriarchs of Alexandria, has collected all the accounts which the Oriental writers give of Athanasius, of whose works the learned and justly celebrated Benedictine, Bernard de Montfaucon, gave a splendid edition.

[f] The works of Bazil were published at Paris by Julian Garnier, a learned Benedictine.

[g] The later editions of the works of this prelate, are those published by Mr. Milles, and by Augustus Toutee, a Benedictine monk.

[h] It must not be understood by this, that Chrysostom was bishop of both these churches; he was preacher at Antioch, (a function, indeed

dition; as also discourses[a] which he had preached with great applause.

Epiphanius, bishop of Salamis, in the isle of Cyprus, wrote a book against all the heresies that had sprung up in the church until his time. This work has little or no reputation, as it is full of inaccuracies and errors, and betrays in almost every page the levity and ignorance of its author.[b]

Gregory Nazianzen and Gregory of Nyssa have obtained a very honourable place among the celebrated theological and polemic writers of this century, and not without foundation, as their works sufficiently testify.[c] Their reputation, indeed, would have yet been more confirmed, had they been less attached to the writings of Origen,[d] and less infected with the false and vicious eloquence of the sophists.

Ephraim the Syrian acquired an immortal name by the sanctity of his conversation and manners, and by the multitude of those excellent works in which he combated the sectaries, explained the sacred writings, and unfolded the moral duties and obligations of Christians.[e]

Beside the learned men now mentioned, there are several others, of whose writings but a small number have survived the ruins of time; such as Pamphilus, a martyr, and an intimate friend of Eusebius; Diodorus, bishop of Tarsus; Hosius, of Cordova; Didymus, of Alexandria; Eustathius, bishop of Antioch; Amphilochius, bishop of Iconium; Palladius, the writer of the Lausiac History;[f] Macarius, the elder and the younger; Apollinaris the elder; and some others, who are frequently mentioned on account of their erudition, and the remarkable events in which they were concerned.

X. The Latins also were not without writers of considerable note, the principal of whom we shall point out here.

Hilary, bishop of Poictiers, acquired a name by twelve books concerning the Trinity, which he wrote against the Arians, and several other productions. He was a man of penetration and genius; notwithstanding which, he has, for the most part, rather copied in his writings Tertullian and Origen, than given us the fruits of his own study and invention.[g]

Lactantius,[h] the most eloquent of the Latin writers in this century, exposed the absurdity of the pagan superstitions in his Divine Institutions, which are written with uncommon purity and eloquence. He wrote also upon other subjects, but was much more successful in refuting the errors of others, than careful in observing and correcting his own.[i]

Ambrose, præfect, and afterwards bishop of Milan, was not destitute of a certain degree of elegance both of genius and style; his sentiments of things were, by no means, absurd; but he did not escape the prevailing defect of that age, a want of solidity, accuracy, and order.[k]

Jerome, a monk of Palestine, rendered, by his learned and zealous labours, such eminent services to the Christian cause, as will hand down his name with honour to the latest posterity. But this superior and illustrious merit was accompanied, and in some measure, obscured, by very great defects. His complexion was excessively warm and choleric, his bitterness against those who differed from him extremely keen, and his thirst of glory insatiable. He was so prone to censure, that several persons, whose lives were not only irreproachable, but even exemplary, became the objects of his unjust accusations. All this, joined to his superstitious turn of mind, and the enthusiastic encomiums which he lavished upon a false and degenerate sort of piety which prevailed in his time, sunk his reputation greatly, even in the esteem of the candid and the wise. His writings are voluminous, but not all equally adapted to instruct and edify. His interpretations of the holy scriptures, and his epistles, are those of his productions which seem the most proper to be read with profit;[l]

The fame of Augustin, bishop of Hippo in Africa, filled the whole Christian world; and not without reason, as a variety of great and shining qualities were united in the character of that illustrious man. A sublime genius, an uninterrupted and zealous pursuit of truth, an indefatigable application, an invincible patience, a sincere piety, and a subtle and lively wit, conspired to establish his fame upon the most lasting foundations. It is, however, certain, that the accuracy and solidity of his judgment were, by no means, proportionable to the eminent talents now mentioned; and that, on many occasions, he was more guided by the violent impulse of a warm imagination, than by the cool dictates of reason and prudence. Hence arose that ambiguity which appears in his writings, and which has sometimes rendered the most attentive readers uncertain with respect to his real sentiments; and hence also the just complaints which many have made of the contradictions

---

which before him was always attached to the episcopal dignity,) and afterwards patriarch of Constantinople.

[a] The best edition of the works of Chrysostom, is that published by Montfaucon, in eleven volumes folio.

[b] The works of Epiphanius were translated into Latin, and published with notes, by the learned Petau. His life, written by Gervase, appeared at Paris in 1738.

[c] There are some good editions of these two writers, which we owe to the care and industry of two learned French editors of the seventeenth century,—☞ namely, the abbot Billy, who published the works of Gregory Nazianzen at Paris, in 1609, with a Latin translation and learned notes, and father Fronton du Duc, who published those of Gregory of Nyssa in 1605.

☞ [d] The charge of Origenism seems to have been adduced by the ancient writers only against Gregory of Nyssa.

[e] There is a large and accurate account of this excellent writer in the Biblioth. Oriental Vatic. of Joseph Simon Asseman, tom. 1. Several works of Ephraim were published at Oxford in Greek; and of these Gerard Vossius has given a Latin translation. An edition of the same works, in Syriac, appeared at Rome, under the auspices of Steph. Euod. Asseman.

☞ [f] This is the history of the solitaries, or hermits, which derived the name of Lausiac history from Lausus, governor of Cappadocia, at whose request it was composed, and to whom it was dedicated by Palladius.

[g] There is a very accurate and ample account of Hilary, in the Histoire de la France, tom. i. The best edition we have of his works is that published by the French Benedictines.

[h] See a complete account of Lactantius, Histoire Literaire de la France, tom. i.

☞ [i] Lactantius considers Christ's mission as having no other end, than that of leading mankind to virtue by the most sublime precepts and the most perfect example. The charge of Manicheism, brought against this eminent writer, is refuted in the most evident and satisfactory manner by Dr. Lardner, in the seventh volume of his Credibility of the Gospel History, where the reader may find an ample and interesting account of his character and writings. Among those who have been editors of the works of Lactantius, the most reputed are Bunemann, Heumann, Walchius, and Lenglet du Fresnoy.

[k] The works of St. Ambrose have been published, by the Benedictines, in two volumes in folio.

[l] The defects of Jerome are exposed by Le Clerc, in his Quæst. Hieronym. published at Amsterdam in 1700. The Benedictine monks have given an edition of the works of this father in five volumes republished at Verona by Vallarsius with considerable additions.

that are so frequent in his works, and of the levity and precipitation with which he set himself to write upon a variety of subjects before he had examined them with a sufficient degree of attention and diligence.[a]

Optatus, bishop of Milevi in Numidia, acquired no small degree of reputation, by a work which he wrote against the schism of the Donatists.[b]

Paulinus, bishop of Nola, wrote some poems and epistles, which are still extant. They are not remarkable either for their excellence or their meanness.[c]

Rufinus, presbyter of Aquileia, is famous on account of his Latin translations of Origen and other Greek writers, his commentaries on several books of the holy scriptures, and his bitter contest with Jerome. He would have obtained a very honourable place among the Latin writers of this century, had it not been his misfortune to have the powerful and foul-mouthed Jerome for his adversary.[d]

As to Philastrius, Damasus, Juvensus, and other writers of that obscure class, we refer the reader, for an account of them, to those authors whose principal object is to give an exact enumeration of the Christian writers. We shall add, nevertheless, to the list already given, Sulpitius Severus, by birth a Gaul, and the most eminent historical writer of this century;[e] as also Prudentius, a Spaniard, a poet of a happy and elegant genius.

CHAPTER III.

Concerning the Doctrine of the Christian Church in this Century.

I. THE fundamental principles of the Christian doctrine were preserved hitherto incorrupt and entire in most churches, though it must be confessed, that they were often explained and defended in a manner that discovered the greatest ignorance, and an utter confusion of ideas. The disputes carried on in the council of Nice, concerning the three persons in the Godhead, afford a remarkable example of this, particularly in the language and explanations of those who approved the decisions of that council. So little light, precision, and order, reigned in their discourses, that they appeared to substitute three gods, in the place of one.

Nor did the evil end here; for those vain fictions, which an attachment to the Platonic philosophy, and to popular opinions, had engaged the greatest part of the Christian doctors to adopt, before the time of Constantine, were now confirmed, enlarged, and embellished, in various ways. Hence arose that extravagant veneration for departed saints, and those absurd notions of a certain *fire* destined to purify separate souls, that now prevailed, and of which the public marks were every where to be seen. Hence also the celibacy of priests, the worship of images and relics, which, in process of time, almost utterly destroyed the Christian religion, or at least eclipsed its lustre, and corrupted its very essence in the most deplorable manner.

II. An enormous train of different superstitions were gradually substituted for true religion and genuine piety. This odious revolution proceeded from a variety of causes. A ridiculous precipitation in receiving new opinions, a preposterous desire of imitating the pagan rites, and of blending them with the Christian worship, and that idle propensity, which the generality of mankind have toward a gaudy and ostentatious religion, all contributed to establish the reign of superstition upon the ruins of Christianity. Accordingly, frequent pilgrimages were undertaken to Palestine, and to the tombs of the martyrs, as if there alone the sacred principles of virtue and the certain hope of salvation were to be acquired.[g] The reins being once let loose to superstition, which knows no bounds, absurd notions and idle ceremonies multiplied almost every day. Quantities of dust and earth brought from Palestine, and other places remarkable for their supposed sanctity, were handed about as the most powerful remedies against the violence of wicked spirits, and were sold and bought every where at enormous prices.[f] The public processions and supplications, by which the Pagans endeavoured to appease their gods, were now adopted into the Christian worship, and celebrated in many places with great pomp and magnificence. The virtues which had formerly been ascribed to the heathen temples, to their lustrations, to the statues of their gods and heroes, were now attributed to Christian churches, to water consecrated by certain forms of prayer, and to the images of holy men. And the same privileges, that the former enjoyed under the darkness of Paganism, were conferred upon the latter under the light of the Gospel, or, rather, under that cloud of superstition which was obscuring its glory. It is true, that, as yet, images were not very common; nor were there any statues at all. But it is, at the same time, as undoubtedly certain, as it is extravagant and monstrous, that the worship of the martyrs was modelled, by degrees, according to the religious services that were paid to the gods before the coming of Christ.[h]

From these facts, which are but small specimens of the state of Christianity at this time, the discerning reader will easily perceive what detriment the church received from the peace and prosperity procured by Constantine, and from the imprudent methods employed to allure the different nations to embrace the Gospel. The brevity we have proposed to observe in this history, prevents our entering into an ample detail of the dismal effects that arose from the progress and the baneful influence of superstition, which had now become universal.

III. This, indeed, among other unhappy effects, opened

[a] An accurate and splendid edition of the works of St. Augustin, has been given by the Benedictines, since that of the divines of Louvain. This elegant edition bears the title of Antwerp, where it was published, with some augmentations, by Le Clerc, under the fictitious name of Jo. Phereponus. The Jesuits, however, pretend to have found many defects in this edition.

[b] Since the edition of Optatus, published by Albaspinæus, another has appeared, which we owe to the care and industry of M. Du-Pin, doctor of the Sorbonne.

[c] The best edition of Paulinus is that which was published at Paris, in 1685, by Le Brun.

☞ [d] Rufinus and Jerome had lived for many years in the most intimate and tender friendship, which ended in a violent rupture, on occasion of a translation which the former made of some of the works of Origen, particularly his Book of Principles. For an account of Rufinus, see Rich. Simon, Critique de la Bibliotheque des Auteurs Eccles. par M. Du-Pin, tom. i. An ample account of the same writer is given by Justus Fontaninus, Hist. Literar. Aquileiens. lib. v.

[e] See Histoire Literaire de la France, tom. ii.; and consult also Hieron. a Prato, who has written, with great accuracy, the life of this historian.

[f] See Gregor. Mysseni Orat. ad eos qui Hierosolymam adeunt, tom. iii. op.—Hieronym. Epist. xiii. ad Paulinum de instituto Monachi, tom. i.—Jac. Godofred. ad Codicem Theodosian. tom. vi.—Petri Wesselingii Dissertat. de causis Peregrinat. Hierosolymit. quam Itinerario Burdigalensi præmisit, inter vetera Romanor. Itineraria, p. 537.

[g] Augustinus, de Civitates Dei, lib. xxii. cap. viii. sect. 6.

[h] For a full account of this matter, see Beausobre, Hist. du Manicheisme, tom. ii.

a wide door to the endless frauds of those odious impostors, who were so far destitute of all principle, as to enrich themselves by the ignorance and errors of the people. Rumors were artfully spread abroad of prodigies and miracles to be seen in certain places (a trick often practised by the heathen priests); and the design of these reports was to draw the populace, in multitudes, to these places, and to impose upon their credulity. These stratagems were generally successful; for the ignorance and slowness of apprehension of the people, to whom every thing that is new and singular appears miraculous, rendered them easily the dupes of this abominable artifice.[a] Nor was this all; certain tombs were falsely given out for the sepulchres of saints[b] and confessors; the list of the saints was augmented with fictitious names, and even robbers were converted into martyrs.[c] Some buried the bones of dead men in certain retired places, and then affirmed, that they were divinely admonished, by a dream, that the body of some friend of God lay there.[d] Many, especially of the monks, travelled through the different provinces; and not only sold, with the most frontless impudence, their fictitious relics, but also deceived the eyes of the multitude with ludicrous combats with evil spirits or genii.[e] A whole volume would be requisite to contain an enumeration of the various frauds which artful knaves practised, with success, to delude the ignorant, when true religion was almost entirely superseded by horrid superstition.

IV. Many of the learned, in this century, undertook translations of the Scriptures; but few succeeded in this arduous enterprise. Among the many Latin versions of the sacred books, that of Jerome was distinguished by its undoubted superiority.[f] The same ingenious and indefatigable writer, whose skill in the languages was by no means inconsiderable, employed much pains upon the Greek version of the seventy interpreters, in order to give a more correct edition of it than had appeared before his time; and it is said that Eusebius, Athanasius, and Euthalius, had embarked in an undertaking of the same nature.[g] Of interpreters the number was very considerable, among whom Jerome, Hilary, Eusebius, Diodorus of Tarsus, Rufinus, Ephraim the Syrian, Theodore of Heraclea, Chrysostom, Athanasius, and Didymus, are generally esteemed worthy of the first rank. It is however certain, that, even of these first-rate commentators, few have discovered a just discernment, or a sound judgment, in their laborious expositions of the sacred writings. Rufinus, Theodore, and Diodorus, with some others, have, indeed, followed the natural signification of the words;[h] the rest, after the example of Origen, are laborious in the search of far-fetched interpretations, and pervert the expressions of Scripture, which they very imperfectly understand, by applying them, or rather straining them to points with which they have no connexion.[i] St. Augustin and Tychonius endeavoured to establish plain and wise rules for the interpretation of Scripture; but their efforts were unsuccessful.[k]

V. The doctrines of Christianity had not a better fate than the sacred writings from which they are drawn. Origen was the great model whom the most eminent of the Christian doctors followed in their explications of the truths of the Gospel, which were consequently explained, according to the rules of the Platonic philosophy, as it was corrected and modified by that learned father for the instruction of the youth. Those who desire a more ample and accurate account of this matter, may consult Gregory Nazianzen among the Greeks, and Augustin among the Latins, who were followed, for a long time, as the only patterns worthy of imitation, and who next to Origen, may be considered as the parents and supporters of the *philosophical* or *scholastic theology*. They were both zealous Platonists; and holding, for certain, all the tenets of that philosopher which were not totally repugnant to the truths of Christianity, they laid them down as fundamental principles, and drew from them a great variety of subtile conclusions, which neither Christ nor Plato ever thought of.

This, however, was not the only sect that flourished at this time. That order of fanatics, who maintained that the knowledge of divine truth was to be acquired, not by reasoning, but by still contemplation, and by turning the eye of the mind upon itself in an entire absence from all external and sensible objects, became now much more numerous. This appears from many circumstances, particularly from the swarms of monks that almost overspread the Christian world, and also from the books of Dionysius, the pretended chief of the Mystics, which seem to have been forged in this century, under that venerable name, by some member of that fanatical tribe.

VI. Among the writers of this century, who published expositions of the Christian doctrine, the first place is due to Cyril of Jerusalem, justly celebrated for his catechetical discourses, which nothing but a partial blindness to the truth could have induced any to attribute to a more modern author.[l] Some have ranked Lactantius in the class of writers now under consideration, but without reason, since it is well known, that the labours of that eloquent author were rather employed in refuting the errors of idolatry, than in explaining the truths of the Gospel. The System of Doctrine addressed to the Clergy and Laity, which, by many, has been attributed to Athanasius, seems to be of a much later date. There are, however, many things in the works of Chrysostom, Athanasius, the Gregories, and others, by which we may be enabled to form a just idea of the manner in which the principal points of the Christian doctrine were explained by learned men in this century. We may more particularly be assisted in this matter by the twelve books of Hilary concerning the Trinity; the Ancoratus of Epiphanius, in which the doctrine of Scripture, concerning Christ and the Holy Ghost, is explained at large; the treatise of Pacian, concerning baptism, addressed to the catechumens; and the two

[a] Henry Dodwell, Disser. ii. in Irenæum, sect. 56. Le Clerc, in his Appendix Augustinian. p. 492, 550, 575.
[b] Concil. Carthag. v. Can. xiv.
[c] Sulpitius Severus, de vitæ S. Mârtini, cap. viii.
[d] Augustin. Serm. cccxviii. sect. i. tom. v. op.
[e] See Godofred. ad cod. Theod. tom. iii.—Augustin. de opere Monachor. cap. xxviii. sect. 36. Hieronymi. Epist. ad Rusticum, tom. i. op.
[f] Jo. Franc. Buddei Isagoge ad Theologiam, tom. ii.
[g] Frickius, de Canone N. T.
[h] Simon, Critique de la Bibliotheque des Auteurs Ecclesiast. par Du-Pin, tom. i. iv. as also Hist. Critique des principaux Commentateurs du N. T. cap. vi.
[i] See Gregor. Nazianz. Carmen de Seipso, in Tollius' Insignia Itineris Italici.
[k] This may be seen in the six books which Augustin wrote concerning the Christian doctrine, and in the rules of interpretation laid down by Tychonius, which are to be found in the Biblioth. Patr. Maxim. tom. vi.
[l] See Jo. Fechtii Comment. de Origine Missarum in Honorem Sanctorum, p. 404.

books of Chrysostom on the same subject. We need not mention here the various works of Jerome and Augustin, in which appear the laborious and noble efforts of those great men to inspire into the minds of the people just notions of religion, and to detect and refute the errors of those who were enemies of the truth.

VII. The controversial writings, that were levelled against those who were considered as heretics, were entirely destitute of that ancient simplicity, which is the natural and the beautiful garb of truth. That simplicity was now succeeded by logical subtilties, acute sophisms, sharp invectives, and other disingenuous arts, more worthy of the patrons of error, than the defenders of that 'wisdom which is from above.' We find, accordingly, many great and eminent men complaining of this abuse, and endeavouring in vain to oppose the muddy torrent of scurrility and dialectic that was overflowing the Christian schools.[a] I pass in silence those rhetorical figures and ornaments, by which many evaded the arguments of their adversaries, and artfully perplexed the true state of the case; that odious custom, also, observed by some, of exciting the popular resentment against those who differed from them, and the total want of order and of perspicuity, chargeable upon almost all. Several writers of this age are so far from disowning these indecorous qualities, that they seem, on the contrary, to glory in them. It must, indeed, be observed, that the adversaries of the truth used the same inglorious arms, though this does not in the least diminish the reproach which is on that account due to its friends.

VIII. New methods of disputing were also added to those which were practised in former times; for the truth of a doctrine was now proved by the number of martyrs that had professed it, by miracles, by the confession of *dæmons*, i. e. of persons possessed with evil spirits. The smallest degree of discernment will persuade any one how ambiguous this method of reasoning was; how dangerous to the truth, by furnishing innumerable occasions for the exercise of fraud and imposture; and I apprehend, that the greatest part of those who used such arguments, however illustrious and respectable they may have been, will be found, upon examination, chargeable with the dangerous and criminal design of imposing upon their brethren. Ambrose, in his disputes with the Arians, produced men possessed with devils, who on the approach of the relics of Gervasius and Protasius, were obliged to acknowledge, with loud cries, that the doctrine of the council of Nice, concerning the three persons of the godhead, was true; and that of the Arians not only false, but also of most dangerous consequence. This testimony of the prince of darkness was regarded by Ambrose, as an unexceptionable argument in favour of his hypothesis. The Arians, on the other hand, held this prodigy in the utmost derision, and maintained that Ambrose had suborned these infernal witnesses by a weighty bribe;[b] and I make no doubt that many will be more disposed to believe the Arians, than to credit Ambrose, though he be enrolled in the order of the saints, and they stigmatised in the list of heretics.[c]

IX. There were, in this century, several controversialists of considerable note; for, beside Apollinaris, Gregory Nazianzen, Cyril of Alexandria, and others who distinguished themselves in the lists against the emperor Julian, many others disputed, with victorious force and a happy success, against the worshippers of the gods. Of this number were, Lactantius, Athanasius, Julius Firmicus Maternus, Apollinaris the younger, whose excellent writings against Porphyry are unhappily lost; Augustin, in those books of the City of God, and in the three books against the Pagans, which have also perished; and, above all, Eusebius of Cæsarea, in his Evangelical Preparation, and his book against Hierocles. Eusebius Emesenus, Diodorus of Tarsus, and St. Chrysostom, whose treatise on the subject is still extant, employed their learned labours to bring over the Jews to the profession of Christianity. Ephraim the Syrian,[d] James of Nisibis, Didymus, and Audentius, attacked the whole body of heretics; as did also Epiphanius, in his voluminous work concerning heresies, entitled Panarium, and Gregory Nazianzen with more brevity in his discourse concerning faith. The books of Augustin and Philastrius, on the same subject, contain rather a list than a refutation of the several sects.

X. If the growth and perfection of a science were to be estimated by the multitude of writers it produces, that of *morals* must have flourished greatly at this time; for a very considerable number of persons applied themselves to that excellent study. Among the eastern writers, James, bishop of Nisibis,[e] and Ephraim, bishop of Syria, became eminent for their zeal and assiduity in inculcating the precepts of morality. The writings of Basil the Great, Gregory of Nyssa, Chrysostom, Ambrose, Augustin, and several others, upon moral subjects, are neither worthy of high encomiums, nor of entire contempt, as they contain a strange mixture of excellent reflections, and insipid details, concerning the duties of the Christian life. Among the productions of these writers, many give the preference to the three books of Ambrose, concerning the duty of the ministers of the church, which are written in the manner of Cicero, and are justly commended for the pious intention they discover, and the beautiful sentiments they contain though there be many things in them worthy of reprehension. But Macarius, an Egyptian monk,[f] undoubtedly deserves the first rank among the practical writers of this time, as his works display, some few things excepted,[g] the brightest and most lovely portraiture of sanctity and virtue.

XI. It must, however, be observed, that almost all the writers of this class are defective in several respects. They have been entirely negligent of order in their compositions, and have taken no sort of care to treat with method and precision the subjects they undertook to explain. They seldom define their terms, and pour out their pious but

---

[a] Methodius apud Epiphanium, Hæres. lxiv. tom. i. op.—Gregor. Nazian. in many places; and others.

[b] Ambros. Epist. xxii. Paulinus, vita Ambrosii, p. 81.

[c] See Le Clerc, Appendix Augustiniana, p. 375. Gregor. Nyss. vita Gregorii Neocæsariensis, tom. ii. op. Sulpitius Severus, Hist. Sacr. lib. ii. cap. xxxviii.

[d] See Jos. Sim. Asseman. Biblioth. Oriental. Clement. Vatic. tom. i. p. 118, 125. From the extracts, which this learned compiler has given of the works of Ephraim, it appears that he was more distinguished by his piety and genius, than by his skill in the management of controversy.

[e] Jos. Sim. Assemanus, in the work quoted in the preceding note, tom. i., thinks, that the writings attributed to the bishop of Nisibis, belong rather to the bishop of Saruga; he however corrects, in some measure, this notion in his Addenda, p. 558.

[f] See the Acta Sanctorum, tom. i. Januar. p. 1005.

☞ [g] The things here excepted by Dr. Mosheim, are some superstitious tenets that are to be found in the writings of Macarius, and also certain opinions that seem tainted with Origenism.

incoherent ideas in fortuitous combinations, just as they offer themselves. They, moreover, neglect deducing the duties of mankind from their true principles, and even sometimes derive them from doctrines and precepts which are either manifestly false, or, at least, whose nature and meaning are not determined with any degree of accuracy. And hence it is, that the greatest part of them are extremely defective, when they come to demonstrate the obligations of virtue, and the incongruity and unfitness of vice. These pretended demonstrations, instead of being deduced by proper conclusions from the reason of things and the divine laws, are nothing more than a collection of airy fancies, cold and insipid allegories, quaint and subtile conceits, which are more proper to afford amusement to the imagination, than light to the understanding, or conviction to the judgment.

XII. But, however defective this method of inculcating the duties of morality may have been, it was much more tolerable than that which was followed by the amphibious disciples of Christ and Plato, those Alexandrian philosophers, of whom Ammonius Sacca was the chief. The double doctrine of morals which they invented, and which was compounded of two systems, one surpassing the other in perfection, gained much ground in this century, to the great detriment of true religion. A circumstance that strongly tends to convince us of the growth and progress of this fanatical sect is, that those who in former times had inculcated a secret doctrine concerning divine things, totally different from that which was publicly propagated among the multitude, gave now the finishing touch to this doctrine, and formed it into a system. The famous Grecian fanatic, who declared himself to be Dionysius the Areopagite, disciple of St. Paul, and who, under the protection of this venerable name, gave laws and instructions to such as were desirous of raising their souls above all human things, in order to unite them to their great source by sublime contemplation, lived most probably in this century, though some place him before, others after the present period.[a] No sooner were the writings and instructions of this fanatic handed about among the Greeks and Syrians, and particularly among the solitaries and monks, than a gloomy cloud of religious darkness began to spread itself over the minds of many. An incredible number of proselytes joined those chimerical sectaries, who maintained that communion with God was to be sought by mortifying the senses, by withdrawing the mind from all external objects, by macerating the body with hunger and labour, and by a holy sort of indolence, which confined all the activity of the soul to a lazy contemplation of things spiritual and eternal.

XIII. The progress of this sect appears evidently from the prodigious number of solitary monks and sequestered virgins, which, upon the return of tranquillity to the church, had over-run the whole Christian world with an amazing rapidity. Many of this order of men had, for a long time, been known among the Christians, and had led silent and solitary lives in the deserts of Egypt; but Antony was the first who formed them into a regular body, engaged them to live in society with each other, and prescribed rules to them for the direction of their conduct.[b] These regulations, which Antony brought forward in Egypt in 305, were, in the year following, introduced into Palestine and Syria, by his disciple Hilarion. Almost about the same time, Aones and Eugenius, with their companions Gaddanas and Azyzus, instituted the monastic order in Mesopotamia and the adjacent countries;[c] and their example was followed with such rapid success, that, in a short time, the east was filled with a lazy set of mortals, who, abandoning all human connexions, advantages, pleasures, and concerns, wore out a languishing and miserable life, amidst the hardships of want and various kinds of suffering, in order to arrive at a more close and rapturous communion with God and angels. The Christian church would never have been disgraced by this cruel and insocial enthusiasm, nor would any have been subjected to those keen torments of mind and body to which it gave rise, had not many Christians been unwarily caught by the specious appearance and the pompous sound of that maxim of the ancient philosophy, "That, in order to the attainment of true felicity and communion with God, it was necessary that the soul should be separated from the body, even here below, and that the body was to be macerated and mortified for this purpose."

XIV. From the east this gloomy institution passed into the west, and first into Italy, and its neighbouring islands, though it is utterly uncertain who transplanted it thither.[d] St. Martin, the celebrated bishop of Tours, erected the first monasteries in Gaul, and recommended this religious solitude with such power and efficacy, both by his instructions and his example, that his funeral is said to have been attended by no less than two thousand monks.[e] Thence, the monastic discipline gradually extended its progress through the other provinces and countries of Europe.

It is, however, proper to observe, that there was a great difference in point of austerity between the western and oriental monks; the former of whom could never be brought to bear the severe rules to which the latter voluntarily submitted. And, indeed, the reason of this difference may be partly derived from the nature of the respective climates in which they dwelt. The European countries abound not so much with delirious fanatics, or with persons of a morose and austere complexion, as those arid regions

[a] Those who have written concerning this impostor, are enumerated by Jo. Franc. Buddeus, in his Isagoge ad Theologiam, lib. ii. cap. iv. See also Jo. Launoii Judicium de Scriptis Dionysii. tom. ii. op. part i. La Croze (in his Histoire du Christianisme d'Ethiopie,) endeavours to prove, that Synesius, an Egyptian bishop, and also the most celebrated philosopher of the fifth century, composed the writings attributed to Dionysius, in order to defend the doctrine of those who held, that Christ only possessed one nature. The arguments, however, of La Croze are weak. Nor are those more satisfactory, which the learned Baratier has employed, in a dissertation added to his book de Successione Rom. Episcop. p. 286, to prove that Dionysius of Alexandria was the true author of the writings in question.

[b] For a full account of Antony, and the discipline established by him, see the Acta Sanctorum, tom. ii. Januar. ad d. 17.

[c] See Jos. Simon. Asseman. Biblioth. Oriental. Clement. Vatican, tom. iii. part ii.

[d] Most writers, following the opinion of Baronius, maintain that St. Athanasius brought the monastic institution from Egypt into Italy, about the year 340, and was the first who built a monastery at Rome. See Mabillon, Præf. ad Acta Sanctorum Ord. Bened. tom. i.——The learned Muratori (Antiq. Ital. tom. v.) combats this opinion, and pretends that the first monastery known in Europe, was erected at Milan; and Just. Fontaninus, in his Hist. Liter. Aquileiens. affirms, that the first society of monks was formed at Aquileia. But these writers do not produce unexceptionable evidence for their opinions. If we may give credit to the Ballerini (Dissert. ii. ad Zenonem Veronensem,) the first convent of nuns was erected toward the end of this century, at Verona, by Zeno, bishop of that city.

[e] See Sulpit. Sever. de vita Martini, cap. x. p. 17, edit. Veron., where the method of living, used by the Martinian monks, is accurately described. See also Histoire Literaire de la France, tom. i. part ii. p. 42.

that lie toward the burning east; nor are our bodies capable of supporting that rigid and abstemious method of living, which is familiar and easy to those who are placed under a glowing firmament, and breathe in a sultry and scorching atmosphere. It was, therefore, rather the name only than the thing itself, which was transported into the European countries,[a] though this name was indeed accompanied with a certain resemblance or distant imitation of the monastic life instituted by Antony and others in the east.

XV. The monastic order, of which we have been taking a general view, was distributed into several classes. It was first divided into two distinct orders, of which one received the denomination of Cœnobites, the other that of Eremites. The former lived together in a fixed habitation, and made up one large community under a chief, whom they called *father*, or *abbot*, which signifies the same thing in the Egyptian language. The latter drew out a wretched life in perfect solitude, and were scattered here and there in caves, in deserts, in the cavities of rocks, sheltered from the wild beasts only by the cover of a miserable cottage, in which each lived sequestered from the rest of his species.

The Anchorets were yet more excessive in the austerity of their manner of living than the Eremites. They frequented the wildest deserts without either tents or cottages; nourished themselves with the roots and herbs which grew spontaneously out of the uncultivated ground; wandered about without having any fixed abode, reposing wherever the approach of night happened to find them; and all this, that they might avoid the view and the society of mortals.[b]

Another order of monks were those wandering fanatics, or rather impostors, whom the Egyptians called Sarabaites, who, instead of procuring a subsistence by honest industry, travelled through various cities and provinces, and gained a maintenance by fictitious miracles, by selling relics to the multitude, and other frauds of a like nature.

Many of the Cœnobites were chargeable with vicious and scandalous practices. This order, however, was not so generally corrupt as that of the Sarabaites, who were for the most part profligates of the most abandoned kind. As to the Eremites, they seem to have deserved no other reproach than that of a delirious and extravagant fanaticism.[c] All these different orders were hitherto composed of the laity, and were subject to the jurisdiction and the inspection of the bishops. But many of them were now adopted among the clergy, even by the command of the emperors; and the fame of monastic piety and sanctity became so general, that bishops were frequently chosen out of that fanatical order.[d]

XVI. If the enthusiastic phrensy of the monks exaggerated, in a manner pernicious to the interests of morality, the discipline that is obligatory upon Christians, the interests of virtue and true religion suffered yet more grievously by two monstrous errors which were almost universally adopted in this century, and became a source of innumerable calamities and mischiefs in the succeeding ages. Of these maxims one was, "That it was an act of virtue to deceive and lie, when by such means the interests of the church might be promoted;" and the second, equally horrible, though in another point of view, was, that "errors in religion, when maintained and adhered to, after proper admonition, were punishable with civil penalties and corporeal tortures." Of these erroneous maxims the former was now of a long standing; it had been adopted for some ages past, and had produced an incredible number of ridiculous fables, fictitious prodigies, and pious frauds, to the unspeakable detriment of that glorious cause in which they were employed. And it must be frankly confessed, that the greatest men, and most eminent saints of this century, were more or less tainted with the infection of this corrupt principle, as will appear evidently to such as look with an attentive eye into their writings and their actions. We would willingly except from this charge Ambrose and Hilary, Augustin, Gregory Nazianzen, and Jerome; but truth, which is more respectable than these venerable fathers, obliges us to involve them in the general accusation. We may add also, that it was, probably, the contagion of this pernicious maxim, that engaged Sulpitius Severus, who is far from being, in general, a puerile or credulous historian, to attribute so many miracles to St. Martin. The other maxim, relating to the justice and expediency of punishing error, was introduced in those serene and peaceful times which the accession of Constantine to the imperial throne procured to the church. It was from that period approved by many, enforced by several examples during the contests that arose with the Priscillianists and Donatists, confirmed and established by the authority of Augustin, and thus transmitted to the following ages.

XVII. When we cast an eye toward the lives and morals of Christians at this time, w efind, as formerly, a mixture of good and evil; some eminent for their piety, others infamous for their crimes. The number, however, of immoral and unworthy Christians began so to increase, that the examples of real piety and virtue became extremely rare. When the terrors of persecution were totally dispelled; when the church, secured from the efforts of its enemies, enjoyed the sweets of prosperity and peace; when the major part of the bishops exhibited to their flock the contagious examples of arrogance, luxury, effeminacy, animosity, and strife, with other vices too numerous to mention; when the inferior rulers and doctors of the church fell into a slothful and opprobrious negligence of the duties

[a] This difference between the *discipline* of the eastern and western monks, and the cause of it, have been ingeniously remarked by Sulpitius Severus, Dial. i. de Vita Martini, where one of the interlocutors, in the dialogue, having mentioned the abstemious and wretched diet of the Egyptian monks, adds what follows: "Placetne tibi prandium, fasciculus herbarum et panis dimidius viris quinque?" To this question the Gaul answers, "Facis tuo more, qui nullam occasionem omittis, quin nos (i. e. the Gallic monks) edacitatis fatiges. Sed facis inhumanè, qui nos Gallos homines cogis exemplo angelorum vivere—Sed contentus sit hoc [*prandio*] Cyrenensis ille, cui vel necessitas vel natura est esurire: nos, *quod tibi sæpe testatus sum, Galli sumus.*" The same speaker, in the above-mentioned dialogue, cap. viii. reproaches Jerome with having accused the monks of gluttony; and proceeds thus: "Sentio de orientalibus illum potius monachis, quam de occidentalibus disputâsse; nam edacitas in Græcis et Orientalibus gula est, in Gallis natura." It appears, therefore, that, immediately after the introduction of the monastic order into Europe, the western differed greatly from the eastern monks in their manners and discipline, and were, in consequence of this, accused by the latter of voraciousness and gluttony.

[b] See Sulpit. Sever. Dial. i. de vita Martini, cap. x.

[c] Whoever is desirous of a more ample account of the vices of the monks of this century, may consult the above-mentioned dialogue of Sulp. Sever. cap. viii. p. 69, 70. cap. xxi. p. 88, where he particularly chastises the arrogance and ambition of those who aspired to clerical honours. See also Dial. ii. cap. viii. and also cap. xv., and Consultat. Apollonii et Zachæi, published by Dacherius, Spicileg. tom. i. lib. iii. cap. iii.

[d] See J. Godofred. ad Codicem Theodosianum, tom. vi.

of their respective stations, and employed, in vain wranglings and idle disputes, that zeal and attention which were due to the culture of piety and to the instruction of their people; and when (to complete the enormity of this horrid detail) multitudes were drawn into the profession of Christianity, not by the power of conviction and argument, but by the prospect of gain or by the fear of punishment; then it was, indeed, no wonder that the church was contaminated with shoals of profligate Christians, and that the virtuous few were, in a manner, oppressed and overwhelmed by the superior numbers of the wicked and licentious. It is true, that the same rigourous penitence, which had taken place before the time of Constantine, continued now in full force against flagrant transgressors; but, when the reign of corruption becomes universal, the vigour of the law yields to its sway, and a weak execution defeats the purposes of the most salutary discipline. Such was now unhappily the case: the age was gradually sinking from one period of corruption to another; the great and the powerful sinned with impunity; and the obscure and the indigent alone felt the severity of the laws.

XVIII. Religious controversies among Christians were frequent in this century; and, as it often happens in the course of civil affairs, external peace gave occasion and leisure for the excitation of intestine troubles and dissensions. We shall mention some of the principal of these controversies, which produced violent and obstinate schisms, not so much, indeed, by their natural tendency, as by incidental occurrences.

In the beginning of this century, about the year 306, arose the famous Meletian controversy, so called from its author, and which, for a long time, divided the church. Peter, bishop of Alexandria, had deposed from the episcopal office, Meletius, bishop of Lycopolis in the Upper Egypt. The reasons that occasioned this violent act of authority, have not been sufficiently explained.

The partisans of Peter allege, that Meletius had sacrificed to the gods, and charge him also with various crimes;[a] while others affirm, that his only failing was an excessive severity against the lapsed.[b] However that may be, Meletius treated the sentence of Peter with the utmost contempt, and not only continued to perform all the duties of the episcopal function, but even assumed the right of consecrating presbyters; a privilege, which, by the laws of Egypt, belonged only to the bishop of Alexandria. The venerable gravity and eloquence of Meletius drew many to his party; and, among others, a considerable number of monks adhered to his cause. The council of Nice made several ineffectual attempts to heal this breach; the Meletians, on the other hand, whose chief aim was to oppose the authority of the bishop of Alexandria, joined themselves to the Arians, who were his irreconcileable enemies. Hence it happened, that a dispute, which had for its first object the authority and jurisdiction of the bishop of Alexandria, gradually degenerated into a religious controversy. The Meletian party was yet subsisting in the fifth century.[c]

XIX. Some time after this, a certain person named Eustathius, was the occasion of great disorders and divisions in Armenia, Pontus, and the neighbouring countries; and he was consequently condemned and excommunicated by the council of Gangra, which soon followed that of Nice. Whether this was the same Eustathius, who was bishop of Sebastia in Armenia, and the chief of the Semi-Arians; or whether the ancient historians have confounded two different persons of the same name, is a matter extremely difficult to determine.[d] However that may be, the leader of the Eustathian sect does not seem so much chargeable with the corruption of any religious doctrine, as with having set up a fanatical form of sanctity, an extravagant system of practical discipline, destructive of the order and happiness of society; for he prohibited marriage, the use of wine and flesh, feasts of charity, and other things of that nature. He prescribed immediate divorce to those who were joined in wedlock, and is said to have granted to children and servants the liberty of violating the commands of their parents and masters, upon pretexts of a religious nature.[e]

XX. Lucifer, bishop of Cagliaria in Sardinia, a man remarkable for his prudence, the austerity of his character, and the steadiness of his resolution and courage, was banished by the emperor Constantius, for having defended the Nicene doctrine, concerning the three persons in the Godhead. He broke the bonds of fraternal communion with Eusebius, bishop of Verceil, in the year 363, because the latter had consecrated Paulinus, bishop of Antioch; and he afterwards separated himself from the whole church, on account of the absolution which it had decreed in favour of those who, under Constantius, had deserted to the Arians.[f] The small tribe, at least, that followed this prelate, under the title of Luciferians, scrupulously and obstinately avoided all commerce and fellowship, both with those bishops who had declared themselves in favour of the Arians, and with those also who consented to an absolution for such as returned from this desertion, and acknowledged their error; and thus of consequence they dissolved the bonds of their communion with the church in general.[g] The Luciferians are also said to have entertained erroneous notions concerning the human soul, whose generation they considered as of a carnal nature, and maintained, that it was transfused from the parents into the children.[h]

XXI. About this time Ærius, a presbyter monk, and a Semi-Arian, erected a new sect, and excited divisions throughout Armenia, Pontus, and Cappadocia, by propagating opinions different from those which were commonly received. His principal tenet was that bishops were not distinguished from presbyters by any divine right, but that according to the institution of the New Testament, their offices and authority were absolutely the same. How far Ærius pursued this opinion, through its natural consequences, is not certainly known; but we know, with certainty, that it was highly agreeable to many good Christians, who were no longer able to bear the tyranny and

[a] Athanasius, Apologia secunda, tom. i. op.

[b] Epiphanius, Hæres. lxviii. tom. i. op. See also Dion. Petavius, Not. in Epiphanium, tom. ii. and Sam. Basnagii Exercitat. de Rebus sacris contra Baronium.

[c] Socrates, Hist. Eccles. lib. i. c. vi. p. 14. Theodoret. Hist. Eccles. lib. i. cap. viii. p. 548.

[d] See Sam. Basnage. Annal. Polit. Eccles. tom. ii.

[e] Socrates, lib. i. cap. xliii.—Sozomen, lib. iii. cap. xiv. lib. iv. cap. xxiv.—Epiphan. Hæres. lxvi.—Philostorgius, Hist. Eccles. lib. iii. cap. xvi.—Wolfg. Gundling, Not. ad Concilium Gangrense.

[f] Rufin. Hist. Eccles. lib. i. cap. xxx.—Socrates, lib. iii. cap. ix. See also Tillemont's Memoires pour servir à l'Histoire de l' Eglise. tom. vii.

[g] See, in the works of Sirmond, a book of Prayers, addressed to Theodosius by Marcellinus and Faustinus, who were Luciferians.

[h] Augustin. de Hæres. cap. lxxxi. with the observations of Lamb. Danæus, p. 346.

arrogance of the bishops of this century. There were other things in which Ærius differed from the common notions of the time; he condemned prayers for the dead, stated fasts, the celebration of Easter, and other rites of that nature, in which the multitude erroneously imagine that the life and soul of religion consist.[a] His great purpose seems to have been that of reducing Christianity to its primitive simplicity; a purpose, indeed, laudable and noble when considered in itself, though the principles whence it springs, and the means by which it is executed, may in some respects deserve censure.[b]

XXII. The progress of superstition in this century, and the erroneous notions that prevailed concerning the true nature of religion, excited the zeal and the efforts of many to stem the torrent. But their labours only exposed them to infamy and reproach. Of these worthy opposers of the reigning superstitions, the most eminent was Jovinian, an Italian monk, who toward the conclusion of this century, taught first at Rome, and afterwards at Milan, that all those who kept the vows they made to Christ at their baptism, and lived according to the rules of piety and virtue laid down in the Gospel, had an equal title to the rewards of futurity; and that, consequently, those who passed their days in insocial celibacy, and severe mortifications and fastings, were in no respect more acceptable in the eye of God, than those who lived virtuously in the bonds of marriage, and nourished their bodies with moderation and temperance. These judicious opinions, which many began to adopt, were first condemned by the church of Rome, and afterwards by Ambrose, in a council holden at Milan in the year 390.[c] The emperor Honorius seconded the authoritative proceedings of the bishops by the violence of the secular arm, answered the judicious reasonings of Jovinian by the terror of coercive and penal laws, and banished this pretended heretic to the island of Boa. Jovinian published his opinions in a book against which Jerome, in the following century, wrote a most bitter and abusive treatise, still extant.[d]

XXIII. Among all the religious controversies that divided the church, the most celebrated, both for their importance and their duration, were those relating to Origen and his doctrine.

This illustrious man, though he had been, for a long time, charged with many errors, was deemed, by the generality of Christians, an object of high veneration; and his name was so sacred as to give weight to the cause in which it appeared. The Arians, who were sagacious in searching for succours on all sides to maintain their sect, affirmed that Origen had adopted their opinions. In this they were believed by some, who consequently included this great man in the hatred which they entertained against the sect of the Arians. But several writers of the first learning and note opposed this report, and endeavoured to vindicate the honour of their master from these injurious insinuations. Of these the most eminent was Eusebius, bishop of Cæsarea, as appears by his learned work, entitled, An Apology for Origen. It is extremely probable, that these clamours raised against the memory and reputation of a man, whom the whole Christian world beheld with respect, would have been soon hushed, had it not been for the rise of new commotions, which proceeded from another source, and of which we shall treat in the following section.

XXIV. The monks in general, and the Egyptian monks in particular, were enthusiastically devoted to Origen, and spared no labour to propagate his opinions in all places. Their zeal, however, met with opposition, nor could they convince all Christians of the truth and soundness of the notions invented or adopted by that eminent writer. Hence arose a controversy concerning the reasons and foundations of Origenism, which was at first managed in a private manner, but afterwards, by degrees, broke out into an open flame. Among the numerous partisans of Origen was John bishop of Jerusalem; which furnished Epiphanius and Jerome with a pretext to cast an odium upon this prelate, against whom they had been previously exasperated on other accounts. But the ingenious bishop conducted matters with such admirable dexterity, that, in defending himself, he vindicated, at the same time, the reputation of Origen, and drew to his party the whole monastic body, and also a prodigious number of those who were spectators of this interesting combat. This was merely the begining of the vehement contests concerning the doctrine of Origen, that were carried on both in the eastern and western provinces. These contests were particularly fomented in the west by Rufinus, a presbyter of Aquileia, who translated into Latin several books of Origen, and insinuated, with sufficient plainness, that he acquiesced in the sentiments they contained,[e] which drew upon him the implacable rage of the learned and choleric Jerome. But these commotions seemed to cease in the west after the death of Rufinus, and in consequence of the efforts which men of the first order made to check, both by their authority and by their writings, the progress of Origenism in those parts.

XXV. The troubles which the writings and doctrines of Origen excited in the east were more grievous and obstinate. Theophilus, bishop of Alexandria, irritated for several reasons against the Nitrian monks, represented them as infected with the contagion of Origenism, and ordered them to give up and abandon all the productions of Origen. The monks refused obedience to this command, and alleged in their defence two considerations: one was, that the passages in the writings of this holy and venerable man, which seemed to swerve from the truth, were insert-

[a] Epiphanius, Hæres. lxxv. p. 905.—Augustin. de Hæres. cap. liii.

[b] The desire of reducing religious worship to the greatest possible simplicity, however rational it may appear in itself, when abstractedly considered, will be considerably moderated in such as bestow a moment's attention upon the imperfection and infirmities of human nature in its present state. Mankind, generally speaking, have too little elevation of mind to be much affected with those forms and methods of worship, in which there is nothing striking to the outward senses. The great difficulty lies in determining the lengths, which it is prudent to go in the accommodation of religious ceremonies to human infirmity; and the grand point is, to fix a medium, in which a due regard may be shown to the senses and imagination, without violating the dictates of right reason, or tarnishing the purity of true religion. It has been said, that the Romish church has gone thus far solely in condescension to the infirmities of mankind; and this is what the ablest defenders of its motley worship have alleged in its behalf. But this observation is not just; the church of Rome has not so much accommodated itself to human weakness as it has abused that weakness by taking occasion from it to establish an absurd variety of ridiculous ceremonies, destructive of true religion, and only adapted to promote the riches and despotism of the clergy, and to keep the multitude still hoodwinked in their ignorance and superstition. How far a just antipathy to the church puppet-shows of the Papists has unjustly driven some Protestant churches into the opposite extreme, is a matter that I shall not now examine, though it certainly deserves a serious consideration.

[c] Hieronymus in Jovinianum, tom. ii. op.—Augustin. de Hæres. cap. lxxxii.—Ambros. Epist. vi.

[d] Codex Theodosianus. tom. iii. vi.

[e] See Just. Fontaninus, Historia Literar. Aquileiensis. lib. iv. cap. iii.

ed in them by ill-designing heretics; and the other, that a few censurable things were not sufficient to justify the condemnation of the rest. Matters were more exasperated by this refusal of submission to the order of Theophilus; for this violent prelate called a council at Alexandria, in the year 399, in which having condemned the followers of Origen, he sent a band of soldiers to drive the monks from their residence on mount Nitria. The poor monks, thus scattered abroad by an armed force, fled first to Jerusalem, whence they retired to Scythopolis; and finding that they could not live here in security and peace, determined, at length, to set sail for Constantinople, and there plead their cause in presence of the emperor.[a] The issue of these proceedings will come under the history of the following century.

It is, however, necessary to observe here, that we must not reduce to the same class all those who are called Origenists in the records of this century: for this ambiguous title is applied to persons who differed widely in their religious notions. Sometimes it merely signifies such friends of Origen, as acknowledged his writings to have been adulterated in many places, and who were far from patronising the errors of which he was accused; in other places this title is attributed to those who confess Origen to be the author of all the doctrines which are imputed to him, and who resolutely support and defend his opinions; of which latter there was a considerable number among the monastic orders.

CHAPTER IV.

Concerning the Rites and Ceremonies used in the Church during this Century.

I. WHILE the Roman emperors were studious to promote the honour of Christianity by the auspicious protection they afforded to the church, and to advance its interests by their most zealous efforts, the inconsiderate and ill-directed piety of the bishops cast a cloud over the beauty and simplicity of the Gospel, by the prodigious number of rites and ceremonies which they had invented to embellish it. And here we may apply that well-known saying of Augustin,[b] that 'the yoke under which the Jews formerly groaned, was more tolerable than that imposed upon many Christians in his time.' The rites and institutions, by which the Greeks, Romans, and other nations, had formerly testified their religious veneration for fictitious deities, were now adopted, with some slight alterations, by Christian bishops, and employed in the service of the true God. We have already mentioned the reasons alleged for this imitation, so likely to disgust all who have a just sense of the native beauty of genuine Christianity. These fervent heralds of the Gospel, whose zeal outran their candour and integrity, imagined that the nations would receive Christianity with more facility, when they saw the rites and ceremonies to which they were accustomed, adopted in the church, and the same worship paid to Christ and his martyrs, which they had formerly offered to their idol deities. Hence it happened, that, in these times, the religion of the Greeks and Romans differed very little, in its external appearance, from that of the Christians. They had both a most pompous and splendid ritual. Gorgeous robes, mitres, tiaras, wax-tapers, crosiers,[c] processions,[d] lustrations, images, gold and silver vases, and many such circumstances of pageantry, were equally to be seen in the heathen temples and in the Christian churches.

II. No sooner had Constantine abolished the superstitions of his ancestors, than magnificent churches were every where erected for the Christians, which were richly adorned with pictures and images, and bore a striking resemblance to the pagan temples, both in their outward and inward form.[e] Of these churches some were built over the tombs of martyrs, and were frequented only at stated times; while others were set apart for the ordinary assemblies of Christians in divine worship. The former were called *Martyria*, from the places where they were erected; and the latter *Tituli*.[f] Both of them were consecrated with great pomp, and with certain rites borrowed mostly from the ancient laws of the Roman pontiffs.

But our wonder will not cease here; it will rather be augmented when we learn, that, at this time, it was looked upon as an essential part of religion, to have in every country a multitude of churches; and here we must look for the true origin of what is called the *right of patronage*, which was introduced among Christians with no other view than to encourage the opulent to erect a great number of churches, by giving them the privilege of appointing the ministers that were to officiate in them.[g] This was a new instance of that servile imitation of the ancient superstitions which reigned at this time; for it was a very common notion among the people of old, that nations and provinces were happy and free from danger, in proportion to the number of fanes and temples, which they consecrated to the worship of gods and heroes, whose protection and succour could not fail, as it was thought, to be shed abundantly upon those who worshipped them with such zeal, and honoured them with so many marks of veneration and respect. The Christians unhappily contracted the same erroneous way of thinking. The more numerous were the temples which they erected in honour of

[a] See Pierre Daniel Huet, Origeniana, lib. ii. cap. iv.—Louis Doucin. Histoire de l'Origenisme, livr. iii.—Hier. a Prato, Diss. vi. in Sulpitium Severum de Monachis ob Origenis noman ex Nitra totaque Ægypto pulsis, p. 273.

[b] Augustin. Epist. cxix. ad Januarium. according to the ancient division.

☞ [c] The lituus, which, among the ancient Romans, was the chief ensign of the augurs, and derived its name from its resemblance to the *military trumpet*, became a mark of Episcopal dignity. We call it the crosier or bishop's staff.

☞ [d] The word *supplicationes*, which I have rendered by that of *processiones*, signified among the pagans, those solemn and public acts of gratitude for national blessings, or deprecation of national calamities, which were expressed by the whole body of the people by a religious approach to the temples of the gods, which by a decree of the senate, were open to all without distinction. See Cic. Catil. iii. 6. liv. x. 23.

[e] See Ezek. Spanheim, Preuves sur les Cesars de Julien, and particularly Le Brun's Explication literale et historique des Ceremonies de la Messe, tom. ii. A description of these churches may be found in Eusebius, de vita Constantini M. lib. iii. cap. xxxv. and an exact plan of their interior structure is accurately engraven in Bishop Beverage's Adnotationes in Pandectas Canonum, tom. ii. and in Frederic Spanheim's Institut. Hist. Eccl. It must also be observed, that certain parts of the Christian churches were formed after the model of the Jewish temples. See Camp. Vitringa de Synagogâ vetere. lib. iii.

[f] Jo. Mabillon, Mus. Ital. tom. ii. in Comment. ad ordin. Roman. p xvi. ☞ The Tituli were the smaller churches so called from this circumstance, that the presbyters, who officiated in them, were called by the names of the places were they were erected, i. e. received titles, which fixed them to those particular cures.

[g] Just. Hen. Bohmeri Jus Eccles. Protestant. tom. iii. p. 466.—Bibliotheque Italique, tom. v. p. 166.

Christ, and his chosen friends and followers, the more sanguine did their expectations grow of powerful succours from them, and of a peculiar interest in the divine protection. They were so weak as to imagine, that God, Christ, and celestial intelligences, were delighted with those marks and testimonies of respect, which captivate the hearts of wretched mortals.

III. The Christian worship consisted in hymns, prayers, the reading of the Scriptures, and a discourse addressed to the people; and concluded with the celebration of the Lord's supper. To these were added various rites, more adapted to please the eyes, and strike the imagination, than to kindle in the heart the pure and sacred flame of genuine piety.[a] We are not, however, to think, that the same method of worship was uniformly followed in every Christian society; for this was far from being the case. Every bishop, consulting his own private judgment, and taking into consideration the nature of the times, the genius of the country in which he lived, and the character and temper of those whom he was appointed to rule and instruct, formed such a plan of divine worship as he thought the wisest and the best. Hence arose that variety of liturgies which were in use, before the bishop of Rome had usurped the supreme power in religious matters, and persuaded the credulous and unthinking, that the model, both of doctrine and worship, was to be given by the mother-church, and to be followed implicitly throughout the Christian world.

IV. It would be almost endless to enter into a minute detail of all the different parts of public worship, and to point out the disadvantageous changes they underwent. A few observations will be sufficient upon this head. The public prayers had lost much of the solemn and majestic simplicity that characterised them in the primitive times, and which now began to degenerate into a vain and swelling bombast. The Psalms of David were now received among the public hymns that were sung as a part of divine service.[b] The sermons, or public discourses addressed to the people, were composed according to the rules of human eloquence, and rather adapted to excite the stupid admiration of the populace, who delight in vain embellishments, than to enlighten the understanding, or to reform the heart. It would even seem as if all possible means had been industriously used, to give an air of folly and extravagance to the Christian assemblies; for the people were permitted, and even exhorted by the preacher himself, to crown his talents with clapping of hands and loud acclamations of applause;[c] a recompense that was hitherto peculiar to the actors on the theatre, and the orators in the forum. How men set apart by their profession to exhibit examples of the contempt of vain glory, and to demonstrate to others the vanity and emptiness of all temporal things, could indulge such a senseless indecent ambition, is difficult to be conceived, though it is highly to be deplored.

V. The first day of the week, which was the ordinary and stated time for the public assemblies of Christians, was, in consequence of a peculiar law enacted by Constantine, observed with greater solemnity than it had formerly been.[d] The festivals, celebrated in most of the churches, were five in number. They were appointed in commemoration of the birth, the sufferings and death, the resurrection, and the ascension of the divine Saviour; and also the effusion of the Holy Ghost upon the apostles and first heralds of the Gospel on the day of Pentecost. Of these festivals, the Christians kept none with so much solemnity and respect as the fourteen days that were appointed for the commemoration of the resurrection.[e]

The eastern Christians celebrated the memory of Christ's birth and baptism in one festival, which was fixed on the sixth of January; and this day was by them called the Epiphany, as on it the immortal Saviour was manifested to the world.[f] On the other hand, the Christians of the west seem to have always celebrated the birth of our Lord on the 25th of December; for there appears to be very little certainty in the accounts of those who allege, that the Roman pontiff, Julius I., removed the festival of Christ's birth from the 6th of January to the 25th of December.[g]

The unlucky success which some had in discovering the carcasses and remains of certain holy men, multiplied the festivals and commemorations of the martyrs in the most extravagant manner. The increase of these festivals would not have been offensive to the wise and the good, if Christians had employed the time they took up, in promoting their spiritual interests, and in forming habits of sanctity and virtue. But the contrary happened. These days, which were set apart for pious exercises, were squandered away in indolence, voluptuousness, and criminal pursuits, and were less consecrated to the service of God, than employed in the indulgence of sinful passions. It is well known, among other things, what opportunities of sinning were offered to the licentious, by what were called the vigils of Easter and Whitsuntide, or Pentecost.

VI. Fasting was considered in this century, as the most effectual and powerful means of repelling the force, and disconcerting the stratagems of evil spirits, and of appeasing the anger of an offended Deity. Hence we may easily understand what induced the rulers of the church to establish this custom by express laws, and to impose, as an indispensable duty, an act of humiliation, the observance of which had hitherto been left to every one's choice. The Quadragesimal or Lent-fast was regarded as more sacred than all the rest, though it was not yet confined to a fixed number of days.[h] We must, however, remark, that the fasts observed in this century, were very different from those which were solemnized in the preceding times. Formerly those who submitted themselves to the discipline of fasting abstained wholly from meat and drink; but now a mere abstinence from flesh and wine was, by many, judged sufficient for the purposes of fasting,[i] and the latter opinion prevailed from this time, and became universal among the Latins.

VII. Baptismal fonts were now erected in the porch of each church, for the more commodious administration of

[a] For a full account of the forms of public worship, or the *liturgies* of this century, the reader will do well to consult the twenty-second catechetical discourse of Cyril of Jerusalem, and the apostolical constitutions, which are falsely attributed to Clement of Rome. These writers are most learnedly illustrated and explained by Pierre Le Brun, in his Explication literale et historique de la Messe, tom. ii.

[b] Beausobre, Hist. du Manicheisme, tom. ii. p. 614.

[c] Franc. Bern. Ferrarius, de Veterum Acclamationibus et Plausu, p. 66.

[d] Jac. Godofred. ad Codicem Theodos. tom. i. p. 135.

[e] Godofred. tom. i. p. 143.

[f] Beausobre, Hist. du Manicheisme, tom. ii. p. 693.

[g] See Jos. Sim. Asseman. Biblioth. Orient. Clement. Vatican. tom. ii. and Alph. des Vignoles, Diss. dans la Bibliotheque Germanique, tom. ii.

[h] Jo. Dallæus, de Jejuniis et Quadragesimâ, lib. iv.

[i] See Barbeyrac, de la Morale des Peres, p. 250.

that initiating sacrament. Baptism was administered during the vigils of Easter and Whitsuntide, with lighted tapers, by the bishop, and the presbyters commissioned by him for that purpose. In cases, however, of urgent necessity, and in such only, a dispensation was granted for performing this sacred rite at other times than those now mentioned. In some places salt was employed, as a symbol of purity and wisdom, and was thrown, with this view, into the mouth of the person baptised; and a double unction was every where used in the celebration of this ordinance, one preceding its administration, and the other following it. The persons who were admitted into the church by baptism, were obliged, after the celebration of that holy ordinance, to go clothed in white garments during the space of seven days. Many other rites and ceremonies might be mentioned here; but, as they neither acquired stability by their duration, nor received the sanction of universal approbation and consent, we shall pass them over in silence.

VIII. The institution of catechumens, and the discipline through which they passed, suffered no variation in this century, but continued upon its ancient footing. It appears farther, by innumerable testimonies, that the Lord's supper was administered, (in some places two or three times in a week, in others on Sunday only,) to all those who were assembled to worship God. It was also sometimes celebrated at the tombs of martyrs and at funerals; which custom, undoubtedly, gave rise to the *masses*, that were afterwards performed in honour of the saints, and for the benefit of the dead. In many places, the bread and wine were holden up to view before their distribution, that they might be seen by the people, and contemplated with religious respect; and hence, not long after, the adoration of the symbols was unquestionably derived. Neither catechumens, penitents, nor those who were supposed to be under the influence and impulse of evil spirits, were admitted to this holy ordinance; nor did the sacred orators in their public discourses ever dare to unfold its true and genuine nature with freedom and simplicity. The reason of thus concealing it from the knowledge and observation of many, was a very mean and shameful one, as we have already observed: many, indeed, offer a much more decent and satisfactory argument in favour of this custom, when they allege, that, by these mysterious proceedings, the desire of the catechumens would naturally burn to penetrate, as soon as was possible, the sublime secret, and that they would thereby be animated to prepare themselves with double diligence for receiving this privilege.

CHAPTER V.

Concerning the Divisions and Heresies that troubled the Church during this Century.

I. The sects which had sprung up in the preceding ages, transmitted their contagious principles to this century. Many of them yet remained, particularly in the east, and, notwithstanding their absurdity, continued to attract followers. The Manichean faction surpassed the rest in its influence and progress. The very turpitude and enormity of its doctrines seemed to seduce many into its snares; and, what is still more surprising, men of genius and penetration were deluded by its enchantments, as the example of Augustin sufficiently testifies. It is true, the wisest and most learned writers of the times (and, among others, Augustin, when he returned from his errors) endeavoured to oppose the growth of this spreading pestilence; nor were their efforts entirely unsuccessful. But the root of this horrible disease was deep; and neither the force of argument, nor the severity of the most rigorous laws, were sufficient to extirpate it thoroughly.[a] For some time, indeed, it seemed to disappear, and many thought it utterly eradicated; but it gathered force secretly, and broke out afterwards with new violence. To avoid the severity of the laws, the Manicheans concealed themselves under a variety of names, which they adopted successively, and changed, in proportion as they were discovered under them. Thus they assumed the names of Encratites, Apotactics, Saccophori, Hydroparastates, Solitaries, and several others, under which they lay concealed for a certain time, but could not long escape the vigilance of their enemies.[b]

II. The state had little danger to apprehend from a sect which the force of severe laws and of penal restraints could not fail to undermine, gradually, throughout the Roman empire. But a new and much more formidable faction started up in Africa, which, though it arose from small beginnings, afflicted most grievously both the church and state for more than a century. Its origin was as follows:

Mensurius (bishop of Carthage) dying in the year 311, the greatest part of the clergy and the people chose, in his place, the archdeacon Cæcilianus, who without waiting for the assembly of the Numidian bishops, was consecrated by those of Africa Minor alone. This hasty proceeding was the occasion of much trouble. The Numidian prelates, who had always been present at the consecration of the bishops of Carthage, were highly offended at their being excluded from this solemn ceremony, and assembling at Carthage, called Cæcilianus before them, to give an account of his conduct. The flame, thus kindled, was greatly augmented by several Carthaginian presbyters, who were competitors with Cæcilianus, particularly Botrus and Celesius. Lucilla, also, an opulent lady, who had been reprimanded by Cæcilianus for her superstitious practices, and had conceived against him a bitter enmity on that account, was active in exasperating the spirits of his adversaries, and distributed a large sum of money among the Numidians to encourage them, in their opposition to the new bishop In consequence of all this, Cæcilianus, refusing to submit to the judgment of the Numidians, was condemned in a council, assembled by Secundus, bishop of Tigisis, consisting of seventy prelates, who with the consent of a considerable part of the clergy and people, declared him unworthy of the episcopal dignity, and chose his deacon Majorinus for his successor. By this proceeding, the Carthaginian church was divided into two factions, and groaned under the contests of two rival bishops, Cæcilianus and Majorinus.

III. The Numidians alleged two important reasons to

[a] The severe laws enacted by the emperors against the Manicheans, are to be found in the Theodosian Code, vol. vi. part i. In 372, Valentinian the elder prohibited their assemblies, and imposed heavy penalties on their doctors. In 381, Theodosius the Great branded them with infamy, and deprived them of all the rights and privileges of citizens. Add, to these, several edicts more dreadful, which may be seen in pages 137, 138, 170, of the above-mentioned work.

[b] See the law of Theodosius, tom. vi. p. 134, &c.

justify their sentence against Cæcilianus; first, that Felix of Aptungus, the chief of the bishops who assisted at his consecration, was a *traitor*, (*i. e.* one of those who, during the persecution under Diocletian, had delivered the sacred writings and the pious books of the Christians to the magistrates in order to be burned;) and that, as he had thus apostatised from the service of Christ, it was not possible that he could impart the Holy Ghost to the new bishop. A second reason for their sentence against Cæcilianus was drawn from the harshness and even cruelty that he had discovered in his conduct, while he was a deacon, towards the Christian confessors and martyrs during the persecution above mentioned, whom he abandoned, in the most merciless manner, to all the extremities of hunger and want, leaving them without food in their prisons, and precluding the grant of relief from those who were willing to succour them. To these accusations they added the insolent contumacy of the new prelate, who refused to obey their summons, and to appear before them in council to justify his conduct. None of the Numidians opposed Cæcilianus with such bitterness and vehemence, as Donatus bishop of Casæ-Nigræ; and hence the whole faction was called after him, as most writers think; though some are of opinion, that the sect derived this name from another Donatus, surnamed the Great.[a] This controversy, in a short time, spread far and wide, not only throughout Numidia, but even through all the imperial provinces in Africa, which entered so zealously into this ecclesiastical war, that in most cities there were two bishops, one at the head of Cæcilianus' party, and the other acknowledged by the followers of Majorinus.

IV. The Donatists having brought this controversy before Constantine, that prince, in the year 313, commissioned Melchiades, bishop of Rome, to examine the matter, and named three bishops of Gaul to assist him in this inquiry. The result of this examination was favourable to Cæcilianus, who was entirely acquitted of the crimes laid to his charge. The accusations adduced against Felix, by whom he was consecrated, were at that time left out of the question; but, in the year 314, the cause of that prelate was examined separately by Ælian, proconsul of Africa, by whose decision he was absolved. The Donatists, whose cause necessarily suffered by these proceedings, complained much of the judgment pronounced by Melchiades and Ælian. The small number of bishops, that had been appointed to examine their cause jointly with Melchiades, excited, in a particular manner, their reproaches, and even their contempt. They looked upon the decision of seventy venerable Numidian prelates, as infinitely more respectable than that pronounced by nineteen bishops (for such was the number assembled at Rome,)[b] who, beside the inferiority of their number, were not sufficiently acquainted with the African affairs to be competent judges in the present question. The indulgent emperor, willing to remove these specious complaints, ordered a much more numerous assembly to meet at Arles, composed of bishops from Italy, Germany, Gaul, and Spain. Here again the Donatists lost their cause, but renewed their efforts by appealing to the immediate judgment of the emperor, who condescended so far as to admit their appeal; and, in consequence thereof, examined the whole affair himself in the year 316 at Milan, in presence of the contending parties. The issue of this third trial was not more favourable to the Donatists than that of the two preceding councils, whose decisions the emperor confirmed by the sentence he pronounced.[c] Hence this perverse sect loaded Constantine with the bitterest reproaches, and maliciously complained that Osius, bishop of Cordova, who was honoured with his friendship, and was intimately connected with Cæcilianus, had by corrupt insinuations, engaged him to pronounce an unrighteous sentence. The emperor, animated with a just indignation at such odious proceedings, deprived the Donatists of their churches in Africa, and sent into banishment their seditious bishops; and he carried his resentment so far as to put some of them to death, probably on account of the intolerable petulance and malignity they discovered both in their writings and in their discourses. Hence arose violent commotions and tumults in Africa, as the Donatists were exceedingly powerful and numerous in that part of the empire. Constantine endeavoured, by embassies and negotiations, to allay these disturbances; but his efforts were fruitless.

V. These unhappy commotions gave rise, no doubt, to a horrible confederacy of desperate ruffians, who passed under the name of Circumcelliones. This furious, fearless, and bloody set of men, composed of the rough and savage populace, who embraced the party of the Donatists, maintained their cause by the force of arms, filled the African provinces with slaughter and rapine, and committed the most enormous acts of perfidy and cruelty against the followers of Cæcilianus. This outrageous multitude, whom no prospect of sufferings could terrify, and who, upon urgent occasions, faced death itself with the most audacious temerity, contributed to render the sect of the Donatists an object of the utmost abhorrence; though it cannot be proved, by any records of undoubted authority, that the bishops of that faction (those, at least, who had any reputation for piety and virtue) either approved the proceedings, or stirred up the violence of this odious rabble. In the mean time, the flame of discord gathered strength daily, and seemed to portend the approaching horrors of a civil war; to prevent which, Constantine, having tried in vain every other method of accommodation, abrogated at last, by the advice of the governors of Africa, the laws that had been enacted against the Donatists, and allowed to the people a full liberty of adhering to that party which they in their minds preferred.

VI. After the death of Constantine the Great, his son

[a] In the faction of the Donatists, there were two eminent persons of the name of Donatus; one was a Numidian, and bishop of Casæ-Nigræ; the other succeeded Majorinus, bishop of Carthage, as leader of the Donatists, and received from this sect, on account of his learning and virtue, the title of Donatus the Great. Hence it has been a question among the learned, from which of these the sect derived its name? The arguments that support the different sides of this trivial question are nearly of equal force; and why may we not decide it by supposing that the Donatists were so called from them both.

☞[b] The emperor, in his letter to Melchiades, named no more than three prelates, viz. Maternus, Rheticius, Marinus, bishops of Cologne, Autun, and Arles, to sit with him as judges of this controversy; but afterwards he ordered seven more to be added to the number, and as many as could soon and conveniently assemble; so that there were nineteen in all.

[c] The proofs of the supreme power of the emperor, in religious matters, appear so incontestable in this controversy, that it is amazing it should have been called in question. Certain it is, that, at this time, the notion of a supreme judge set over the church universal, by the appointment of Christ, never had entered into any one's head. The assemblies of the clergy at Rome and Arles are commonly called *councils*, but improperly, since, in reality, they were nothing more than meetings of judges or *commissaries* appointed by the emperor.

Constans, to whom Africa was allotted in the division of the empire, sent Macarius and Paulus into that province, with a view to heal this deplorable schism, and to engage the Donatists to conclude a peace. Their principal bishop opposed all methods of reconciliation with the utmost vehemence, and his example was followed by the other prelates of the party. The Circumcelliones also continued to support the cause of the Donatists by assassinations and massacres, executed with the most unrelenting fury. They were, however, stopped in their career, and were defeated by Macarius in the battle of Bagnia. Upon this, the affairs of the Donatists rapidly declined; and Macarius no longer used the soft voice of persuasion to engage them to an accommodation, but employed his authority for that purpose. A few submitted; the greatest part saved themselves by flight; numbers were sent into banishment, among whom was Donatus the Great; and many of them were punished with the utmost severity. During these troubles, which continued near thirteen years, several steps were taken against the Donatists, which the equitable and impartial will be at a loss to reconcile with the dictates of humanity and justice; nor, indeed, do the Catholics themselves deny the truth of this assertion.[a] Such treatment naturally excited, among the Donatists, loud complaints of the cruelty of their adversaries.[b]

VII. The emperor Julian, upon his accession to the throne in the year 362, permitted the exiled Donatists to return to their country, and restored them to the enjoyment of their former liberty. This step so far renewed their vigour, that they brought over, in a short time, the majority of the African provincials to their interests. Gratian, indeed, published several edicts against them, and, in the year 377, deprived them of their churches, and prohibited all their assemblies, public and private. But the fury of the Circumcelliones, who may be considered as the soldiery of the Donatists, and the apprehension of intestine tumults, prevented, no doubt, the vigorous execution of these laws. This appears from the number of churches which this people had in Africa toward the conclusion of the century, and which were served by no less than four hundred bishops. Two things, however, diminished considerably the power and lustre of this flourishing sect, and made it decline apace about the end of this century: one was, a violent division that arose among them, on account of a person named Maximin; and this division, so proper to weaken the common cause, was the most effectual instrument the catholics could use to combat the Donatists. But a second circumstance which precipitated their decline, was the zealous and fervent opposition of Augustin, first presbyter, and afterwards bishop of Hippo. This learned and ingenious prelate attacked the Donatists in every way. In his writings, in his public discourses, and in his private conversation, he exposed the dangerous and seditious principles of this sect in the strongest manner; and as he was of a warm and active spirit, he animated against them the whole Christian world, as well as the imperial court.

VIII. The doctrine of the Donatists was conformable to that of the church, as even their adversaries confess; nor were their lives less exemplary than those of other Christian societies, if we except the enormous conduct of the Circumcelliones, which the greatest part of the sect regarded with the utmost detestation and abhorrence. The crime, therefore, of the Donatists lay properly in the following points; in their declaring the church of Africa, which adhered to Cæcilianus, fallen from the dignity and privileges of a true church, and deprived of the gifts of the Holy Ghost, on account of the offences with which the new bishop, and Felix, who had consecrated him, were charged; in their pronouncing all the churches, which held communion with that of Africa, corrupt and polluted; in maintaining, that the sanctity of their bishops gave their community alone a full right to be considered as the true, the pure, and holy church; and in their avoiding all communication with other churches, from an apprehension of contracting their impurity and corruption. This erroneous principle was the source of that most shocking uncharitableness and presumption which appeared in their conduct to other churches. Hence they pronounced the sacred rites and institutions void of all virtue and efficacy among those Christians who were not precisely of their sentiments, and not only re-baptised those who came over to their party from other churches, but even with respect to those who had been ordained ministers of the Gospel, they observed the severe custom, either of depriving them of their office, or obliging them to be ordained a second time. This schismatic pestilence was almost wholly confined to Africa; for the few pitiful assemblies, which the Donatists had formed in Spain and Italy, had neither stability nor duration.[c]

IX. The faction of the Donatists was not the only one that troubled the church during this century. In the year 317, a contest arose in Egypt upon a subject of much higher importance, and its consequences were of a yet more pernicious nature. The subject of this warm controversy, which kindled such deplorable divisions throughout the Christian world, was the doctrine of *three persons in the Godhead;* a doctrine which, in the three preceding centuries, had happily escaped the vain curiosity of human researches, and been left undefined and undetermined by any particular set of ideas. The church, indeed, had frequently decided, against the Sabellians and others, that there was a real difference between the Father and Son, and that the Holy Ghost was distinct from both; or, as we commonly speak, that three distinct persons exist in the Deity; but the exact relation of these persons to each other, and the nature of the distinction that subsists between them, are matters that hitherto were neither disputed nor explained, and with respect to which the church had, consequently, observed

[a] The testimony of Optatus of Milevi is beyond exception in this matter; it is quoted from the third book of his treatise, de Schismate Donatistarum, and runs thus: "Ab operariis Unitatis (i. e. the emperor's ambassadors Macarius and Paulus) multa quidem asperè gesta sunt. Fugerunt omnes episcopi cum clericis suis; aliqui sunt mortui; qui fortiores fuerunt, capti et longe relegati sunt." Optatus, through the whole of this work, endeavours to excuse the severities committed against the Donatists, of which he lays the principal fault upon that sect itself, confessing, however, that, in some instances, the proceedings against them were too rigorous to deserve approbation, or admit an excuse.

[b] See Collat. Carthag. diei tertiæ, sect. 258, at the end of Optatus.

[c] A more ample account of the Donatists will be found in the following writers: Henr. Valesius, Dissert. de Schismate Donatistarum, (subjoined to his edition of the ecclesiastical history of Eusebius.)—Thom. Ittigius' History of Donatism, published in the Appendix to his book concerning the Heresies of the apostolic age.—Herm. Witsius, Miscellanea Sacra, tom. i. lib. iv.; Henr. Noris, Hist. Donat. augmented by the Ballerini, op. tom. iv.—Long's History of the Donatists, London, 1677. These are the sources whence we have drawn the accounts that we have given of this troublesome sect.

a profound silence. Nothing was dictated on this head to the faith of Christians, nor were there any modes of expression prescribed as requisite to be used in speaking of this mystery. Hence it happened, that the Christian doctors entertained different sentiments upon this subject without giving the least offence, aud discoursed variously concerning the distinctions in the Godhead, each following his respective opinion with the utmost liberty. In Egypt, and the adjacent countries, the greatest part embraced, in this as well as in other matters, the opinion of Origen, who held that the Son was, in God, that which reason is in man, and that the Holy Ghost was nothing more than the divine energy, or active force. This notion is attended with many difficulties; and, when it is not proposed with the utmost caution, tends, in a particular manner, to remove all real distinction between the persons in the God-head, or, in other words, leads directly to Sabellianism.

X. In an assembly of the presbyters of Alexandria, the bishop of that city, whose name was Alexander, expressed his sentiments on this subject with a high degree of freedom and confidence, maintaining, among other things, that the Son was not only of the same eminence and dignity, but also of the same essence, with the Father.[a] This assertion was opposed by Arius, one of the presbyters, a man of a subtile turn, and remarkable for his eloquence. Whether his zeal for his own opinions, or personal resentment against his bishop, was the motive that influenced him, is not very certain. Be that as it will, he first treated, as false, the assertion of Alexander, on account of its affinity to the Sabellian errors, which had been condemned by the church; and then, rushing into the opposite extreme, he maintained, that the Son was totally and essentially distinct from the Father; that he was the first and noblest of those beings, whom God had created out of nothing, the instrument by whose subordinate operation the Almighty Father formed the universe, and therefore inferior to the Father, both in nature and in dignity. His opinions concerning the Holy Ghost are not so well known. It is however certain, that his notion concerning the Son of God was accompanied and connected with other sentiments, that were very different from those commonly received among Christians, though none of the ancient writers have given us a complete and coherent system of those religious tenets which Arius and his followers really held.[b]

XI. The opinions of Arius were no sooner divulged, than they found in Egypt, and the neighbouring provinces, a multitude of abettors, and among these, many who were distinguished as much by the superiority of their learning and genius, as by the eminence of their rank and station. Alexander, on the other hand, in two councils assembled at Alexandria, accused Arius of impiety, and caused him to be expelled from the communion of the church. Arius received this severe and ignominious shock with great firmness and constancy of mind; retired into Palestine; and thence wrote several letters to the most eminent men of those times, in which he endeavoured to demonstrate the truth of his opinions, and that with such surprising success, that vast numbers were drawn over to his party; and among these Eusebius, bishop of Nicome dia, a man distinguished in the church by his influence and authority. The emperor Constantine, looking upon the subject of this controversy as a matter of small importance, and as little connected with the fundamental and essential doctrines of religion, contented himself at first with addressing a letter to the contending parties, in which he admonished them to put an end to their disputes. But when the prince saw that his admonitions were without effect, and that the troubles and commotions, which the passions of men too often mingle with religious disputes, were spreading and increasing daily throughout the empire, he convoked, in the year 325, a great council at Nice in Bithynia, hoping and desiring that the deputies of the church universal would put an end to this controversy. In this general assembly, after many keen debates, and violent efforts of the two parties, the doctrine of Arius was condemned; Christ was declared *consubstantial*,[c] or of the same essence with the Father; the vanquished presbyter was banished among the Illyrians, and his followers were compelled to give their assent to the creed,[d] or confession of faith, which was composed on this occasion.

XII. The council assembled by Constantine at Nice, is one of the most famous and interesting events that are presented to us in ecclesiastical history; and yet, what is most surprising, scarcely any part of the history of the church has been unfolded with such negligence, or rather passed over with rapidity.[e] The ancient writers are neither agreed with respect to the time or place in which it was assembled, the number of those who sat in the council, nor the bishop who presided in it; and no authentic acts of its famous sentence are now extant.[f]

The eastern Christians differ from all others both with regard to the number and the nature of the laws which were enacted in this celebrated council. The latter mention only twenty canons; but, in the estimate of the former, they amount to a much greater number.[g] It appears, however, by those laws which all parties have admitted as genuine, and also from other authentic records, not only that Arius was condemned in this council, but that some other points were determined, and certain measures agreed upon, to calm the religious tumults that had so long troubled

[a] See Socrates, Hist. Eccles. lib. i. cap. v. and Theodoret, lib. i.

[b] For an account of the Arian controversy, the curious reader must consult the Life of Constantine, by Eusebius; the various libels of Athanasius, which are to be found in the first volume of his works; the Ecclesiastical Histories of Socrates, Sozomen, and Theodoret, the sixty-ninth Heresy of Epiphanius, and other writers of this and the following age. But, among all these, there is not one to whom the merit of impartiality can be attributed with justice; so that the Arian history stands yet in need of a pen guided by integrity and candour, and unbiassed by affection or hatred. Both sides have deserved reproach upon this head; and those who have hitherto written the history of the Arian controversy have only espied the faults of one side; e. g. it is a common opinion, that Arius was too much attached to the opinions of Plato and Origen (see Petav. Dogm. Theol. tom. ii. lib. i. cap. viii.); but this common opinion is a vulgar error. Origen and Plato entertained notions entirely different from those of Arius; whereas Alexander, his antagonist, undoubtedly followed the manner of Origen, in explaining the doctrine of the three persons. See Cudworth's Intellectual System of the Universe.

[c] Ὁμοούσιος.

[d] John Christ. Luicer has illustrated this famous creed from several important and ancient records, in a very learned book published at Utrecht in 1718.

[e] See Ittigius, Hist. Concilii Nicæni.—Le Clerc, Bibliotheque Histor. et Universelle, tom. x. xxii.—Beausobre, Histoire du Manicheisme, tom. i. The accounts, which the Oriental writers have given of this council, have been collected by Euseb. Renaudot, in his History of the Patriarchs of Alexandria.

[f] See the Annotations of Valesius upon the Ecclesiastical History of Eusebius, and Jos. Sim. Asseman. Bibl. Oriental. Clement. Vatican, tom. i. The history of this council was written by Maruthas, a Syrian, but is long since lost.

[g] Th. Ittigius, Supplem. op. Clement. Alex.—J. S. Asseman. tom. i. Euseb. Renaudot.

the church. The controversy concerning the time of celebrating Easter was terminated;[a] the troubles which Novatian had excited, by opposing the re-admission of the lapsed to the communion of the church, were composed; the Meletian schism was condemned,[b] and the jurisdiction of the greater bishops precisely defined and determined,[c] with several other matters of a like nature. But, while these good prelates were employing all their zeal and attention to correct the errors of others, they were upon the point of falling into a very capital one themselves; for they had almost come to a resolution of imposing upon the clergy the yoke of perpetual celibacy, when Paphnutius put a stop to their proceedings, and warded off that unnatural law.[d]

XIII. But, notwithstanding all these determinations, the commotions excited by this controversy remained yet in the minds of many, and the spirit of dissension triumphed both over the decrees of the council and the authority of the emperor. For those who, in the main, were far from being attached to the party of Arius, found many things reprehensible, both in the decrees of the council, and in the forms of expression which it employed to explain the controverted points; while the Arians, on the other hand, left no means untried to heal their wounds, and to recover their place and their credit in the church. And their efforts were crowned with the desired success: for, a few years after the council of Nice, an Arian priest, who had been recommended to the emperor, in the dying words of his sister Constantia, found means to persuade him, that the condemnation of Arius was utterly unjust, and was rather occasioned by the malice of his enemies, than by their zeal for the truth. In consequence of this, the emperor recalled him from banishment in the year 330,[e] repealed the laws that had been enacted against him, and permitted his chief protector Eusebius of Nicomedia, and his vindictive faction, to vex and oppress the partisans of the Nicene council in various ways. Athanasius, bishop of Alexandria, was one of those who suffered most from the violent measures of the Arian party. Invincibly firm in his purpose, and deaf to the most powerful solicitations and entreaties, he obstinately refused to restore Arius to his former rank and office. On this account he was deposed, by the council holden at Tyre, in the year 335, and was afterwards banished into Gaul, while Arius and his followers were, with great solemnity, reinstated in their privileges, and received into the communion of the church. The people of Alexandria, unmoved by these proceedings in favour of Arius, persisted in refusing to grant him a place among their presbyters; upon which the emperor invited him to Constantinople in the year 336, and ordered Alexander, the bishop of that city, to admit him to his communion. But, before this order could be put in execution, Arius died in the imperial city in a very dismal manner;[f] and his sovereign did not long survive him.

XIV. After the death of Constantine the Great, one of his sons, Constantius, who, in the division of the empire, became ruler of the east, was warmly attached to the Arian party, whose principles were also zealously adopted by the empress, and, indeed, by the whole court. On the other hand, Constantine and Constans, emperors of the west, maintained the decrees of the council of Nice in all the provinces over which their jurisdiction extended. Hence arose endless animosities and seditions, treacherous plots, and open acts of injustice and violence between the contending parties. Council was assembled against council; and their jarring and contradictory decrees spread perplexity and confusion through the Christian world.

In the year 350, Constans was assassinated; and, about two years after this, a great part of the western empire, particularly Rome and Italy, fell into the hands of Constantius. This change was extremely unfavourable to those who adhered to the decrees of the council of Nice. The emperor's attachment to the Arians animated him against their adversaries, whom he involved in various troubles and calamities, and he obliged many of them, by threats and punishment, to come over to the sect which he esteemed and protected. One of these forced proselytes was Liberius, the Roman pontiff, who was compelled to embrace Arianism in the year 357. The Nicene party meditated reprisals, and waited only a convenient time, a fit place, and a proper occasion, for executing their resentment.

☞ [a] The decision, with respect to Easter, was in favour of the custom of the western churches; and accordingly all churches were ordered to celebrate that festival on the Sunday which immediately followed the 14th of the first moon that happened after the vernal equinox.

☞ [b] Meletius, bishop of Lycopolis in Egypt, was accused and convicted of having offered incense to idols; and, in consequence thereof, was deposed by Peter, bishop of Alexandria, whose jurisdiction extended over all Egypt. Meletius, upon this, became the head of a schism in the church, by assuming to himself the power of ordination, which was vested in the bishop of Alexandria, and exercised by him in all the Egyptian churches. Epiphanius attributes the dissensions between Meletius and Peter to another cause (Hær. 68.): he alleges, that the vigorous proceedings of Peter against Meletius were occasioned by the latter's refusing to re-admit into the church those who had fallen from the faith during Diocletian's persecution, before their penitential trial was entirely finished. The former opinion is maintained by Socrates and Theodoret, whose authority is certainly more respectable than that of Epiphanius.

☞ [c] The confusion that Meletius introduced, by presuming (as was observed in the preceding note) to violate the jurisdiction of Peter, the metropolitan of Alexandria, by conferring ordination in a province where he alone had a right to ordain, was rectified by the council of Nice, which determined that the metropolitan bishops, in their respective provinces, should have the same power and authority that the bishops of Rome exercised over the suburbicarian churches and countries.

[d] Socrates, Hist. Eccles. lib. i. c. viii. compared with Franc. Balduinus, in Constant. Magn. and George Calixtus, de Conjugio Clericorum.

☞ [e] The precise time in which Arius was recalled from banishment, has not been fixed with such perfect certainty as to prevent a diversity of sentiment on that head. The Annotations of the learned Valesius (or Valois) upon Sozomen's History, will throw some light upon this matter, and make it probable, that Dr. Mosheim has placed the recall of Arius, too late, at least by two years. Valesius has proved, from the authority of Philostorgius, and from other most respectable monuments and records, that Eusebius of Nicomedia, and Theognis, who were banished by the emperor about three months after the council of Nice, (i. e. in 325) were recalled in 328. Now, in the writing by which they obtained their return, they pleaded the restoration of Arius, as an argument for theirs, which proves that he was recalled before the year 330. The same Valesius proves, that Arius, the first head of the Arian sect, was dead before the council of Tyre, which was transferred to Jerusalem; and that the letters which Constantine addressed to that council in favour of Arius and his followers, were in behalf of a second chief of that name, who put himself at the head of the Arians, and who, in conjunction with Euzoius, presented to Constantine such a confession of their faith as made him imagine their doctrine to be orthodox, and procured their reconciliation with the church at the council of Jerusalem.

☞ [f] The dismal manner in which Arius is said to have expired, by his entrails falling out as he was discharging one of the natural functions, is a fact that has been called in question by some modern writers, though without foundation, since it is confirmed by the unexceptionable testimonies of Socrates, Sozomen, Athanasius, and others. The causes of this tragical death have, however, furnished much matter of dispute. The ancient writers, who considered this event as a judgment of Heaven, miraculously drawn down by the prayers of the just, to punish the impiety of Arius, will find little credit in our times, among such as have studied with attention and impartiality the history of Arianism. After having considered this matter with the utmost care, it appears to me extremely probable, that this unhappy man was a victim to the resentment of his enemies, and was destroyed by poison, or some such violent method. A blind and fanatical zeal for certain systems of faith, has in all ages produced such horrible acts of cruelty and injustice.

Thus the history of the church, under the emperor Constantius, presents to the reader a perpetual scene of tumult and violence, and the deplorable spectacle of a war, carried on between brothers, without religion, justice, or humanity.

XV. The death of Constantius, in the year 362, changed considerably the face of religious affairs, and diminished greatly the strength and influence of the Arian party. Julian, who, by his principles, was naturally prevented from taking a part in the controversy, bestowed his protection on neither side, but treated them both with an impartiality which was the result of a perfect indifference. Jovian, his successor, declared himself in favour of the Nicene doctrine; and immediately the whole west, with a considerable part of the eastern provinces, changed sides, conformed to the decrees of the council of Nice, and abjured the Arian system.

The scene, however, changed again in the year 364, when Valentinian, and his brother Valens, were raised to the empire. Valentinian adhered to the decrees of the Nicene council; and hence the Arian sect, a few churches excepted, suffered extirpation in the west. Valens, on the other hand, favoured the Arians; and his zeal for their cause exposed their adversaries, the Nicenians, in the eastern provinces, to many severe trials and sufferings. These troubles, however, ended with the reign of this emperor, who fell in a battle which was fought against the Goths in the year 378, and was succeeded by Gratian, a friend to the Nicenians, and the restorer of their tranquillity. His zeal for their interests, though fervent and active, was surpassed by that of his successor, Theodosius the Great, who raised the secular arm against the Arians, with a terrible degree of violence; drove them from their churches; enacted laws whose severity exposed them to the greatest calamities;[a] and rendered, throughout his dominions, the decrees of the council triumphant over all opposition; so that the public profession of the Arian doctrine was confined to the barbarous and unconquered nations, such as the Burgundians, Goths, and Vandals.

During this long and violent contest between the Nicenians and Arians, the attentive and impartial will acknowledge that unjustifiable measures were taken, and great excesses committed, on both sides: so that when, abstractedly from the merits of the cause, we only consider with what temper, and by what means, the parties defended their respective opinions, it will be difficult to determine which of the two exceeded most the bounds of probity, charity, and moderation.

XVI. The efforts of the Arians to maintain their cause, would have been much more prejudical to the church than they were in effect, had not the members of that sect been divided among themselves, and torn into factions, which viewed each other with the bitterest aversion. Of these, the ancient writers make mention under the names of Semi-Arians, Eusebians, Aëtians, Eunomians, Acacians, Psathyrians, and others; but they may all be ranked with propriety in three classes. The first of these were the primitive and genuine Arians, who, rejecting all these forms and modes of expression which the moderns had invented to render their opinions less shocking to the Nicenians, taught simply, "That the Son was not begotten of the Father, (i. e. produced out of his substance,) but was only created out of nothing." This class was opposed by the Semi-Arians, who, in their turn, were abandoned by the Eunomians, or Anomœans, the disciples of Aëtius and Eunomius, of whom the latter was eminent for his knowledge and penetration. The Semi-Arians held, that the Son was ὁμοιούσιος, i. e. similar to the Father in his essence, not by nature but by a peculiar privilege; and the leading men of this party were George of Laodicea and Basilius of Ancyra.[b] The Eunomians, who were also called Aëtians and Exucontians, and may be reckoned in the number of pure Arians, maintained, that Christ was ἑτεροούσιος, or ἀνόμοιος, i. e. unlike the Father, as well in his essence, as in other respects.[c] Under this general division, many other subordinate sects were comprehended, whose subtilties and refinements have not been clearly developed by the ancient writers. The Arian cause suffered as much from the discord and animosities that reigned among these sects, as from the laboured confutations and the zealous efforts of the orthodox party.

XVII. The Arian controversy produced new sects, occasioned by the indiscreet lengths to which the contending parties pushed their respective opinions; and such, indeed, are too generally the unhappy effects of disputes, in which human passions have so large a part. Some, while they were careful in avoiding, and zealous in opposing, the sentiments of Arius, ran headlong into systems of doctrine of an equally dangerous and pernicious nature. Others, in defending the Arian notions, went farther than their chief, and thus fell into errors much more extravagant than those which he maintained. Thus does it generally happen in religious controversies: the human mind, amidst its present imperfection and infirmity, and its unhappy subjection to the empire of imagination and the dictates of sense, rarely follows the middle way in search of truth, or contemplates spiritual and divine things with that accuracy and simplicity, that integrity and moderation, which alone can guard against erroneous extremes.

Among those who fell into such extremes by their inconsiderate violence in opposing the Arian system, Apollinaris the younger, bishop of Laodicea, may be justly placed, though otherwise a man of distinguished merit, and one whose learned labours had rendered to religion the most important services. He strenuously defended the *divinity* of Christ against the Arians; but, by indulging himself too freely in philosophical distinctions and subtilities, he was carried so far as to deny, in some measure, his *humanity*. He maintained, that the body which Christ assumed, was endowed with a sensitive, and not a rational, soul; and that the Divine Nature performed the functions of reason, and supplied the place of what we call the mind, the spiritual and intellectual principle in man; and from this it seemed to follow, as a natural consequence, that the divine nature in Christ was blended with the human, and suffered with it the pains of crucifixion and death itself.[d] This great man was led astray, not only by his love of disputing, but also by an immoderate attachment to the Platonic doctrine, concerning the two-fold nature of the

[a] See the Theodosian Code, tom. vi. p. 5, 10, 130, 146; as also Godofred's annotation upon it.

[b] See Prud. Maran's Dissert. sur les Semi-Arians, published in Voigt's Biblioth. Hæresiolog. tom. ii.

[c] See Basnage's Dissert. de Eunomio, in the Lectiones Antiquæ of Canisius, tom. i. where we find the confession and apology of Eunomius yet extant. See also Jo. Alb. Fabric. Bibliotheca Græc. vol. viii. and the Codex Theodos. tom. vi.

[d] However erroneous the hypothesis of Apollinaris may have been, the consequences here drawn from it are not entirely just; for if it

soul, which was too generally adopted by the divines of this age; and which, undoubtedly, perverted their judgment in several respects, and led them into erroneous and extravagant decisions on various subjects.

Other errors, beside that now mentioned, are imputed to Apollinaris by certain ancient writers; but it is not easy to determine how far they deserve credit upon that head.[a] Be that as it may, his doctrine was received by great numbers in almost all the eastern provinces, though, by the different explications that were given of it, its votaries were subdivided into various sects. It did not, however, long maintain its ground; but, being attacked at the same time by the laws of the emperors, the decrees of councils, and the writings of the learned, it sunk by degrees under their united force.

XVIII. Marcellus, bishop of Ancyra, in Galatia, may be ranked in the same class with Apollinaris, if we are to give credit to Eusebius of Cæsarea, and the rest of his adversaries, who represent his explication of the doctrine of the Trinity as bordering upon the Sabellian and Samosatenian errors. Many however are of opinion that this Eusebius, and that bishop of Nicomedia who bore the same name, represented with partiality the sentiments of Marcellus, on account of the bitterness and vehemence which he discovered in his opposition to the Arians, and their protectors. But though it should be acknowledged, that, in some particulars, the accusations of his enemies carried an aspect of partiality and resentment, yet it is manifest that they were far from being entirely groundless; for, if the doctrine of Marcellus be attentively examined, it will appear, that he considered the Son and the Holy Ghost as two emanations from the Divine Nature, which, after performing their respective offices, were at length to return into the substance of the Father; and every one will perceive, at first sight, how incompatible this opinion is with the belief of three distinct Persons in the Godhead. Beside this, a particular circumstance, which augmented considerably the aversion of many to Marcellus, and strengthened the suspicion of his erring in a capital manner, was his obstinately refusing, toward the conclusion of his life, to condemn the tenets of his disciple Photinus.[b]

XIX. Photinus, bishop of Sirmium, may, with propriety, be placed at the head of those whom the Arian controversy was the occasion of seducing into the most extravagant errors. This prelate published, in the year 343, his opinions concerning the Deity, which were equally repugnant to the orthodox and Arian systems. His notions, which have been obscurely, and indeed sometimes inconsistently represented by the ancient writers, amount to this, when attentively examined: "That Jesus Christ was born of the Holy Ghost and the Virgin Mary; that a certain *divine emanation*, or ray (which he called the *word*) descended upon this extraordinary man; that, on account of the union of the divine word with his human nature, Jesus was called the Son of God, and even God himself; and that the Holy Ghost was not a distinct person, but a celestial virtue proceeding from the Deity." The temerity of this bold innovator was chastised, not only by the orthodox in the councils of Antioch[c] and Milan, holden in the years 345 and 347, and in that of Sirmium, whose date is uncertain, but also by the Arians in one of their assemblies at Sirmium, convoked in 351. In consequence of all this, Photinus was degraded from the episcopal dignity, and died in exile in 372.[d]

XX. After him arose Macedonius, bishop of Constantinople, a very eminent Semi-Arian doctor, who, through the influence of the Eunomians, was deposed by the council of Constantinople, in 360, and sent into exile, where he formed the sect of the Macedonians, or Pneumatomachians. In his exile, he declared with the utmost freedom those sentiments which he had formerly either concealed, or, at least, taught with much circumspection. He considered the Holy Ghost as "a divine energy, diffused throughout the universe, and not as a person distinct from the Father and the Son."[e] This opinion had many partisans in the Asiatic provinces; but the council assembled by Theodosius, in 381, at Constantinople, (to which the second rank, among the œcumenical or general councils, is commonly attributed,) put a stop by its authority to the growing evil, and crushed this rising sect before it had arrived at maturity. A hundred and fifty bishops, who were present at this council, gave the finishing touch to what the council of Nice had left imperfect, and fixed in a full and determined manner, the doctrine of *three* persons *in one* God, which is still received among the generality of Christians. This venerable assembly did not stop here; they branded with infamy all the errors, and set a mark of execration upon all the heresies, that were hitherto known; they advanced the bishop of Constantinople, on account of the eminence and extent of the city in which he resided, to the first rank after the Roman pontiff, and determined several other points, which they looked upon as essential to the well-being of the church in general.[f]

XXI. The phrensy of the ancient Gnostics, which had been so often vanquished, and in appearance removed, by the various remedies that had been used for that purpose, broke out anew in Spain. It was transported thither, in the beginning of this century, by a certain person named Marc, of Memphis in Egypt, whose converts at first were not very numerous. They increased, however, in process of time, and counted in their number several persons highly eminent for their learning and piety. Among others, Priscillian, a layman, distinguished by his birth, fortune and eloquence, and afterwards bishop of Abila, was infected with this odious doctrine, and became its most zealous and ardent defender. Hence he was accused by several bishops, and, by a rescript obtained from the emperor Gratian, he was banished with his followers from

---

is true that the human soul does not, in any respect, suffer death by the dissolution of the body, the same must hold good with respect to the divine nature.

[a] See Basnage's Histor. Hæres. Apollin. published by Voigt in his Bibliotheca Hæresiologica, tom. i. fascic. i. p. 1—96, and improved by some learned and important additions. See also tom. i. fascic. iii. and p. 607 of the latter work. The laws enacted against the followers of Apollinaris, are extant in the Theodosian Code, tom. vi. See an account of Apollinaris, and his heresy, in the English edition of Bayle's Dictionary.

[b] See Montfaucon's Diatriba de Causâ Marcelli in Novâ Collectione Patrum Græcorum, tom. ii. p. 51; as also Gervaise, Vie de S. Epip. p. 42.

[c] According to Dr. Lardner's account, this council of Antioch, in 345, was holden by the Arians, or Eusebians, and not by the orthodox, as our author affirms. See Lardner's Credibility, &c. vol. ix. p. 13; see also Athanas. de Synod. N. vi. vii. compared with Socrat. lib. ii. cap. xviii. xix.

[d] Or in 375, as is concluded from Jerome's Chronicle.—Matt. Larroque, de Photini, et ejus multiplici condemnatione.—Thom. Ittigius, Historia Photini, in Ap. ad librum de Hæresiarchis Ævi Apostolici.

[e] Socrat. Hist. Eccles. lib. iv. cap. iv.

[f] Socrat. lib. v. cap. viii. Sozomen, lib. vii. cap. vii.

Spain;[a] but he was restored, some time after, by an edict of the same prince, to his country and his functions. His sufferings did not end here; for he was accused a second time, in 384,[b] before Maximus, who had procured the assassination of Gratian, and made himself master of Gaul; and by the order of that prince, he was put to death at Treves with some of his associates. The agents, however, by whose barbarous zeal this sentence was obtained, were justly regarded with the utmost abhorrence by the bishops of Gaul and Italy;[c] for Christians had not yet learned, that giving over heretics to be punished by the magistrates, was either an act of piety or justice.[d] [No: this abominable doctrine was reserved for those times, when religion was to become an instrument of despotism, or a pretext for the exercise of pride, malevolence, and vengeance.]

The death of Priscillian was less pernicious to the progress of his opinions, than might naturally have been expected. His doctrine not only survived him, but was propagated through the greatest part of Spain and Gaul; and even so far down as the sixth century, the followers of this unhappy man gave much trouble to the bishops and clergy in those provinces.

XXII. No ancient writer has given an accurate account of the doctrine of the Priscillianists. Many authors, on the contrary, by their injudicious representations of it, have highly disfigured it, and added new degrees of obscurity to a system which was before sufficiently dark and perplexed. It appears, however, from authentic records, that the difference between their doctrine, and that of the Manicheans, was not very considerable. For "they denied the reality of Christ's birth and incarnation; maintained, that the visible universe was not the production of the Supreme Deity, but of some dæmon, or malignant principle; adopted the doctrine of æons, or emanations from the divine nature; considered human bodies as prisons formed by the author of evil, to enslave celestial minds; condemned marriage, and disbelieved the resurrection of the body." Their rules of life and manners were rigid and severe; and the accounts which many have given of their lasciviousness and intemperance deserve not the least credit, as they are totally destitute of evidence and authority. That the Priscillianists were guilty of dissimulation upon some occasions, and deceived their adversaries by cunning stratagems, is true; but that they held it as a maxim, that lying and perjury were *lawful*, is a most notorious falsehood, without even the least shadow of probability,[e] however commonly this odious doctrine has been laid to their charge. In the heat of controversy, the eye of passion and of prejudice is too apt to confound the principles and opinions of men with their practice.

XXIII. To what we have here said concerning those sects which made a noise in the world, it will not be improper to add some account of those of a less considerable kind.

Audæus, a man of remarkable virtue, being excommunicated in Syria, on account of the freedom and importunity with which he censured the corrupt and licentious manners of the clergy, formed an assembly of those who were attached to him, and became, by his own appointment, their bishop. Banished into Scythia by the emperor, he went among the Goths, where his sect flourished, and augmented considerably. The ancient writers are not agreed about the time in which we are to date the origin of this sect. With respect to its religious institutions we know that they differed in some points from those observed by other Christians; and, particularly, that the followers of Audæus celebrated Easter, or the Paschal feast, with the Jews, in repugnance to the express decree of the council of Nice. With respect to their doctrine, several errors have been imputed to them,[f] and this, among others, that they attributed to the Deity a human form.

XXIV. The Grecian and Oriental writers place, in this century, the rise of the sect of the Messalians, or Euchites, whose doctrine and discipline were, indeed, much more ancient, and subsisted, even before the birth of Christ in Syria, Egypt, and other eastern countries, but who do not seem to have been formed into a religious body before the latter part of the century of which we now write. These fanatics, who lived after the monkish fashion, and withdrew from all commerce and society with their fellow-creatures, seem to have derived their name from their habit of continual *prayer*. "They imagined that the mind of every man was inhabited by an evil dæmon, whom it was impossible to expel by any other means than by constant prayer and singing of hymns; and that, when this malignant spirit was cast out, the pure mind returned to God, and was again united to the divine essence from which it had been separated." To this leading tenet they added many other enormous opinions, which bear a manifest resemblance to the Manichean doctrine, and are evidently drawn from the same source whence the Manicheans derived their errors, even from the tenets of the Oriental philosophy.[g] In a word, the Euchites were a sort of Mystics, who imagined, according to the Oriental notion, that two souls resided in man, the one good, and the other evil; and who were zealous in hastening the return of the good spirit to

[a] This banishment was the effect of a sentence pronounced against Priscillian, and some of his followers, by a Synod convened at Saragossa in 380; in consequence of which, Idacius and Ithacius, two cruel and persecuting ecclesiastics, obtained from Gratian the rescript above mentioned. See Sulpit. Sever. Hist. Sacr. lib. ii. cap. xlvii.

[b] Upon the death of Gratian, who had favoured Priscillian toward the latter end of his reign, Ithacius presented to Maximus a petition against him; whereupon this prince appointed a council to be holden at Bourdeaux, from which Priscillian appealed to the prince himself. Sulp. Sever. lib. ii. cap. xlix. p. 287.

[c] It may be interesting to the reader to hear the character of the first person that introduced *civil* persecution into the Christian church. "He was a man abandoned to the most corrupt indolence, and without the least tincture of true piety. He was talkative, audacious, impudent, luxurious, and a slave to his belly. He accused as heretics, and as protectors of Priscillian, all those whose lives were consecrated to the pursuit of piety and knowledge, or distinguished by acts of mortification and abstinence," &c. Such is the character which Sulpitius Severus, who had an extreme aversion to the sentiments of Priscillian, gives us of Ithacius, bishop of Sossuba, by whose means he was put to death.

[d] See Sulp. Sever. Hist. Sacr. edit. Leips. 1709, where Martin, the truly apostolical bishop of Tours, says to Maximus, 'novum esse et inauditum nefas ut causam ecclesiæ judex seculi judicaret.' See also Dial. iii. de vitâ Martini, cap. xi. p. 495.

[e] See Simon de Vries, Dissert. Critica de Priscillianistis, printed at Utrecht, in 1745. The only defect in this dissertation is the implicit manner in which the author follows Beausobre's History of the Manicheans, taking every thing for granted which is affirmed in that work. See also Franc. Girvesii Historia Priscillianistarum Chronologica, published at Rome in 1750. We find, moreover, in the twenty-seventh volume of the Opuscula Scientifica of Angelus Calogera, a treatise entitled Bachiarius Illustratus, seu de Priscillianâ Hæresi Dissertatio; but this dissertation seems rather intended to clear up the affair of Bachiarius, than to give a full account of the Priscillianists and their doctrine.

[f] Epiphanius, Hæres. lxx. p. 811.—Augustin. de Hæres. cap. l.—Theodoret. Fabul. Hæret. lib. iv. cap. ix.—J. Joach. Schroder, Dissertat. de Audæanis, published in Voigt's Bibliotheca Historiæ Hæresiolog. tom. i.

[g] Epiphanius, Hæres. lxxx. p. 1067.—Theodoret. Hæret. Fabul. lib. iv.

God, by contemplation and prayer. The external air of piety and devotion, which accompanied this sect, imposed upon many, while the Greeks, on the other hand, opposed it with vehemence in all succeeding ages.

It is proper to observe here, that the title of Messalinians or Euchites had a very extensive application among the Greeks and the Orientals, for they gave it to all those who endeavoured to raise the soul to God by recalling and withdrawing it from terrestrial and sensible objects, however these enthusiasts might differ from each other in their opinions upon other subjects.

XXV. Toward the conclusion of this century, two opposite sects involved Arabia and the adjacent countries in the troubles and tumults of a new controversy. These jarring factions went by the names of Antidico-Marianites and Collyridians. The former maintained, that the Virgin Mary did not always preserve her immaculate state, but received the embraces of her husband Joseph after the birth of Christ. The latter, on the contrary, (who were singularly favoured by the female sex), running into the opposite extreme, worshipped the Blessed Virgin as a goddess, and judged it necessary to appease her anger, and seek her favour and protection, by libations, sacrifices, oblations of cakes, (*collyridæ*,) and the like services.[a]

Other sects might be mentioned here; but they are too obscure and inconsiderable to deserve notice.

cap. x. p. 672.—Timotheus, Presbyter, de receptione Hæreticor. published in the third volume of Cotelerius' Monumenta Eccles. Græcæ.—Jac. Tollii Insignia Itineris Italici, p. 110.—Assemani, Bibliotheca Orientalis Vaticana, tom. i. et iii.

[a] See Epiphan. Hæres. lxxviii. lxxix.

THE FIFTH CENTURY.

PART I.

THE EXTERNAL HISTORY OF THE CHURCH.

CHAPTER I.

Concerning the prosperous Events that happened to the Church.

I. In order to arrive at a true knowledge of the causes to which we are to attribute the outward state of the church, and the events which happened to it during the fifth century, we must keep in view the civil history of this period. It is, therefore, proper to observe, that, in the beginning of this century, the Roman empire was divided into two sovereignties; one of which comprehended the eastern provinces, the other those of the west. Arcadius, the emperor of the east reigned at Constantinople; and Honorius, who governed the western provinces, chose Ravenna for the place of his residence. The latter prince, remarkable only for the sweetness of his temper and the goodness of his heart, neglected the great affairs of the empire; and, inattentive to the weighty duties of his station, held the reins of government with an unsteady hand. The Goths, taking advantage of this criminal indolence, made incursions into Italy, laid waste its fairest provinces, and sometimes carried their desolations as far as Rome, which they ravaged and plundered in the most dreadful manner. These calamities, which fell upon the western part of the empire from the Gothic depredations, were followed by others still more dreadful under the succeeding emperors. A fierce and warlike people, issuing from Germany, overspread Italy, Gaul, and Spain, the noblest of all the European provinces, and erected new kingdoms in these fertile countries; and Odoacer, at last, at the head of the Heruli, having conquered Augustulus, in 476, gave the mortal blow to the western empire, and reduced all Italy under his dominion. About sixteen years after this, Theodoric, king of the Ostrogoths, made war upon these barbarian invaders, at the request of Zeno, emperor of the east; conquered Odoacer in several battles; and obtained, as the fruit of his victories, a kingdom for the Ostrogoths in Italy, which subsisted under various turns of fortune from the year 493 to 552.[a]

These new monarchs of the west pretended to acknowledge the supremacy of the emperors, who resided at Constantinople, and gave some faint external marks of a disposition to reign in subordination to them; but, in reality, they ruled with an absolute independence in their respective governments; and, as appears particularly from the dominion exercised by Theodoric in Italy, they left nothing to the eastern emperors but a mere shadow of power and authority.[b]

II. These constant wars, and the inexpressible calamities with which they were attended, were undoubtedly detrimental to the cause and progress of Christianity. It must, however, be acknowledged that the Christian emperors, especially those who ruled in the east, were active and assiduous in extirpating the remains of the ancient superstitions. Theodosius the younger distinguished himself in this pious and noble work, and many remarkable monuments of his zeal are still preserved;[c] such as the laws which enjoined either the destruction of the heathen temples, or the dedication of them to Christ and his saints; the edicts, by which he abrogated the sacrilegious rites and ceremonies of Paganism, and removed from all offices and employments in the state such as persisted in their attachment to the absurdities of Polytheism.

This spirit of reformation appeared with less vigour in the western empire. There the feasts of Saturn and Pan, the combats of the gladiators, and other rites that were instituted in honour of the pagan deities, were celebrated with the utmost freedom and impunity; and persons of the highest rank and authority publicly professed the religion of their idolatrous ancestors.[d] This liberty was, however, from time to time, reduced within narrower limits: and all those public sports and festivals, which were more peculiarly incompatible with the genius and sanctity of the Christian religion, were every where abolished.[e]

III. The limits of the church continued to extend themselves, and gained ground daily upon the idolatrous nations, both in the eastern and western empires. In the east, the inhabitants of the mountains Libanus and Anti-Libanus, being dreadfully infested with wild beasts, implored the assistance and counsels of the famous Simeon the Stylite, of whom we shall have occasion to speak hereafter. Simeon gave them for answer, that the only effectual method of removing this calamity was, to abandon the superstitious worship of their ancestors, and substitute the Christian religion in its place. The docility of this people, joined to the extremities to which they were reduced, engaged them to follow the counsels of this holy man. They embraced Christianity, and, in consequence of their conversion, they had the pleasure of seeing their savage enemies abandon their habitations, if we may believe the

[a] See, for a fuller illustration of this branch of history, the learned work of M. de Boss, entitled, Histoire Critique de la Monarchie Françoise, tom. i. p. 258; as also Mascow's History of the Germans.

[b] Car. du Fresne, Dissert. xxiii. ad Histor. Ludovici S. p. 280.—Muratori, Antiq. Ital. tom. ii. p. 578, 832.—Giannone, Historia di Napoli, tom. i. p. 207.—Vita Theodorici Ostrogothorum Regis, a Johanne Cochlæo, printed in 1699, with the observations of Peringskiold.

[c] See the Theodosian Code, tom. vi. p. 327.

[d] See the Saturnalia of Macrobius, lib. i.—Scipio Maffei delli Anfiteatri, lib. i. p. 56.—Pierre le Brun, Hist. Critique des Pratiques superstitieuses, tom. i. p. 237; and, above all, Montfaucon's Diss. de Moribus Tempore Theodosii M. et Arcadii, which is to be found in Latin, in the eleventh volume of the works of St. Chrysostom, and in French, in the twentieth volume of the Memoires de l'Academie des Inscriptions et des Belles Lettres, p. 197.

[e] Anastasius prohibited, toward the conclusion of this century, the combats with the wild beasts, and other shows. Asseman. Biblioth. Orient. Vatic. tom. i. p. 246.

writers who may affirm the truth of this prodigy. The same Simeon, by this influence and authority, introduced the Christian worship into a certain district of the Arabians: some allege, that this also was effected by a miracle, which to me appears more than doubtful.[a] To these instances of the progress of the Gospel, we may add the conversion of a considerable number of Jews in the isle of Crete: finding themselves grossly deluded by the impious pretensions of an impostor, called Moses Cretensis,[b] who gave himself out for the Messiah, they opened their eyes upon the truth, and spontaneously embraced the Christian religion.[c]

IV. The German nations, who rent in pieces the Roman empire in the west, were not all converted to Christianity at the same time. Some of them had embraced the truth before the time of their incursion; and such, among others, was the case of the Goths. Others, after having erected their little kingdoms in the empire, embraced the Gospel, that they might thus live with more security amidst a people, who, in general, professed the Christian religion. It is, however, uncertain (and likely to continue so) at what time, and by whose ministry, the Vandals, Sueves, and Alans, were converted to Christianity. With respect to the Burgundians, who inhabited the banks of the Rhine, and thence passed into Gaul, we are informed, by Socrates,[d] that they embraced the Gospel of their own accord, from a notion that Christ, or the God of the Romans, who had been represented to them as a most powerful being, would defend them against the rapines and incursions of the Huns. They afterwards sided with the Arian party, to which also the Vandals, Sueves, and Goths, were zealously attached. All these fierce and warlike nations considered a religion as excellent, in proportion to the success which crowned the arms of those who professed it; and therefore, when they saw the Romans in possession of an empire much more extensive than that of any other people, they concluded that Christ, their God, was of all others the most worthy of religious homage.

V. It was the same principle, as well as the same views, that engaged Clovis,[e] king of the Salii, a nation of the Franks, to embrace Christianity. This prince, whose signal valour was accompanied with barbarity, arrogance, and injustice, founded the kingdom of the Franks in Gaul, after having made himself master of a great part of that country, and meditated with remarkable eagerness and avidity the conquest of the whole. His conversion to the Christian religion is dated from the battle he fought with the Alemans, in 496, at a village called Tolbiacum;[f] in which, when the Franks began to give ground, and their affairs seemed desperate, he implored the assistance of Christ, (whom his queen Clotildis, daughter of the king of the Burgundians, had often represented to him, in vain, as the Son of the true God,) and solemnly engaged himself, by a vow, to worship him as his God, if he would render him victorious over his enemies. Victory decided in favour of the Franks; and Clovis, faithful to his engagement, received baptism at Rheims,[g] toward the conclusion of the same year, after having been instructed by Remigius, bishop of that city, in the doctrines of Christianity.[h] The example of the king had such a powerful effect upon the minds of his subjects, that three thousand of them immediately followed it, and were baptized with him. Many are of opinion, that the desire of extending his dominions principally contributed to render Clovis faithful to his engagement, though some influence may also be allowed to the zeal and exhortations of his queen Clotildis. Be that as it will, nothing is more certain than that his profession of Christianity was, in effect, of great use to him, both in confirming and enlarging his empire.

The miracles, which are said to have been wrought at the baptism of Clovis, are unworthy of the smallest degree of credit. Among others, the principal prodigy, that of the phial full of oil said to have been brought from heaven by a milk-white dove during the ceremony of baptism, is a fiction, or rather, perhaps, an imposture; a pretended miracle contrived by artifice and fraud.[i] Pious frauds of this nature were very frequently practised in Gaul and in Spain at this time, in order to captivate, with more facility, the minds of a rude and barbarous people, who were scarcely susceptible of a rational conviction.

The conversion of Clovis is looked upon by the learned as the origin of the titles of Most Christian King, and Eldest Son of the Church, which have been so long attributed to the kings of France;[k] for, if we except this prince, all the kings of those barbarous nations, who seized the Roman provinces, were either yet involved in the darkness of Paganism, or infected with the Arian heresy.

VI. Celestine, the Roman pontiff, sent Palladius into

[a] Vide idem Opus, tom. i. p. 246.

☞ [b] We shall give the relation of Socrates, concerning this impostor, in the words of the learned and estimable author of the Remarks on Ecclesiastical History. "In the time of Theodosius the younger, an impostor arose, called Moses Cretensis. He pretended to be a second Moses, sent to deliver the Jews who dwelt in Crete, and promised to divide the sea, and give them a safe passage through it. They assembled together, with their wives and children, and followed him to a promontory. He there commanded them to cast themselves into the sea. Many of them obeyed, and perished in the waters; and many were taken up and saved by fishermen. Upon this, the deluded Jews would have torn the impostor to pieces; but he escaped them, and was seen no more." See Jortin's Remarks, vol. iii.

[c] Socrates, Hist. Eccles. lib. vii. cap. xxxviii. p. 383.

[d] Socrat. lib. vii. cap. xxx. p. 371.

☞ [e] Besides the name of Clovis, this prince was also called Clodovæus, Hludovicus, Ludovicus, and Ludicin.

☞ [f] Tolbiacum is thought to be the present Zulpick, which is about twelve miles from Cologne.

[g] See Gregory of Tours, Historia Francorum, lib. ii. cap. xxx. xxxi.—Count Bunau's Historia Imperii Romano-Germanici, tom. i. p. 588.—Du Bos' Histoire Critique de la Monarchie Françoise, tom. ii. p. 340.

☞ [h] The epitomiser of the history of the Franks tells us, that Remigius having preached to Clovis, and those who had been baptized with him, a sermon on the passion of our Saviour, the king, in hearing him, could not forbear crying out, "If I had been there with my Franks, that should not have happened."

[i] The truth of this miracle has been denied by the learned John James Chiflet, in his book De Ampullâ Rhemensi, printed at Antwerp, in 1651; and it has been affirmed by Vertot, in the Memoires de l'Academie des Inscriptions et des Belles Lettres, tom. iv. p. 350. After a mature consideration of what has been alleged on both sides of the question, I can scarcely venture to deny the fact: I am therefore of opinion, that, in order to confirm and fix the wavering faith of this barbarian prince, Remigius had prepared his measures before-hand, and trained a pigeon, by great application and dexterity, in such a manner, that, during the baptism of Clovis, it descended from the roof of the church with a phial of oil. Among the records of this century, we find accounts of many such miracles. ☞ There is one circumstance, which obliges me to differ from Dr. Mosheim upon this point, and to look upon the story of the famous phial rather as a mere fiction, than as a pious fraud, or pretended miracle brought about by artifice; and that circumstance is, that Gregory of Tours, from whom we have a full account of the conversion and baptism of Clovis, and who, from his proximity to this time, may almost be called a contemporary writer, has not made the least mention of this famous miracle. This omission, in a writer whom the Roman catholics themselves consider as an over-credulous historian, amounts to a proof, that, in his time, this fable was not yet invented.

[k] See Gab. Daniel et De Camps, Dissert. de Titulo Regis Christianissimi, in the Journal des Sçavans for the year 1720, p. 243, 336, 404, 448. Memoires de l'Academie des Inscriptions, tom. xx. p. 466.

Ireland, to propagate the Christian religion among the rude inhabitants of that island. This first mission[a] was not attended with much fruit; nor did the success of Palladius bear any proportion to his laborious and pious endeavours. After his death, the same pontiff employed, in this mission, Succathus, a native of Scotland, whose name he changed into that of Patrick, and who arrived among the Irish in 432. The success of his ministry, and the number and importance of his pious exploits, stand upon record as undoubted proofs, not only of his resolution and patience, but also of his dexterity and address. Having attacked, with much more success than his predecessor, the errors and superstitions of that uncivilized people, and brought great numbers of them over to the Christian religion, he founded, in 472, the archbishoprick of Armagh,[b] which has ever since remained the metropolitan see of the Irish nation. Hence this famous missionary, though not the first who brought among that people the light of the Gospel, has yet been justly entitled the Apostle of the Irish, and the father of the Hibernian church, and is still generally acknowledged and revered in that honourable character.

VII. The causes and circumstances by which these different nations were engaged to abandon the superstition of their ancestors, and to embrace the religion of Jesus, may be easily deduced from the facts we have related in the history of their conversion. It would, indeed, be an instance of the blindest and most perverse partiality, not to acknowledge, that the labours and zeal of great and eminent men contributed to this happy purpose, and were the means by which the darkness of many was turned into light. But, on the other hand, they must be very inattentive and superficial observers of things, who do not perceive that the fear of punishment, the prospect of honours and advantages, and the desire of obtaining succour against their enemies from the countenance of the Christians, or the miraculous influence of their religion, were the prevailing motives that induced the greatest part to renounce the service of their impotent gods.

How far these conversions were due to real miracles attending the ministry of the early preachers is a matter extremely difficult to be determined; for, though I am persuaded that those pious men, who in the midst of many dangers, and in the face of obstacles seemingly invincible, endeavoured to spread the light of Christianity among the barbarous nations, were sometimes accompanied with the more peculiar presence and succours of the Most High,[c] yet I am equally convinced, that the greatest part of the prodigies, recorded in the histories of this age, are liable to the strongest suspicions of falsehood or imposture. The simplicity and ignorance of the generality in those times furnished the most favourable occasion for the exercise of fraud, and the impudence of impostors, in contriving false miracles, was artfully proportioned to the credulity of the vulgar,[d] while the sagacious and the wise, who perceived these cheats, were overawed into silence by the dangers that threatened their lives and fortunes, if they should expose the artifice.[e] Thus does it generally happen in human life, that, when danger attends the discovery and profession of the truth, the prudent are *silent*, the multitude *believe*, and impostors *triumph*.

CHAPTER II.

Concerning the Calamitous Events which happened to the Church during this Century.

I. IT has been already observed, that the Goths, Heruli, Franks, Huns, and Vandals, with other fierce and warlike nations, for the most part strangers to Christianity, had invaded the Roman empire, and rent it asunder in the most deplorable manner. Amidst these calamities, the Christians were grievous (we may venture to say, the principal) sufferers. It is true, these savage nations were much more intent upon the acquisition of wealth and dominion, than upon the propagation or support of the pagan superstitions; nor did their cruelty and opposition to the Christians arise from any religious principle, or from an enthusiastic desire to ruin the cause of Christianity; it was merely by the instigation of the Pagans who remained yet in the empire, that they were excited to treat with such severity and violence the followers of Christ. The painful consideration of their abrogated rites, and the hope of recovering their former liberty and privileges by the means of their new masters, induced the worshippers of the gods to seize with avidity every opportunity of inspiring them with the most bitter aversion to the Christians. Their endeavours, however, were without the desired effect, and their expectations were entirely disappointed. The greatest part of these barbarians embraced Christianity, though it be also true, that, in the beginning of their usurpations, the professors of that religion suffered heavily under the rigour of their government.

II. To destroy the credit of the Gospel, and to excite the hatred of the multitude against the Christians, the Pagans took occasion, from the calamities and tumults which distracted the empire, to renew the obsolete complaint of their ancestors against Christianity, as the source of these complicated woes. They alleged, that, before the coming of Christ, the world was blessed with peace and prosperity; but that, since the progress of his religion every where, the gods, filled with indignation to see their worship neglected and their altars abandoned, had visited the earth with plagues and desolations, which increased every day. This feeble objection was entirely removed by Augustin, in his

[a] From the fragments of the lives of some Irish bishops who are said to have converted many of their countrymen in the fourth century, archbishop Usher concludes, that Palladius was not the first bishop of Ireland; (see his Antiquities of the British Church;) but it has been evidently proved, among others by Bollandus, that these fragments are of no earlier date than the twelfth century, and are besides, for the most part, fabulous. Dr. Mosheim's opinion is farther confirmed by the authority of Prosper, which is decisive in this matter.

[b] See the Acta Sanctor. tom. ii. Martii, p. 517, tom. iii. Februar. p. 131, 179; and the Hibernia Sacra of Sir James Ware, printed at Dublin in 1717. The latter published at London, in 1656, the Works of St. Patrick. Accounts of the synods, that were holden by this eminent missionary, are to be found in Wilkins' Concilia Magnæ Brit. et Hiberniæ, tom. i. With respect to the famous cave, called the Purgatory of St. Patrick, the reader may consult Le Brun, Histoire Critique des Pratiques superstitieuses, tom. iv. p. 34.

[c] There is a remarkable passage, relating to the miracles of this century, in the dialogue of Æneas Gazæus concerning the immortality of the soul, entitled *Theophrastus*. See the controversy concerning the time when miracles ceased in the church, that was carried on about the middle of the eighteenth century, on occasion of Dr. Middleton's Free Inquiry.

[d] This is ingenuously confessed by the Benedictine monks in their Literary History of France, tom. ii. p. 33, and happily expressed by Livy, Hist. lib. xxiv. cap. x. sect. 6. 'Prodigia multa nuntiata sunt, quæ quo magis credebant simplices et religiosi homines, eo plura nuntiabantur.'

[e] Sulpitius Severus, Dial. i. p. 438. Ep. i. p. 457. Dial. iii. cap. ii. p. 487.

book *de Civitate Dei;* a work exceedingly rich and ample in point of matter, and filled with the most profound and diversified erudition. It also drew a complete confutation from the learned pen of Orosius, who, in a history written expressly for that purpose, showed, with the strongest evidence, that not only the same calamities now complained of, but also plagues of a much more dreadful kind, had afflicted mankind before the Christian religion appeared in the world.

The misfortunes of the times produced still more pernicious effects upon the religious sentiments of the Gauls. They introduced among that people the most desperate notions, and led many of them to reject the belief of a superintending providence, and to exclude the Deity from the government of the universe. Against these phrenetic infidels, Salvian wrote his book concerning the divine government.

III. Hitherto we have given only a general view of the sufferings of the Christians; it is, however, proper, that we should enter into a more distinct and particular account of those misfortunes.

In Gaul, and the neighbouring provinces, the Goths and Vandals (whose cruel and sacrilegious soldiery respected neither the majesty of religion, nor the rights of humanity) committed acts of barbarity and violence against a multitude of Christians.

In Britain, a long series of tumults and divisions involved the Christians in many troubles. When the affairs of the Romans declined in that country, the Britons were tormented by the Picts and Scots, nations remarkable for their violence and ferocity. Hence, after many sufferings and disasters, they chose, in 445, Vortigern for their king. This prince, finding himself too weak to make head against the enemies of his country, called the Anglo-Saxons from Germany to his aid, about the year 449. The consequences of this measure were pernicious; and it soon appeared, that the warriors, who came as auxiliaries into Britain, oppressed it with calamities more grievous than those which it had suffered from its enemies; for the Saxons aimed at nothing less than to subdue the ancient inhabitants of the country, and to reduce the whole island under their dominion. Hence a most bloody and obstinate war arose between the Britons and the Saxons, which, after having been carried on, during a hundred and thirty years, with various successes, ended in the final defeat of the Britons, who were at length constrained to seek a retreat in Wales. During these commotions, the state of the British church was deplorable beyond expression; it was almost totally overwhelmed and extinguished by the Anglo-Saxons, who adhered to the worship of the gods, and put an immense number of Christians to the most cruel deaths.[a]

IV. In Persia, the Christians suffered grievously by the imprudent zeal of Abdas, bishop of Susa, who pulled down the Pyræum, which was a temple dedicated to fire; for when this obstinate prelate was ordered by the king (Yezdejird) to rebuild that temple, he refused to comply; for which he was put to death in 414, and the churches of the Christians were demolished. This persecution was not, however, of long duration, but seems to have been extinguished soon after its commencement.

Warharan or Bahram, the son of the monarch already mentioned, treated the Christians, in 421, in a manner yet more barbarous and inhuman, to which he was led partly by the instigation of the Magi, and partly by his keen aversion to the Romans, with whom he was at war; for, as often as the Persians and the Romans were at variance, the Christians, who dwelt in Persia, felt new and redoubled effects of their monarch's wrath; and this from a prevailing notion, not perhaps entirely groundless, that they favoured the Romans, and rendered real services to their empire.[b] In this persecution, a prodigious number of Christians perished in the most exquisite tortures, and by various kinds of punishment.[c] But they were, at length, delivered from these cruel oppressions by the peace that was made in 427, between Warharan and the emperor Theodosius the younger.[d]

It was not from the Pagans only that the Christians were exposed to suffering and persecution; they were also harassed and oppressed in a variety of ways by the Jews, who lived in great opulence, and enjoyed a high degree of favour and credit in several parts of the east.[e] Among these, none treated them with greater rigour and arrogance than Gamaliel, the patriarch of that nation, a man of the greatest power and influence, whose authority and violence were, on that account, restrained, in 415, by an express edict of Theodosius.[f]

V. It does not appear, from extant records, that any writings against Christ and his followers were published in this century, unless we consider as such the histories of Olympiodorus[g] and Zosimus, of whom the latter loses no opportunity of reviling the Christians, and loading them with the most unjust and bitter reproaches. But, though so few books were written against Christianity, we are not to suppose that its adversaries had laid aside the spirit of opposition. The schools of the philosophers and rhetoricians were yet open in Greece, Syria, and Egypt; and there is no doubt that these artful teachers laboured assiduously to corrupt the minds of the youth, and to instil into them, at least some of the principles of the ancient superstition.[h] The history of these times, and the writings of several Christians who lived in this century, exhibit evident proofs of these clandestine methods of opposing the progress of the Gospel.

---

[a] See, beside Bede and Gildas, archbishop Usher's Antiquitat. Ecclesiæ Britannicæ, cap. xii. p. 415, and Rapin's Histoire d'Angleterre, tom. i. livr. ii.

[b] Theodoret, Hist. Eccles. lib. v. cap. xxix. p. 245. Bayle's Dictionary, at the article Abdas. Barbeyrac, de la Morale des Peres, p. 320.

[c] Jos. Sim. Assemani Biblioth. Oriental. Vatican. tom. i. p. 182, 248.

[d] Socrates, Hist. Eccles. lib. vii. cap. xx.

[e] Socrat. lib. vii. cap. xiii. xvi. Codex Theodos. tom. vi. p. 265.

[f] Codex Theodos. tom. vi. p. 262.

[g] Photii Biblioth. cod. lxxx.

[h] Zacharias Mitylen. de Opificio Dei.

PART II.

THE INTERNAL HISTORY OF THE CHURCH.

CHAPTER I.

Concerning the state of Learning and Philosophy.

I. Though, in this century, the illiterate and ignorant were advanced to eminent and important stations, both ecclesiastical and civil, yet we must not thence conclude, that the sciences were treated with universal contempt. The value of learning, and the excellence of the fine arts, were generally acknowledged among the thinking part of mankind. Hence public schools were erected in almost all the great cities, such as Constantinople, Rome, Marseilles, Edessa, Nisibis, Carthage, Lyons, and Treves; and public instructors of capacity and genius were set apart for the education of the youth, and maintained at the expense of the emperors. Several bishops and monks contributed also to the advancement of knowledge, by imparting to others their small stock of learning and science. But the infelicity of the times, the incursions of the barbarous nations, and the scarcity of great geniuses, rendered the fruits of these excellent establishments much less important than their generous founders and promoters expected.

II. In the western provinces, and especially in Gaul, there were indeed some men eminently distinguished by their learning and talents, and every way proper to serve as models to the lower orders in the republic of letters. Of this we have abundant proof in the writings of Macrobius, Salvian, Vincentius bishop of Liris, Ennodius, Sidonius Apollinaris, Claudian, Mamertus, Dracontius, and others, who, though in some respects inferior to the celebrated authors of antiquity, are yet far from being destitute of elegance, and discover in their productions a most laborious application to literary researches of various kinds. But the barbarous nations, which either spread desolation, or formed settlements in the Roman territories, choked the growth of those genial seeds, which the hand of science had sown in more auspicious times. These savage invaders, who possessed no other ambition than that of conquest, and considered military courage as the only source of true virtue and solid glory, beheld, in consequence, the arts and sciences with the utmost contempt. Wherever therefore they extended their conquests, ignorance and darkness followed their steps; and the culture of science was confined to the priests and monks alone; and even among these, learning degenerated from its primitive lustre, and put on the most unseemly and fantastic form. Amidst the seduction of corrupt examples, the alarms of perpetual danger, and the horrors and devastations of war, the sacerdotal and monastic orders gradually lost all taste for solid science, in the place of which they substituted a lifeless spectre, an enormous phantom of barbarous erudition. They indeed kept public schools, and instructed the youth in what they called the *seven liberal arts*;[a] but these, as we learn from Augustin's account of them, consisted only of a certain number of dry, subtile, and useless precepts, and were consequently more adapted to load and perplex the memory, than to improve and strengthen the judgment; so that, toward the conclusion of this century, the sciences were almost totally extinguished; at least, what remained of them was no more than a shadowy form, without solidity or consistence.

III. The few who applied themselves to the study of philosophy in this age, had not yet embraced the doctrine or method of Aristotle. They looked upon the system of this eminent philosopher, as a labyrinth beset with thorns and thistles;[b] and yet, had they been able to read and understand his works, it is probable that many of them would have become his followers. The doctrine of Plato had a more established reputation, which it had enjoyed for several ages, and was considered, not only as less subtile and difficult than that of the Stagirite, but also as more conformable to the genius and spirit of the Christian religion. Besides, the most valuable of Plato's works were translated into Latin by Victorinus, and were thus adapted to general use;[c] and Sidonius Apollinaris[d] informs us, that all those, among the Latins, who had any inclination to the study of truth, fell into the Platonic notions, and followed that sage as their philosophical guide.

IV. The fate of learning was less deplorable among the Greeks and Orientals, than in the western provinces; and not only the several branches of polite literature, but also the more solid and profound sciences, were cultivated by them with tolerable success. Hence we find among them more writers of genius and learning than in other countries. Those, who were inclined to the study of law, resorted generally to Berytus, famous for its learned academy,[e] or to Alexandria,[f] which was frequented by the students of physic and chemistry. The professors of eloquence, poetry, philosophy, and the other liberal arts, taught the youth in public schools, which were erected in almost every city. Those however of Alexandria, Constantinople, and Edessa, were deemed superior to all others, both in point of erudition and method.[g]

V. The doctrine and sect of the modern Platonics, or Platonists, retained, among the Syrians and Alexandrians a considerable part of their ancient splendour. Olympiodorus, Hero,[h] and other philosophers of the first rank, added a lustre to the Alexandrian school. That of Athens was rendered famous by the talents and erudition of Theophrastus, Plutarch, and his successor Syrianus. These were the instructors of the renowned Proclus, who far surpassed the Platonic philosophers of this century, and acquired such a high degree of the public esteem, as enabled him to give new life to the doctrine of Plato, and restore it to its former credit in Greece.[i] Marinus, of Neapolis, Ammo-

[a] These arts were grammar, rhetoric, logic, arithmetic, music, geometry, and astronomy. See cent. viii. part ii. ch. ii. in this volume.

[b] The passages of different writers, that prove what is here advanced, are collected by Launoy, in his book, *de variâ Aristotelis Fortunâ in Academiâ Parisiensi.*

[c] See Augustini Confess. lib. i. cap. ii. sect. i. p. 105, 106. tom. i. op.

[d] See his Epistles, book iv. ep. iii. xi. book iv. ep. ix.

[e] See Hasæi Lib. de Academia Jureconsultorum Berytensi; as also Mitylenæus, de Opificio Dei, p. 164.

[f] Mitylenæus de Opificio Dei, p. 179.

[g] Æneas Gazæus in Theophrasto. [h] Marinus, Vita Procli, cap. ix.

[i] The life of Proclus, written by Marinus, was published at Hamburg, in 1700, by John Albert Fabricius, and was enriched by the famous editor, with a great number of learned observations.

nius the son of Hermias, Isidorus and Damascius, the disciples of Proclus, followed, with an ardent emulation, the traces of their master, and formed successors who resembled them in all respects. But the imperial laws, and the daily progress of the Christian religion, gradually diminished the lustre and authority of these philosophers;[a] and, as there were many of the Christian doctors who adopted the Platonic system, and were sufficiently qualified to explain it to the youth, this naturally prevented the schools of these heathen sages from being so much frequented as they had formerly been.

VI. The credit of the Platonic philosophy, and the preference that was given to it, as more excellent in itself, and less repugnant to the genius of the Gospel than other systems, did not prevent the doctrine of Aristotle from coming to light after a long struggle, and forcing its way into the Christian church. The Platonists themselves interpreted, in their schools, some of the writings of Aristotle, particularly his Dialectics, and recommended that work to such of the youth as had a taste for logical discussions, and were fond of disputing. In this, the Christian doctors imitated the manner of the heathen schools; and this was the first step to that universal dominion, which the Stagirite afterwards obtained in the republic of letters. A second and yet larger stride toward this universal empire was made by the Aristotelian philosophy during the controversies which Origen had occasioned, and the Arian, Eutychian, Nestorian, and Pelagian dissensions, which, in this century, were so fruitful of calamities to the Christian church. Origen, as is well known, was zealously attached to the Platonic system. When, therefore, he was publicly condemned, many, to avoid the imputation of his errors, and to preclude their being reckoned among the number of his followers, adopted openly the philosophy of Aristotle, which was entirely different from that of Origen. The Nestorian, Arian, and Eutychian controversies were managed, or rather drawn out, on both sides, by a perpetual recourse to subtile distinctions and captious sophisms; and no philosophy was so proper to furnish such weapons, as that of Aristotle; for that of Plato was far from being adapted to form the mind to the polemic arts. Besides, the Pelagian doctrine bore a striking resemblance to the Platonic opinions concerning God and the human soul; and this was an additional reason which engaged many to desert the Platonists, and to assume, at least, the name of Peripatetics.

CHAPTER II.

Concerning the Doctors and Ministers of the Christian Church, and its Form of Government.

I. SEVERAL causes contributed to bring about a change in the external form of ecclesiastical government. The power of the bishops, particularly those of the first order, was sometimes augmented, and sometimes diminished, according as the times and the occasions offered; and in all these changes the intrigues of the court and the political state of the empire, had much more influence, than the rules of equity and wisdom.

These alterations were, indeed, matters of small moment. But an affair of much greater consequence now drew the general attention; and this was the vast augmentation of honours and rank, accumulated upon the bishops of Constantinople, in opposition to the most vigorous efforts of the Roman pontiff. In the preceding century, the council of Constantinople had, on account of the dignity and privileges of that imperial city, conferred on its bishops a place among the first rulers of the Christian church. This new dignity adding fuel to their ambition, they extended their views of authority and dominion; and, encouraged, no doubt, by the consent of the emperor, reduced the provinces of Asia Minor, Thrace, and Pontus, under their spiritual jurisdiction. In this century, they grasped at still farther accessions of power; so that not only the whole eastern part of Illyricum was added to their former acquisitions, but they were also exalted to the highest summit of ecclesiastical authority; for, by the 28th canon of the council holden at Chalcedon in 451, it was resolved that the same rights and honours which had been conferred upon the bishop of Rome, were due to the bishop of Constantinople, on account of the equal dignity and lustre of the two cities, in which these prelates exercised their authority. The same council confirmed also, by a solemn act, the bishop of Constantinople in the spiritual government of those provinces over which he had ambitiously usurped the jurisdiction. Pope Leo the Great, bishop of Rome, opposed with vehemence the passing of these decrees; and his opposition was seconded by that of several other prelates. But their efforts were vain, as the emperors threw their weight into the balance, and thus supported the decisions of the Grecian bishops.[b] In consequence then of the decrees of this famous council, the prelate of Constantinople began to contend obstinately for the supremacy with the Roman pontiff, and to crush the bishops of Alexandria and Antioch, so as to make them feel the oppressive effects of his pretended superiority; and no one distinguished himself more by his ambition and arrogance in this affair, than Acacius.[c]

II. It was much about this time that Juvenal, bishop of Jerusalem, or rather of Ælia, attempted to withdraw himself and his church from the jurisdiction of the bishop of Cæsarea, and aspired to a place among the first prelates of the Christian world. The high degree of veneration and esteem, in which the church of Jerusalem was holden among all other Christian societies (on account of its rank among the apostolical churches, and its title to the appellation of *mother-church*, as having succeeded the first Christian assembly founded by the apostles,) was extremely favourable to the ambition of Juvenal, and rendered his project much more practicable than it would otherwise have been. Encouraged by this, and animated by the favour and protection of the younger Theodosius, the aspiring prelate not only assumed the dignity of patriarch of all Palestine,[d] a rank that rendered him su

[a] See Æneas Gazæus in Theophrasto.

[b] Le Quien, Oriens Christ. tom. i. p. 36.

[c] See Bayle's *Dictionaire Historique*, at the article Acacius.

☞ [d] By *all Palestine*, the reader is desired to understand three distinct provinces, of which each bore the name of Palestine; and accordingly the original is thus expressed, *Trium Palæstinarum Episcopum seu Patriarcham.* After the destruction of Jerusalem, the face of Palestine was almost totally changed; and it was so parcelled out and wasted by a succession of wars and invasions, that it scarcely preserved any trace of its former condition. Under the Christian emperors there were three Palestines formed out of the ancient country of that name, each of which was an episcopal see; and it was these three dioceses that Juvenal usurped and maintained the jurisdiction. See, for a further account of the three Palestines, Spanhemii Geographia Sacra.

preme and independent of all spiritual authority, but also invaded the rights of the bishop of Antioch, and usurped his jurisdiction over the provinces of Phœnicia and Arabia. Hence arose a warm contest between Juvenal and Maximus, bishop of Antioch, which the council of Chalcedon decided, by restoring to the latter the provinces of Phœnicia and Arabia, and confirming the former in the spiritual possession of all Palestine,[a] and in the high rank which he had assumed in the church.[b] Thus were created, in the fifth century, five superior rulers of the church, who were distinguished from the rest by the title of Patriarchs.[c] The oriental historians mention a sixth, viz. the bishop of Seleucia and Ctesiphon, to whom, according to their account, the bishop of Antioch voluntarily ceded a part of his jurisdiction.[d] But this addition to the number of the patriarchs is unworthy of credit, as the only proof of it is drawn from the Arabic laws of the council of Nice, which are notoriously destitute of all authority.

III. The patriarchs were distinguished by considerable and extensive rights and privileges, that were annexed to their high station. They alone consecrated the bishops, who lived in the provinces that belonged to their jurisdiction. They assembled yearly in council the clergy of their respective districts, in order to regulate the affairs of the church. The cognisance of all important causes, and the determination of the more weighty controversies, were referred to the patriarch of the province where they arose. They also pronounced a decisive judgment in those cases, where accusations were brought against bishops, and, lastly, they appointed vicars,[e] or deputies, clothed with their authority, for the preservation of order and tranquillity in the remoter provinces. Such were the great and distinguishing privileges of the patriarchs; and they were accompanied with others of less moment, which it is needless to mention. It must, however, be carefully observed, that the authority of the patriarchs was not acknowledged through all the provinces without exception. Several districts, both in the eastern and western empires, were exempted from their jurisdiction.[f] The emperors, who reserved to themselves the supreme power in the Christian hierarchy, and received, with great facility and readiness, the complaints of those who considered themselves as injured by the patriarchs; and the councils also, in which the majesty and legislative power of the church immediately resided; were obstacles to the arbitrary proceedings of the patriarchal order.

IV. This constitution of ecclesiastical government was so far from contributing to the peace and prosperity of the Christian church, that it proved, on the contrary, a perpetual source of dissensions and animosities, and was productive of various inconveniences and grievances. The patriarchs, who, by their exalted rank and extensive authority, were equally able to do much good and much mischief, began to encroach upon the rights, and trample upon the prerogatives of their bishops, and thus introduced, gradually, a sort of spiritual bondage into the church; and that they might invade, without opposition, the rights of the bishops, they permitted the latter, in their turn, to trample with impunity upon the ancient rights and privileges of the people; for, in proportion as the bishops multiplied their privileges and extended their usurpations, the patriarchs gained new accessions of power by the despotism which they exercised over the episcopal order. They fomented also divisions among the bishops, and excited animosities between them and the other ministers of the church. They went still farther, and sowed the seeds of discord between the clergy and the people, that all these combustions might furnish them with perpetual matter for the exercise of their authority, and procure them a multitude of clients and dependents. They left no artifice unemployed to strengthen their own authority, and to raise opposition against the prelates from every quarter. For this purpose it was that they engaged in their cause by the most alluring promises, and attached to their interests by the most magnificent acts of liberality, whole swarms of monks, who served as intestine enemies to the bishops, and as a dead weight on the side of patriarchal tyranny. The efforts of these monastic hirelings contributed more than any other means to ruin the ancient ecclesiastical discipline, to diminish the authority of the bishops, and raise, to an enormous and excessive height, the power and prerogatives of their insolent and ambitious patrons.

V. To these lamentable evils, were added the ambitious quarrels, and the bitter animosities, that rose among the patriarchs themselves, and which produced the most bloody wars and the most detestable and horrid crimes. The patriarch of Constantinople distinguished himself in these odious contests. Elate with the favour and proximity of the imperial court, he cast a haughty eye on all sides, where any objects were to be found on which he might exercise his lordly ambition. On one hand, he reduced under his jurisdiction the patriarchs of Alexandria and Antioch, as prelates only of the second order; and, on the other, he invaded the diocese of the Roman pontiff, and despoiled him of several provinces. The two former prelates, though they struggled with vehemence, and raised considerable tumults by their opposition, laboured ineffectually, both for want of strength, and likewise on account of a variety of unfavourable circumstances. But the pope, far superior to them in wealth and power, contended also with more vigour and obstinacy, and in his turn, gave a deadly wound to the usurped supremacy of the Byzantine patriarch.

The attentive inquirer into the affairs of the church, from this period, will find, in the events now mentioned, the principal source of those most scandalous and deplorable dissensions, which divided first the eastern church into various sects, and afterwards separated it entirely from that of the west. He will find, that these ignominious schisms flowed chiefly from the unchristian contentions for dominion and supremacy, which reigned among those who set themselves up for the fathers and defenders of the church.

VI. No one of the contending bishops found the occurrences of the times so favourable to his ambition, as the Roman pontiff. Notwithstanding the redoubled efforts of the bishop of Constantinople, a variety of circumstances con-

[a] See also, for an account of the Three Palestines, Caroli à S. Paulo Geographia Sacra, p. 307.

[b] See Mich. Le Quien, Oriens Christianus, tom. iii.

[c] See the authors who have written of the patriarchs, mentioned and recommended by the learned Fabricius, in his Bibliograph. Antiquar. cap. xiii. p. 453. [d] Assemani Biblioth. Orient. Vatican. tom. i.

[e] Dav. Blondel, de la Primauté de l'Eglise, chap. xxv. p. 332. Theod. Ruinart, de Pallio Archi-Episcopali, p. 445; tom. ii. of the posthumous works of Mabillon.

[f] Brerewood's Dissert. de veteris Ecclesiæ Gubernatione patriarchali, printed at the end of archbishop Usher's book, entitled, Opusculum de Origine Episcoporum et Metropolitanorum.

curred to augment his power and authority, though he had not yet assumed the dignity of supreme lawgiver and judge of the whole Christian church. The bishops of Alexandria and Antioch, unable to make head against the lordly prelate of Constantinople, often fled to the Roman pontiff for succour against his violence; and the inferior order of bishops used the same method, when their rights were invaded by the prelates of Alexandria and Antioch: so that the bishop of Rome, by taking all these prelates alternately under his protection, daily added new degrees of influence and authority to the Roman see, rendered it every where respected, and was thus imperceptibly establishing its supremacy. Such were the means by which that pontiff extended his dominion in the east. In the west its increase arose from other causes. The declining power and the supine indolence of the emperors, left the authority of the bishop, who presided in their capital, almost without control. The incursions, moreover, and triumphs of the barbarians were so far from being prejudicial to his rising dominion, that they rather contributed to its advancement; for the kings who penetrated into the empire, were only solicitous about the methods of giving a sufficient degree of stability to their respective governments; and when they perceived the subjection of the multitude to the bishops, and the dependence of the latter upon the Roman pontiff, they immediately resolved to reconcile this ghostly ruler to their interests, by loading him with benefits and honours of various kinds.

Among all the prelates who ruled the church of Rome during this century, there was not one who asserted his authority and pretensions with such vigour and success, as Leo, surnamed the Great. It must however be observed, that neither he, nor the other promoters of the same claims, were able to overcome all the obstacles that were laid in their way, or the various checks which were given to their ambition. Many examples might be alleged in proof of this assertion, particularly the case of the Africans, whom no threats or promises could engage to submit the decision of their controversies, and the determination of their causes, to the Roman tribunal.[a]

VII. The vices of the clergy were now carried to the most enormous excess; and all the writers of this century, whose probity and virtue render them worthy of credit, are unanimous in their accounts of the luxury, arrogance, avarice, and voluptuousness of the sacerdotal orders. The bishops, and particularly those of the first rank, created various delegates, or ministers, who managed for them the affairs of their dioceses; and courts were gradually formed, where these pompous ecclesiastics gave audience, and received the homage of a cringing multitude. The office of a presbyter was looked upon of such a high and eminent nature, that Martin, bishop of Tours, audaciously maintained, at a public entertainment, that the emperor was inferior, in dignity, to one of that order.[b] As to the deacons, their pride and licentiousness occasioned many and grievous complaints, as appears from the decrees of several councils.[c]

These opprobrious stains, in the characters of the clergy, would never have been endured, had not the greatest part of mankind been sunk in superstition and ignorance, and people in general formed their ideas of the rights and liberties of Christian ministers from the model exhibited by the sacerdotal orders among the Hebrews, during the prevalence of the law of Moses, and among the Greeks and Romans in the darkness of paganism. The barbarous nations also, which, on the ruin of the Romans, divided among themselves the western empire, bore, with the utmost patience and moderation, both the dominion and vices of the bishops and priests, because, upon their conversion to Christianity, they became naturally subject to their jurisdiction; and still more, because they considered the ministers of Christ as invested with the same rights and privileges, which distinguished the priests of their fictitious deities.

VIII. The corruption of an order, appointed to promote, by doctrine and example, the sacred interests of piety and virtue, will appear less surprising when we consider, that multitudes of people were in every country admitted, without examination or choice, into the body of the clergy, the greatest part of whom had no other view, than the enjoyment of a lazy and inglorious repose. Many of these ecclesiastics were confined to no fixed places or assemblies, and had no employment of any kind, but sauntered about wherever they pleased, gaining their maintenance by imposing upon the ignorant multitude, and sometimes by mean and dishonest practices. But if any should ask, how this account is reconcileable with the number of saints, who, according to the testimonies both of the eastern and western writers, are said to have shone forth in this century, the answer is obvious; these saints were canonised by the ignorance of the times; for, in an age of darkness and corruption, those who distinguished themselves from the multitude, either by their genius, their writings, or their eloquence, by their prudence and dexterity in conducting affairs of importance, or by their meekness and moderation, and the ascendancy which they had gained over their resentments and passions, were esteemed something more than men; they were reverenced as gods; or, to speak more properly, they appeared to others as men divinely inspired, and full of the Deity.

IX. The monks, who had formerly lived only for themselves in solitary retreats, and had never thought of assuming any rank among the sacerdotal orders, were now gradually distinguished from the populace, and were endowed with such opulence and such honourable privileges that they found themselves in a condition to claim an eminent station among the supports and pillars of the Christian community.[d] The fame of their piety and sanctity was at first so great, that bishops and presbyters were often chosen out of their order;[e] and the passion of erecting edifices and convents, in which the monks and holy virgins might serve God in the most commodious manner, was at this time carried beyond all bounds.[f]

The monastic orders did not all observe the same rule of discipline, or the same manner of living. Some followed the rule of Augustine, others that of Basil, others that of Antony, others that of Athanasius, others that of

[a] Du-Pin, de Antiquâ Ecclesiæ, Disciplinâ, Diss. ii. p. 166. Melch. Leydeck. Historia Eccles. Africanæ, tom. ii. Diss. ii. p. 505.

[b] Sulpitius Severus, de Vitâ Martini, cap. xx. p. 339, compared with Dialog. ii. cap. vi. p. 457.

[c] See Dav. Blondel. Apologia pro Sententiâ Hieronymi de Episcopis et Presbyteris, p. 140.

[d] Epiphanius, Exposit. Fidei, tom. i. op. p. 1094.—Mabillon's Reponse aux Chanoines Reguliers.

[e] Severus, de Vitâ Martini, cap. x. p. 320. Dial. i. cap. xxi. p. 426.

[f] Severus, Dial. i. p. 419.—Norisius, Histor. Pelag. lib. i. cap. iii. p. 273. tom. i. op.—Histoire Literaire de la France, tom. ii. p. 35.

Pachomius; but they must all have become extremely negligent and remiss in observing the laws of their respective orders, since the licentiousness of the monks, even in this century, was even proverbial,[a] and they are said to have excited in various places the most dreadful tumults and seditions. All the monastic orders were under the protection of the bishops in whose provinces they lived; nor did the patriarchs claim any authority over them, as appears with the utmost evidence from the decrees of the councils holden in this century.[b]

X. Several writers of considerable merit adorned this century. Among the Greeks and Orientals, the first place is due to Cyril, bishop of Alexandria, so famous for his learned productions, and the various controversies in which he was engaged. It would be unjust to derogate from the praises which are due to this eminent man; but it would betray, on the other hand, a criminal partiality, if we should pass uncensured the turbulent spirit, the litigious and contentious temper, and other defects, which are laid to his charge.[c]

After Cyril we may place Theodoret, bishop of Cyrus, (or Cyropolis,) an eloquent, copious, and learned writer, eminent for his acquaintance with all the branches of sacred erudition, but unfortunate in his attachment to some of the Nestorian errors.[d]

Isidore, of Pelusium, was a man of uncommon learning and sanctity. A great number[e] of his epistles are yet extant, and discover more piety, genius, erudition, and wisdom, than are to be found in the voluminous productions of many other writers.[f]

Theophilus, bishop of Alexandria, few of whose writings are now extant, acquired an immortal name, by his violent opposition to Origen and his followers.[g]

Palladius deserves a rank among the better sort of authors by his Lausiac History and his Life of Chrysostom.

Theodore of Mopsuestia, though accused after his death of the greatest errors, was one of the most learned men of his time. Those who have read, with any attention, the fragments of his writings, which are to be found in Photius, will lament the want of these excellent compositions, which are either entirely lost, or, if any remain,[h] are only extant among the Nestorians, and in the Syriac language.[i]

Nilus, disciple of Chrysostom, composed several treatises of a practical and pious kind; but these performances derive more merit from the worthy and laudable intention of their author than from any other circumstance.

We pass over in silence Basilius of Seleucia, Theodotus of Ancyria, and Gelasius of Cyzicum, for the sake of brevity.

XI. A Roman pontiff, Leo I. surnamed the Great, shines forth at the head of the Latin writers of this century. He was a man of uncommon genius and eloquence, which he employed however too much in extending his authority; a point in which his ambition was both indefatigable and excessive.[k]

Orosius acquired a considerable degree of reputation by the History which he wrote to refute the cavils of the Pagans against Christianity, and by his books against the Pelagians and Priscillianists.[l]

Cassian, an illiterate and superstitious man, inculcated in Gaul, both by his discourse and his writings, the discipline and manner of living which prevailed among the Syrian and Egyptian monks, and was a sort of teacher to those who were called Semi-Pelagians.[m]

Maximus of Turin published several Homilies, which are yet extant, and, though short, are for the most part recommended both by elegance and piety.

Eucherius, bishop of Lyons, was one of the most considerable moral writers that flourished among the Latins in this century.[n]

Pontius of Nola,[o] distinguished by his eminent and fervent piety, is also esteemed for his poems, and other good performances.

Peter, bishop of Ravenna, obtained by his eloquence the title of Chrysologus; nor are his discourses entirely destitute of genius.[p]

Salvian was an eloquent, but, at the same time, a melancholy and sour writer, who, in his vehement declamations against the vices of his times, unwarily discovers the defects of his own character.[q]

Prosper of Aquitaine, and Marius Mercator, are abundant-

---

[a] Sulp. Severus, Dial. i. cap. viii. p. 399.

[b] See Jo. Launoii Inquisitio in Chartam Immunitatis B. Germani, op. tom. iii. part ii. p. 3. In the ancient records, posterior to this century, the monks are frequently called Clerks. (See Mabillon's Præf. ad Sæc. ii. Actor. Sanctor. Ord. Benedicti.) And this shews, that they now began to be ranked among the clergy, or ministers of the church.

[c] The works of Cyril were published at Paris by Aubert, in six vols. folio, in 1638.

[d] The Jesuit Sirmond gave at Paris, in 1642, a noble edition of the works of this prelate in four volumes; a fifth was added by Garnier, in 1685. ☞ We must observe, in favour of this excellent ecclesiastic, so renowned for the sanctity and simplicity of his manners, that he abandoned the doctrines of Nestorius, and thus effaced the stain he had contracted by his personal attachment to that heretic, and to John of Antioch.

☞ [e] These epistles amount to 2012, and are divided into five books. They are short, but admirably written, and are equally recommendable for the solidity of the matter, and the purity and elegance of their style.

[f] The best edition of Isidore's Epistles, is that which was published by the Jesuit Scott, at Paris, in 1638.

[g] See Euseb. Renaudot, Historia Patriarchar. Alexandrinor. p. 103.

[h] See Assemani Bibl. Oriental. Clement. Vatic. tom. iii. part ii. p. 227.

☞ [i] It appears by this account of the works of Theodore, that Dr. Mosheim had not seen the Dissertations of the late duke of Orleans, in one of which that learned prince has demonstrated, that the commentary upon the Psalms, which is to be found in the Chain or Collection of Corderius, and which bears the name of Theodore, is the production of Theodore of Mopsuestia. There exists, also, beside the fragments that are to be found in Photius, a manuscript commentary of this illustrious author upon the twelve minor prophets.

[k] All the works of Leo were published at Lyons, in 1700, by the care of the celebrated Quesnel of the Oratory.

[l] See Bayle's Dictionary, at the article *Orosius*. A valuable edition of this author, enriched with ancient coins and medals, was published at Leyden, in 1738, by the learned Havercamp.

[m] Histoire Literaire de la France, tom. ii. p. 215.—Simon, Critique de la Biblioth. Ecclesiastique par Du-Pin, tom. i. p. 156.—The works of Cassian were published at Frankfort, in 1722, with a copious Commentary by Alardus Gazæus.

[n] See a satisfactory account of this prelate, in the Histoire Literaire de la France, tom. ii. p. 275.

☞ [o] This pious and ingenious ecclesiastic is more generally known by the name of Paulin. See Hist. Lit. de la France, tom. ii. p. 179. The best edition of his work is that published by Le Brun, at Paris, 1685.

[p] Agnelli, Liber Pontificalis Ecclesiæ Ravennatis, tom. i. p. 321.

[q] Hist. Liter. de la France, tom. ii. p. 517. ☞ The authors of the history here referred to, give a different account of Salvian's character. They acknowledge, that his declamations against the vices of the age, in his Treatise against Avarice, and his Discourse concerning Providence, are warm and vehement; but they represent him, notwithstanding, as one of the most humane and benevolent men of his time. It is, however, beyond all doubt, that he was extravagantly austere in the rules he prescribed for the conduct of life. For what is more unnatural than to recommend to Christians, as a necessary *condition* of salvation, their leaving their whole substance to the poor, to the utter ruin of their children and relations? It must, however, be confessed, that his austerity in point of discipline was accompanied with the most amiable moderation toward those who differed from him in articles of faith. There is a most remarkable passage to this purpose, in his treatise concerning Providence, book v. p. 100.

ly known to such as have employed any part of their time and attention in the study of the Pelagian disputes, and the other controversies that were agitated in this century.

Vincent of Lerins gained a lasting reputation by his short, but excellent treatise against the sects, entitled Commonitorium.[a]

Sidonius Apollinaris, a tumid writer, though not entirely destitute of eloquence; Vigilius of Tapsus; Arnobius the younger, who wrote a commentary on the book of Psalms; Dracontius, and others of that class, are of too little consequence to deserve more particular notice.

CHAPTER III.

Concerning the Doctrine of the Church during this Century.

I. MANY points of religion were more largely explained, and many of its doctrines determined with more accuracy and precision, than they had been in the preceding ages. This was one result of the controversies that were multiplied, at this time, throughout the Christian world, concerning the person and nature of Christ; the innate corruption and depravity of man; the natural inability of men to live according to the dictates of the divine law; the necessity of the divine grace in order to salvation; the nature and existence of human liberty; and other such intricate and perplexing questions. The sacred and venerable simplicity of the primitive times, which required no more than a true faith in the word of God, and a sincere obedience to his holy laws, appeared little better than rusticity and ignorance to the subtile doctors of this quibbling age. Yet so it happened, that many of the over-curious divines, who attempted to explain the nature, and remove the difficulties of these intricate doctrines, succeeded very ill in this matter. Instead of leading men into the paths of humble faith and genuine piety, they bewildered them in the labyrinths of controversy and contention, and rather darkened than illustrated the sacred mysteries of religion by a thick cloud of unintelligible subtilties, ambiguous terms, and obscure distinctions. Hence arose new matter of animosity and dispute, of bigotry and uncharitableness, which flowed like a torrent through succeeding ages, and which all human efforts seem unable to vanquish. In these disputes, the heat of passion, and the excessive force of religious antipathy and contradiction, frequently hurried the contending parties into the most dangerous and disgraceful extremes.

II. If, before this time, the lustre of religion was clouded with superstition, and its divine precepts were adulterated with a mixture of human inventions, this evil, instead of diminishing, increased daily. The happy souls of departed Christians were invoked by numbers, and their aid implored by assiduous and fervent prayers, while none stood up to censure or oppose this preposterous worship. The question, how the prayers of mortals ascended to the celestial spirits, (a question which afterwards produced much wrangling, and many idle fancies,) did not yet occasion any difficulty; for the Christians of this century did not imagine that the souls of saints were so entirely confined to the celestial mansions, as to be deprived of the privilege of visiting mortals, and travelling when they pleased, through various countries. They were farther of opinion, that the places most frequented by departed spirits were those where the bodies which they had formerly animated were interred; and this opinion, borrowed by the Christians from the Greeks and Romans, rendered the sepulchres of the saints the general rendezvous of suppliant multitudes.[b] The images of those who, during their lives, had acquired the reputation of uncommon sanctity, were now honoured with a particular worship in several places; and many imagined that this worship drew down into the images the propitious presence of the saints or celestial beings they represented; deluded, perhaps, into this idle fancy by the crafty fictions of the heathen priests, who had published the same things concerning the statues of Jupiter and Mercury.[c] A singular and irresistible efficacy was also attributed to the bones of martyrs, and to the figure of the cross, in defeating the attempts of Satan, removing all sorts of calamities, and in healing, not only the diseases of the body, but also those of the mind.[d] We shall not enter into a particular account of the public supplications, the holy pilgrimages, the superstitious services paid to departed souls, the multiplication of temples, chapels, altars, penitential garments, and a multitude of other circumstances, that showed the decline of genuine piety, and the corrupt darkness that was eclipsing the lustre of primitive Christianity. As none in these times forbade the Christians to retain the opinions of their pagan ancestors concerning departed souls, heroes, demons, temples, and other things, or even to transfer them into their religious services; and as, instead of entirely abolishing the rites and institutions of ancient times, these institutions were still observed, with only some slight alterations; all this swelled of necessity the torrent of superstition, and deformed the beauty of the Christian religion and worship with those corrupt remains of paganism, which still subsist in a certain church.

It will not be improper to observe here, that the famous pagan doctrine, concerning the purification of departed souls, by means of a certain kind of fire, was now more amply explained and established than it had formerly been.[e] Every one knows, that this doctrine proved an inexhaustible source of riches to the clergy through the succeeding ages, and that it still enriches the Romish church with its nutritious streams.

III. The interpretation of the Scriptures employed fewer pens in this century than in the preceding age, in which the Christian doctors were less involved in the labyrinths of controversy. Yet, notwithstanding the multiplication of religious disputes, a considerable number of learned men undertook this useful and important task. We shall not mention those who confined their illustrations to some one, or a few books of the divine word, such as Victor of Anti-

☞ [a] This work of Vincent, which is commended by our author, seems scarcely worthy of such applause. I see nothing in it, but that blind veneration for ancient opinions, which is so fatal to the discovery and progress of truth, and an attempt to prove that nothing but the voice of tradition is to be consulted in fixing the sense of the Scriptures.

An ample account of Vincent, Prosper, and Arnobius, is to be found in the Histoire Literaire de la France, tom. ii. p. 305, 342, 369.

[b] See the Institutiones Divinæ of Lactantius, lib. i. p. 164, and Hesiod. Op. et Dies, ver. 122. Compare with these, Sulp. Severus, Epist. ii. p. 371. Dial. ii. cap. xiii. p. 474. Dial. iii. p. 512.—Æneas Gazæus, in Theophrasto.—Macarius, in Jac. Tollii Insignibus Itineris Italici, and other writers of this age.

[c] Clementina, Homil. x. p. 697, tom. i. PP. Apostolic.—Arnobius adv. Gentes, lib. vi. p. 254.—Casp. Barthius, ad Rutilium Numantian. p. 250.

[d] Prudentius, Hymn xi. de Coronis, p. 150.—Sulp. Severus, Ep. i. p. 364.—Æneas Gazæus, in Theophrasto.

[e] See, particularly concerning this matter, Augustin's book de viii.

och, Polychronius, Philo Carpathius, Isidore of Cordova, Salonius, and Andrew of Cæsarea. We must not, however, pass over in silence Theodoret and Theodore, bishops of Cyrus and Mopsuestia, the two most famous expositors of this age, who illustrated a great part of the Scriptures by their pious labours. They were truly eminent, both in point of learning and genius; and, free and unprejudiced in their search after truth, they followed the explications given by their predecessors, only as far as they found them agreeable to reason. The commentaries of Theodoret are yet extant, and in the hands of the learned;[a] those of Theodore are concealed in the east among the Nestorians, though on many accounts worthy to see the light.[b] Cyril, of Alexandria, deserves also a place among the commentators of this century; but a still higher rank, among that useful and learned body, is due to Isidore of Pelusium, whose epistles contain many observations, which cast a considerable degree of light upon several parts of Scripture.[c]

IV. It is, however, to be lamented, that the greatest part of the commentators, both Greek and Latin, following the idle fancies of Origen, overlooked the true and natural sense of the words, and hunted after subtle and hidden significations, or *mysteries* (as the Latins then termed them,) in the plainest precepts of the Scriptures. Several of the Greeks, and particularly Theodoret, laboured, with success and precision, in illustrating the books of the New Testament; and their success in that task is to be principally attributed to their perfect knowledge of the Greek language, which they had learned from their infancy. But neither the Greeks nor Latins threw much light upon the Old Testament, which was cruelly tortured by the allegorical pens of almost all who attempted to illustrate and explain it; for nothing is more common, than to see the interpreters of the fifth century straining all the passages of that sacred book, either to typify Christ, and the blessings of his kingdom, or Antichrist, and the wars and desolations which he was to bring upon the earth,—without the least spark of judgment, or the smallest air of probability.

V. A few chosen spirits, superior to the others in sagacity and wisdom, were bold enough to stand up against these critical delusions, and to point out a safer and plainer way to divine truth. This we learn from the epistles of Isidore of Pelusium, who, though he was not himself entirely free from this allegorical contagion, censures judiciously, in many places, such as abandoned the historical sense of the Old Testament, and applied its narrations and predictions to Christ alone. But none went greater lengths in censuring the fanciful followers of Origen, than Theodore of Mopsuestia, who not only wrote a book concerning allegory and history, against Origen,[d] but also in his commentary on the prophets did not hesitate to apply the greater part of their predictions to various events in ancient history.[e] This manner of interpreting Scripture was very ill received, and contributed, perhaps, more to raise the general cry against him, than all the erroneous doctrines with which he was charged.[f] The Nestorians followed the example of this remarkable and eminent man;[g] and they continue to consider him as a saint of the first order, and to preserve his writings with the utmost care, as precious monuments of his piety and learning.

VI. The doctrines of religion were, at this time, understood and represented in a manner that savoured little of their native purity and simplicity. They were drawn out by laboured commentaries beyond the terms in which the divine wisdom had thought fit to reveal them; and were examined with that minuteness and subtlety which were only calculated to cover them with obscurity; and (what was still worse) the theological notions that generally prevailed, were proved rather by the authorities and logical discussions of the ancient doctors, than by the unerring dictates of the divine word. It does not appear that in this century any attempted to form a complete system of theology, unless we give that title to six books of instruction, which Nicæas is said to have composed for the use of the Neophytes.[h] But, as we have already observed, the principal branches of religion were laboriously explained in the various books that were written against the Nestorians, Eutychians, Pelagians, and Arians.

VII. The number of those who disputed in this century against paganism and infidelity, was very considerable, yet not greater than the exigency of the times, and the frequent attacks made upon Christianity, rendered necessary. Theodoret in his ingenious and learned treatise, de curandis Græcorum Affectionibus, Orientius in his Commonitorium, and Evagrius in his Dispute between Zachæus and Apollonius, opposed, with fortitude and vigour, those who worshipped images, and who offered their religious services to the pagan deities.[i] To these we may add Philip Sidetes and Philostorgius, of whom the latter attacked Porphyry, and the former Julian. Basilius of Seleucia, Gregentius in his Controversy with Herbanus, and Evagrius in his Dialogue between Theophilus and Judæus, exposed and refuted the errors and cavils of the Jews. Voconius the African, Syagrius in his book concerning Faith, Gennadius of Marseilles, who deserves to be placed in the first rank, and Theodoret in his Treatise concerning the Fables of the Heretics, opposed all the different sects;

Quæstionibus ad Dulcitium, N. xiii. tom. vi. op. p. 128; de fide et operibus, cap. xvi. p. 182; de fide, spe, et charitate, sect. 118, p. 222. Enarratione Psal. xxxv. sect. 3, &c.

[a] See Simon's Histoire critique des principaux Commentateurs du N. Test. chap. xxii. p. 314; as also his Critique de la Biblioth. Ecclesiast. de M. Du-Pin, tom. i. p. 180. ☞ Theodoret wrote Commentaries upon the five books of Moses, Joshua, Judges, Ruth, Samuel, Kings, Chronicles, the Psalms, the Canticles, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Baruch, Lamentations, Ezekiel, Daniel, the 12 minor Prophets, and St. Paul's 14 Epistles.

[b] Assemani's Biblioth. Orient. Clem. Vatic. tom. iii. sect. 2, p. 227.—Simon's Critique de la Biblioth. Eccles. tom. i. p. 108, 677. ☞ We are assured by Fabricius, upon the testimony of Lambecius, that Theodore's Commentary upon the twelve Prophets is still extant in MS. in the emperor's library at Vienna. See Fabr. Bibl. Græc. tom. ix. p. 162. See also, for an ample and learned account of the writings of this author, Lardner's Credibility, vol. ix. p. 389.

[c] See, for an account of these two authors, Simon's Histoire des principaux Commentateurs du Nouveau Testament, ch. xxi. p. 300.

[d] Facundus Hermianensis, de tribus Capitulis, lib. iii. cap. vi.—Liberatus in Breviario, cap. xxiv.

[e] Acta Concilii Constantinopol. II. seu Œcumenici V. tom. iii. Conciliorum, p. 58, edit. Harduini.

☞ [f] Theodore, after his death, was considered as the parent of the Pelagian and Nestorian heresies, though during his life he was an object of the highest esteem, and died in the communion of the church.

[g] This appears by the testimony of Cosmas Indicopleustes, a writer of the sixth century, who was undoubtedly a Nestorian; for this author, in the fifth book of his Christian Topography, which Montfaucon published in his new collection of the Greek fathers, maintains that, of all the Psalms of David, four only are applicable to Christ; and, to confirm this opinion, he boldly asserts, that the writers of the New Testament, when they apply to Jesus the prophesies of the Old, do this by a mere accommodation of the words, without any regard to their true and genuine sense.

[h] Gennadius Massiliensis, de Scriptor. Ecclesiast. cap. xxii.

[i] See for an account of Orientius and Evagrius, the Histoire Literaire de la France, tom. ii. p. 121, and 252.

not to mention those who wrote only against the errors of one or other party of sectaries.

VIII. Those who disputed against the Christian sects, observed a most absurd and vicious method of controversy. They proceeded rather according to the rules of the ancient sophists, and, what is still more surprising, according to the spirit of the Roman law, than by the examples and instructions of Christ and his apostles. In the Roman courts, matters of a difficult and doubtful nature were decided by the authority of certain aged lawyers, who were distinguished by their abilities and experience; and, when they happened to differ in opinion, the point was determined either by a plurality of voices, or by the sentiments of the more learned and illustrious members of that venerable body.[a] This procedure of the Roman tribunals, was, in this century, admitted as a standing law, both in the deliberations of councils, and in the management of religious controversy, to the great and unspeakable detriment of truth; for, by this, reason, and even common sense, were in some measure excluded from every question; and that was determined as right and true, which appeared such to the eatest number, or had been approved by doctors of the greatest note in preceding times. The acts of the various councils, which are yet extant, manifestly show that this was the case; and this circumstance, combined with what we have already observed with respect to the disputants of the age now under consideration, will make it easy for us to imagine the various defects that must have prevailed in the methods of defending truth, and opposing error.

IX. This absurd imitation of the Roman law in the management of religious controversy, and this preposterous method of deciding truth by human authorities, were fruitful sources of spurious and supposititious productions; for many audacious impostors were hence encouraged to publish their own writings under the names of ancient Christian worthies, and even under the sacred names of Christ himself and his holy apostles, that thus, in the deliberations of councils, and in the course of controversy, they might have authorities to oppose to authorities in defence of their respective opinions. The whole Christian church was, in this century, overwhelmed with these spurious productions, these infamous impositions. This is said to have engaged Gelasius, the Roman pontiff, to call a council, composed of the bishops of the Latin church; in which assembly, after strict examination of those writings which appeared under great and venerable names, the famous decree passed, that deprived so many apocryphal books of their borrowed authority. That something of this kind really happened, it would be, perhaps, an instance of temerity to deny: but many learned men assert, that the decree attributed to Gelasius, labours under the same imputation with the books which it condemns, and was by no means the production of that pontiff, but of some deceiver, who usurped clandestinely his name and authority.[b]

X. Eucherius, Salvian, and Nilus, shine with a superior lustre among the moral writers of this century. The epistle of Eucherius, concerning the Contempt of the World and the secular Philosophy, is an excellent performance, both in point of matter and style. The works of Mark the hermit breathe a spirit of fervent piety, but are highly defective in many respects: the matter is ill chosen and is treated without order, perspicuity, or force of reasoning. Fastidius composed several discourses concerning moral duties; but they have not survived the ruins of time. The works that are yet extant of Diadochus, Prosper, and Severian, are extremely pleasing, on account of the solidity and elegance which are to be found, for the most part, in their moral sentences, though they afford but indifferent entertainment to such as are desirous of precision, method, and sound argumentation; and indeed this want of method in the distribution and arrangement of their matter, and a constant neglect of tracing their subject to its first principles, are defects common to almost all the moral writers of this century.

XI. Had this, indeed, been their only defect, the candid and impartial would have supported it with patience, and attributed it charitably to the infelicity of the times. But many of the writers and teachers of this age did unspeakable injury to the cause of true piety by their crude and enthusiastic inventions. The Mystics, who pretended to higher degrees of perfection than other Christians, drew every where to their party, particularly in the eastern provinces, a vast number of the ignorant and inconsiderate multitude, by the striking appearance of their austere and singular piety. It is impossible to describe the rigour and severity of the laws which these senseless fanatics imposed upon themselves, in order, as they alleged, to appease the Deity, and to deliver the celestial spirit from the bondage of this mortal body. They not only lived among the wild beasts, but also lived after the manner of these savage animals; they ran naked through the lonely deserts with a furious aspect, and with all the agitations of madness and phrensy; they prolonged the existence of their emaciated bodies by the wretched nourishment of grass and wild herbs, avoided the sight and conversation of men, remained motionless in certain places for several years, exposed to the rigour and inclemency of the seasons; and, toward the conclusion of their lives, shut themselves up in narrow and miserable huts; and all this was considered as true piety, the only acceptable method of worshipping the Deity, and rendering him propitious.[c] The major part of the Mystics were led into the absurdities of this extravagant discipline, not so much by the pretended force of reason and argument, as by a natural propensity to solitude, a gloomy and melancholy cast of mind, and an implicit and blind submission to the authority and examples of others; for the diseases of the mind, as well as those of the body, are generally contagious, and no pestilence spreads its infection with a more dreadful rapidity than superstition and enthusiasm. Several persons have committed to writing the precepts of this severe discipline, and reduced its absurdities into a sort of system, such as Julianus Pomerius among the Latins,[d] and many among the Syrians, whose names it is needless to mention.

XII. Of all the instances of superstitious phrensy that disgraced this age, none obtained higher veneration, or excited more the wonder of the multitude, than that of a certain order of men, who were called Stylites by the Greeks, and Sancti Columnares, or Pillar Saints, by the Latins. These were persons of a most singular and ex-

[a] See the Codex Theodos. lib. i. tit. iv. de responsis prudentum.

[b] Pearson, Vindiciæ Ignatianæ, part i. cap. iv. p. 189.—Cave, Hist. Liter. Scriptor. Ecclesias. p. 260.—Urb. Godofr. Siberus, Præfat. ad Enchiridion Sexti, p. 79.

[c] See the Pratum Spirituale of Moschus, the Lausiac History of Palladius, and Sulpitius Severus, Dial. i.

[d] Pomerius wrote a treatise, de Vitâ Contemplativâ, in which the doctrines and precepts of the Mystics were carefully collected.

travagant turn of mind, who stood motionless upon the tops of pillars, expressly raised for this exercise of their patience, and remained there for several years, amidst the admiration and applause of the stupid populace. The inventor of this strange and ridiculous discipline was Simeon Sisanites, a Syrian, who began his follies by changing the agreeable employment of a shepherd for the senseless austerities of the monkish life. But his enthusiasm carried him still greater lengths; for, in order to climb as near heaven as he could, he passed thirty-seven years of his wretched life upon five pillars, of the height of six, twelve, twenty-two, thirty-six, and forty cubits, and thus acquired a most shining reputation, and attracted the veneration of all about him.[a] Many of the inhabitants of Syria and Palestine, seduced by a false ambition, and an utter ignorance of true religion, followed the example of this fanatic, though not with the same degree of austerity;[b] and (what is almost incredible) this superstitious practice continued in vogue until the twelfth century, when, however, it was totally suppressed.[c]

The Latins had too much wisdom and prudence to imitate the Syrians and Orientals in this whimsical superstition; and when a certain fanatic, or impostor, named Wulfilaicus, erected one of these pillars in the country of Treves, and proposed living upon it after the manner of Simeon, the neighbouring bishops ordered it to be pulled down, and thus nipped this species of superstition in the bud.[d]

XIII. The Mystic rules of discipline and manners had a bad effect upon the moral writers, and those who were set apart for the instruction of Christians. Thus, in instructing the catechumens and others, they were more diligent and zealous in inculcating a regard for the external parts of religion, and an attachment to bodily exercise, than in forming the heart and the affections to inward piety and solid virtue. They even went so far, as to prescribe rules of sanctity and virtue little different from the unnatural rigour and fanatical piety of the Mystics. Salvian, and other celebrated writers, gave it as their opinion, that none could be truly and perfectly holy, but those who abandoned all riches and honours, abstained from matrimony, banished all joy and cheerfulness from their hearts, and macerated their bodies with various sorts of torments and mortifications: and, as all could not support such inordinate degrees of severity, those madmen, or fanatics, whose robust constitutions and savage tempers were the best adapted to this kind of life, were distinguished by the public applause, and saw their influence and authority daily increase. Thus saints started up like mushrooms in almost every place.

XIV. A small number of ecclesiastics, animated by the laudable spirit of reformation, boldly attempted to pluck up the roots of this growing superstition, and to bring back the deluded multitude from this vain and chimerical discipline to the practice of solid and genuine piety. But the votaries of superstition, who were superior in number reputation, and authority, soon reduced them to silence, and rendered their noble and pious efforts utterly ineffectual.[e] We have an example of this in the case of Vigilantius, a man remarkable for his learning and eloquence, who was born in Gaul, and thence went to Spain, where he performed the functions of a presbyter. This ecclesiastic, on his return from a voyage he had made into Palestine and Egypt, began, about the commencement of this century to propagate several doctrines, and to publish repeated exhortations quite opposite to the opinions and manners of the times. Among other things, he denied that the tombs and the bones of the martyrs ought to be honoured with any sort of homage or worship, and therefore censured the pilgrimages that were made to places which were reputed holy. He turned into derision the prodigies which were said to be wrought in the temples consecrated to martyrs, and condemned the custom of performing vigils in them. He asserted, and indeed with reason, that the custom of burning tapers at the tombs of the martyrs in broad day, was imprudently borrowed from the ancient superstition of the Pagans. He maintained, moreover, that prayers addressed to departed saints were void of all efficacy; and treated with contempt fasting and mortifications, the celibacy of the clergy, and the various austerities of the monastic life; and, finally, he affirmed, that the conduct of those who, distributing their substance among the indigent, submitted to the hardships of a voluntary poverty, or sent a part of their treasures to Jerusalem for devout purposes, had nothing in it acceptable to the Deity.

There were among the Gallic and Spanish bishops several who approved the opinions of Vigilantius: but Jerome, the great monk of the age, assailed this bold reformer of religion with such bitterness and fury, that the honest presbyter soon found that nothing but his silence could preserve his life from the intemperate rage of bigotry and superstition. This project then of reforming the corruptions, which a fanatical and superstitious zeal had introduced into the church, was choked in its birth;[f] and the name of the good Vigilantius remains still in that list of heretics, which is acknowledged as authentic by those who, without any regard to their own judgment or the declarations of Scripture, blindly follow the decisions of antiquity.

XV. The controversies, which had been raised in Egypt, concerning Origen and his doctrine, toward the conclusion of the preceding century, were now renewed at Constantinople, and carried on without either decency or prudence. The Nitrian monks, banished from Egypt on account of their attachment to Origen, took refuge at Constantinople, and were treated by John Chrysostom, the bishop of that city, with clemency and benignity. This no sooner came to the knowledge of Theophilus, patriarch of Alexandria, than he formed a perfidious project against

[a] See the Acta Sanctorum Mensis Januarii, tom. i. p. 261—277, where the reader will find the account we have given of this whimsical discipline. Theodoret, indeed, had before given several hints of it, alleging, among other things, that Simeon had gradually added to the height of his pillar, in the hope of making nearer approaches to heaven. See Tillemont's Memoires pour servir à l'Histoire de l'Eglise, tom. xv. See also the acts of Simeon the Stylite, in Assemani Act. Martyrum, vol. ii.

☞ [b] The learned Frederic Spanheim, in his Ecclesiastical History, p. 1154, speaks of a second Simeon the Stylite (mentioned by Evagrius,) who lived in the sixth century. This second fanatic seems to have carried his austerities still farther than the chief of his sect: for he remained upon his pillar sixty-eight years, and from it, like the first Simeon, he taught, or rather deluded the gazing multitude, declaimed against heresy, pretended to cast out devils, to heal diseases, and to foretel future events.

[c] See Urb. Godofr. Siberi Diss. de Sanc. Column. and Caroli Majelli Diss. de Stylitis, published in Assemani Act. Martyr. tom. ii. p. 246.

[d] Gregor. Turonens. Histor. Francor. lib. viii. cap. xv. p. 387.

[e] Augustin complains of this, in his famous epistle to Januarius, No. 119.

[f] Bayle's Dictionary, at the article Vigilantius.—Barbeyrac, de la Morale des Peres, p. 252.—Ger. Jo. Vossius, Theses Historico-Theologicæ, p. 170.—Histoire Literaire de la France, tom. ii. p. 57.

the eloquent prelate, and sent the famous Epiphanius, with several other bishops, to Constantinople, to compass his fall, and deprive him of his episcopal dignity. No time could be more favourable for the execution of this project, than that in which it was formed; for Chrysostom, by his austerity, and his vehement declamations against the vices of the people, and the corrupt manners of the ladies of the court, had incurred the displeasure of many, and had also excited, in a more particular manner, the resentment and indignation of the empress Eudoxia, wife of Arcadius. This violent princess sent for Theophilus and the Egyptian bishops, who, pursuant to her orders, repaired to Constantinople, and having called a council, inquired into the religious sentiments of Chrysostom, and examined his morals, and the whole course of his conduct and conversation with the utmost severity. This council, which was holden in the suburbs of Chalcedon, in 403, with Theophilus at its head, declared Chrysostom unworthy of his high rank in the church, on account of his favourable inclinations toward Origen and his followers; and in consequence of this decree, condemned him to banishment. The people of Constantinople, who were tenderly attached to their pious and worthy bishop, rose in a tumultuous manner, and prevented the execution of this unrighteous sentence.[a] When this tumult was entirely hushed, the same unrelenting judges, in order to satisfy their vindictive rage and that of Eudoxia, renewed their sentence, in the following year, under another pretext,[b] and with greater effect, for the pious Chrysostom, yielding to the redoubled efforts of his enemies, was banished to Cucusus, a city of Cilicia, where he died about three years after.[c]

The exile of this illustrious man was followed by a terrible sedition of the Johannists (so his votaries were called,) which was calmed, though with much difficulty, by the edicts of Arcadius.[d] It is beyond all doubt, that the proceedings against Chrysostom were cruel and unjust; in this however he was to blame, that he assumed the authority and rank, which had been granted by the council of Constantinople to the bishops of that city, and even acted as a judge of the controversy between Theophilus and the Egyptian monks, which the Alexandrian prelate could not behold without the utmost impatience and resentment. These monks, when they lost their protector, were restored to the favour of Theophilus; but the faction of the Origenists continued, notwithstanding all this, to flourish in Egypt, Syria, and the adjacent countries, and held their chief residence at Jerusalem.

CHAPTER IV.

Concerning the Rites and Ceremonies used in the Church during this Century.

I. To enumerate the rites and institutions that were added, in this century, to the Christian worship, would require a volume of a considerable size. The acts of councils, and the records left us by the most celebrated ancient writers, are the sources from which the curious may draw a particular and satisfactory account of this matter; and to these we refer such as are desirous of something more than a general view of the subject under consideration. Several of these ancient writers, uncorrupted by the contagious examples of the times in which they lived, have ingenuously acknowledged, that true piety and virtue were smothered as it were, under that enormous burthen of ceremonies under which they lay groaning in this century. This evil was owing, partly, to the ignorance and dishonesty of the clergy; partly to the calamities of the times, which were extremely unfavourable to the pursuit of knowledge, and to the culture of the mind; and partly, indeed, to the natural depravity of imperfect mortals, who are much more disposed to worship with the eye than with the heart, and are more ready to offer to the Deity the laborious pomp of an outward service, than the nobler, yet simple oblation of pious dispositions and holy affections.

II. Divine worship was now daily rising from one degree of pomp to another, and degenerating more and more into a gaudy spectacle, only calculated to attract the stupid admiration of a gazing populace. The sacerdotal garments were embellished with a variety of ornaments, with a view of exciting in the minds of the multitude a greater veneration for the sacred order. New acts of devotion were also celebrated. In Gaul particularly, the solemn prayers and supplications, which usually precede the anniversary of Christ's ascension, were now instituted for the first time.[e] In other places, perpetual acclamations of praise to God were performed both night and day by successive singers, so that the service suffered no interruption;[f] as if the Supreme Being took pleasure in such noisy and turbulent shouting, or received any gratification from the blandishments of men. The riches and magnificence of the churches exceeded all bounds.[g] They were also adorned with costly images, among which, in consequence of the Nestorian controversy, that of the Virgin Mary, holding the child Jesus in her arms, obtained the principal place. The altars, and the chests in which the relics were preserved were in most places made of solid silver; and from this we may easily imagine the splendour and expenses that were lavished upon the other utensils which were employed in the service of the church.

III. On the other hand, the *agapæ*, or feasts of charity, were now suppressed, on account of the abuses to which they gave occasion, amidst the daily decline of that piety and virtue, which had rendered these meetings useful and edifying in the primitive ages.

A new method also of proceeding with penitents was introduced into the Latin church; for grievous offenders, who had formerly been obliged to confess their guilt in the face of the congregation, were now delivered from this mortifying penalty, and obtained from Leo the Great, a permission to confess their crimes privately to a priest appointed

☞ [a] This is not quite exact; for it appears, by the accounts of the best historians, that this sentence was really executed, and that the emperor confirmed the decree of this first Synod, by banishing Chrysostom into Bithynia; or, as others allege, by ordering him to retire into the country.

A violent earthquake, and a terrible shower of hail, which were looked upon by the multitude as judgments occasioned by the unrighteous persecution of their pious bishop, alarmed the court, and engaged them to recall Chrysostom to his office.

☞ [b] This new pretext was the indecent manner in which Chrysostom is said to have declaimed against Eudoxia, on account of her having erected her statue in silver near the church.

[c] See Tillemont and Hermant, who have both written the life of Chrysostom; as also Bayle's Dictionary, at the article *Acacius*.

[d] See Cyrilli Vita Sabæ in Cotelerii Monument. Eccles. Græc. tom. ii. p. 274. Jos. Sim. Asseman. Biblioth. Oriental. Vatican. tom. ii. p. 31.

[e] See Sidonius Apollinaris, Epist. lib. v. Epist. xvi. lib. vi. Epist. i.; as also Martenne, Thesaurus Anecdotorum, tom. v.

[f] Gervais, Histoire de Suger, tom. i. p. 23.

[g] See Zacharias of Mitylene, de Opificio Mundi, p. 165.

for that purpose. By this change of the ancient discipline, one of the greatest restraints upon licentiousness (and the only remaining barrier of chastity) was entirely removed, and the actions of Christians were subject to no other scrutiny than that of the clergy; a change, which was frequently convenient for the sinner, and also advantageous in many respects to the sacred order.

CHAPTER V.

Concerning the Dissensions and Heresies that troubled the Church during this Century.

I. SEVERAL of those sects, which had divided the church in the preceding ages, renewed their efforts at this time, to propagate their respective opinions, and introduced new tumults and animosities among the Christians. We shall say nothing of the Novatians, Marcionites, and Manicheans, those inauspicious and fatal names which disgrace the earlier annals of the church, though it is evident, that those sects still subsisted, and were even numerous in many places. We shall confine ourselves to an account of the Donatists and Arians, who were the pests of the preceding century.

The Donatists had hitherto maintained themselves with a successful obstinacy, and their affairs were in a good state. But, about the beginning of this century, the face of things changed much to their disadvantage, by the means of St. Augustine, bishop of Hippo. The catholic bishops of Africa, animated by the exhortations, and conducted by the counsels of this zealous prelate, exerted themselves with the utmost vigour in the destruction of those seditious sectaries, whom they justly looked upon, not only as troublesome to the church by their obstinacy, but also as a nuisance to the state by the brutal soldiery[a] which they employed in their cause. Accordingly, deputies were sent, in 404, from the council of Carthage to the emperor Honorius, to request, that the laws enacted against heretics by the preceding emperors, might have force against the Donatists, who denied that they belonged to the heretical tribe; and also to desire, that bounds might be set to the barbarous fury of the Circumcelliones. The first step that the emperor took, in consequence of this request, was to impose a fine upon all the Donatists who refused to return into the bosom of the church, and to send their bishops and doctors into banishment. In the following year, new laws, much more severe than the former, were enacted against this rebellious sect, under the title of Acts of Uniformity; and, as the magistrates were remiss in the execution of them, the council of Carthage, in 407, sent a second time deputies to the emperor, to desire that certain persons might be appointed to execute the new edicts with vigour and impartiality; and this request was granted.

II. The Donatist faction, though much broken by these repeated shocks, was yet far from being totally extinguished. It recovered a part of its strength in 408, after Stilicho had been put to death by the order of Honorius, and gained an accession of vigour in the following year, in which the emperor published a law in favour of liberty of conscience, and prohibited all compulsion in matters of religion. This law, however, was not of long duration. It was abrogated at the earnest and repeated solicitations of the council, which met at Carthage in 410; and Marcellinus the tribune was sent by Honorius into Africa, with full power to bring to a conclusion this tedious and unhappy contest. Marcellinus, therefore, held at Carthage, in 411, a solemn conference, in which he examined the cause with much attention, heard the contending parties during the space of three days, and at length, pronounced sentence in favour of the catholics.[b] The catholic bishops, who were present at this conference, were 286 in number; and those of the Donatists were 279. The latter, upon their defeat, appealed to the emperor, but without effect. The glory of their defeat was due to Augustine, who bore the principal part in this controversy, and who, indeed, by his writings, counsels, and admonitions, governed almost the whole African church, and also the principal and most illustrious heads of that extensive province.

III. This conference greatly weakened the party of the Donatists; nor could they ever get the better of this terrible shock, though the face of affairs changed afterwards in a manner that seemed to revive their hopes. The greatest part of them, through the fear of punishment, submitted to the emperor's decree, and returned into the bosom of the church; while the severest penalties were inflicted upon those who remained obstinate, and persisted in their rebellion. Fines, banishment, confiscation of goods, were the ordinary punishments of the obstinate Donatists; and even the pain of death was inflicted upon such as surpassed the rest in perverseness, and were the seditious ringleaders of that stubborn faction. Some avoided these penalties by flight, others by concealing themselves, and some were so desperate as to seek deliverance by self-murder, to which the Donatists had a shocking propensity. In the mean time, the Circumcelliones used more violent methods of warding off the execution of the sentence that was pronounced against their sect; for they ran up and down through the province of Africa in the most outrageous manner, committing acts of great cruelty, and defending themselves by force of arms.

The Donatists, indeed, recovered afterwards their former liberty and tranquillity by the succour and protection they received from the Vandals, who invaded Africa, with Genseric at their head, in 427, and took that province out of the hands of the Romans. The wounds, however, which this sect had received from the vigorous execution of the imperial laws, were so deep, that though it began to revive and multiply by the assistance of the Vandals, it could never regain its former strength and lustre.

IV. The Arians, oppressed and persecuted by the imperial edicts, took refuge among those fierce and savage nations, who were gradually overturning the western empire, and found among the Goths, Suevi, Heruli, Vandals, and Burgundians, a fixed residence and a peaceful retreat; and, as their security animated their courage, they treated

[a] The *Circumcelliones* already mentioned.

[b] See Franc. Balduin, Hist. Collationis Carthag. in Optat. Milev. Pinian. p. 337. It is proper to observe here, that this meeting, holden by Marcellinus, is very improperly termed a *conference* (*collatio*); for there was no dispute carried on at this meeting between the catholics and the Donatists, nor did any of the parties endeavour to gain or defeat the other by superiority of argument. This conference, then, was properly a *judicial trial*, in which, Marcellinus was, by the emperor, appointed judge, or arbiter, of this religious controversy, and accordingly pronounced sentence after a proper hearing of the cause. It appears, therefore, from this event, that the notion of a supreme spiritual judge of controversy, and ruler of the church appointed by Christ, had not yet entered into any one's head, since we see the African bishops appealing to the emperor in the present religious question.

the catholics with the same violence which the latter had employed against them and other heretics, and harassed and persecuted in various ways such as professed their adherence to the Nicene doctrines. The Vandals who reigned in Africa, surpassed all the other savage nations in barbarity and injustice toward the catholics. The kings of this fierce people, particularly Genseric and Huneric his son, pulled down the churches of those Christians who acknowledged the divinity of Christ, sent their bishops into exile, and maimed and tormented such as were nobly firm and inflexible in the profession of their faith.[a] They however declared, that in using these severe and violent methods, they were authorised by the example of the emperors, who had enacted laws of the same rigorous nature against the Donatists, the Arians, and other sects who differed in opinion from the Christians of Constantinople.[b]

We must not here omit mentioning the stupendous miracle, which is said to have been wrought during these persecutions in Africa, and by which the Supreme Being is supposed to have declared his displeasure against the Arians, and his favour towards their adversaries. This miracle consisted in enabling those catholics whose tongues had been cut out by the Arian tyrant Huneric, to speak distinctly, and to proclaim aloud the divine majesty of the Saviour of the world. This remarkable fact can scarcely be denied, since it is supported by the testimony of the most credible and respectable witnesses;[c] but whether it is to be attributed to a supernatural and miraculous power, is a point which admits dispute.[d]

V. A new sect, which was the source of most fatal and deplorable divisions in the Christian church, was formed by Nestorius, a Syrian bishop of Constantinople, a disciple of the celebrated Theodore of Mopsuestia, and a man remarkable for his learning and eloquence, which were, however, accompanied with much levity, and with intolerable arrogance. Before we enter into a particular account of the doctrine of this sectary, it is proper to observe, that though, by the decrees of former councils, it had been clearly and peremptorily determined, that Christ was, at

[a] See Victor Vitens. lib. iii. de Persequutione Vandalicâ, which Theod. Ruinart published at Paris in 1694, with his own history of the same persecution.

[b] See the edict of Huneric, in the history of Victor, lib. iv. cap. ii. p. 64.

[c] These witnesses, who had themselves ocular demonstration of the fact, were Victor of Utica, Æneas of Gaza (who examined the mouths of the persons in question, and found that their tongues were entirely rooted out,) Procopius, Marcellinus the count, and the emperor Justinian. Upon the authority of such respectable testimonies, the learned Abbadie formed a laboured and dexterous defence of the miraculous nature of this extraordinary fact, in his work entitled, La Triomphe de la Providence, vol. iii. p. 255, where all the fire of his zeal, and all the subtlety of his logic, seem to have been exhausted. Dr. Berriman, in his Historical Account of the Trinitarian Controversy, as also in his sermons preached at Lady Moyer's Lectures, in 1725, and Dr. Chapman, in his Miscellaneous Tracts, have maintained the same hypothesis. To the former, an answer was published by an anonymous writer, under the following title: "An Inquiry into the Miracle said to have been wrought in the fifth century, upon some orthodox Christians, in favour of the Doctrine of the Trinity, &c. in a Letter to a Friend." We may venture to say, that this answer is utterly unsatisfactory. The author of it, after having laboured to invalidate the testimony alleged in favour of the fact, seems himself scarcely convinced by his own arguments; for he acknowledges at last the possibility of the event, but persists in denying the miracle, and supposes, that the cruel operation was so imperfectly performed upon these confessors, as to leave in some of them such a share of the tongue, as was sufficient for the use of speech. Dr. Middleton (to whom some have attributed the above-mentioned Answer) maintains the same hypothesis, in his Free Inquiry into the Miraculous Powers, &c. supposing, that the tongues of the persons in question were not entirely rooted out, which he corroborates by the following consideration, that two of the sufferers are said to have utterly lost the faculty of speaking; for though this might be ascribed to a peculiar judgment of God, punishing the immoralities of which they were afterwards guilty, yet this appears to be a forced and improbable solution of the matter, in the opinion of the doctor, who imagines that he solves it better, by supposing, that they had not been deprived of their entire tongues. He goes yet farther, and produces two cases from the Memoirs of the Academy of Sciences at Paris, which prove, in his opinion, "That this pretended miracle owed its whole credit to our ignorance of the powers of nature." The first is that of "a girl born without a tongue, who yet talked as easily and distinctly, as if she had enjoyed the full benefit of that organ;" and the second, that of "a boy, who, at the age of eight or nine years, lost his tongue by a gangrene, or ulcer, and yet retained the faculty of speaking." See Middleton's Free Inquiry, p. 183, 184.

This reasoning of the sceptical doctor of divinity appeared superficial and unsatisfactory to the judicious Mr. Dodwell, who (saying nothing about the case of the two Trinitarians who remained dumb, after their tongues were cut out, and whose dumbness is but indifferently accounted for by their immorality, since *gifts* have been often possessed without *grace*) confines himself to the consideration of the two parallel facts drawn from the Academical Memoirs already mentioned. To show that these facts prove little or nothing against the miracle in question, he justly observes, that though, in one or two particular cases, a mouth may be so singularly formed as to utter articulate sounds, without the usual instrument of speech (some excrescence probably supplying the defect,) yet it cannot be any thing less than miraculous, that this should happen to a considerable number of persons, whose tongues were cut out to prevent their preaching a discountenanced doctrine. To deny the miracle in question, we must maintain, that it is as easy to speak without a tongue, as with it. See Mr. Dodwell's Free Answer to Dr. Middleton's Free Inquiry, p. 96.

Mr. Toll, who defended Middleton's hypothesis, has proposed an objection, *à priori*, as it may be justly called, to the truth of this miracle. He observes, that the occasion on which it was wrought was not of sufficient consequence or necessity to require a divine interposition; for it was not wrought to convert infidels to Christianity, but to bring over the followers of Arius to the Athanasian faith; it was wrought, in a word, for the explication of a doctrine, which both sides allowed to be founded in the New Testament. Now, as the Scriptures are a revelation of the will of God, "it seems (says Mr. Toll) to cast a reflection on his wisdom, as if he did things by halves, to suppose it necessary for him to work miracles in order to ascertain the sense of those Scriptures. This (continues he) would be multiplying miracles to an infinite degree:—besides, it would destroy the universal truth of that proposition from which we cannot depart, namely, That the Scriptures are sufficiently plain in all things necessary to salvation." See Mr. Toll's Defence of Dr. Middleton's Free Inquiry, against Mr. Dodwell's Free Answer. To this specious objection Mr. Dodwell replies, that on the doctrine in dispute between the Arians and the orthodox, the true notion, as well as the importance and reality of our salvation, may be said to depend; that the doctrines, duties, and motives of Christianity, are exalted or debased, as we embrace one or the other of those systems; that, on the divinity of Christ, the meritoriousness of the propitiation offered by him must entirely rest; and that therefore, no occasion of greater consequence can be assigned on which a miracle might be expected. He adds, that the disputes which men have raised about certain doctrines, are no proof that these doctrines are not plainly revealed in Scripture, since this would prove that no truth is there sufficiently revealed, because, at one time or other, they have been all disputed; and he observes judiciously, that the expediency of interposing by miracles, is what we always are not competent judges of, since God alone knows the times, seasons, and occasions, in which it is proper to alter the usual course of nature, in order to maintain the truth, to support the oppressed, and to carry on the great purposes of his gospel kingdom. It is enough, that the present interposition be not *incredible*, to remove Mr. Toll's objection, without considering its particular use, and the unexceptionable manner in which it is attested. See Mr. Dodwell's Full and final Reply to Mr. Toll's Defence, p. 270.

We must observe here that the latter objection and answer are merely hypothetical, *i. e.* they draw their force only from the different opinions, which the ingenious Mr. Toll and his learned antagonist entertain concerning the importance of the doctrine, in favour of which this pretended miracle is said to have been wrought. The grand question, whose decision alone can finish this controversy, is, whether the tongues of these African confessors were entirely rooted out, or not. The case of the two who remained dumb furnishes a shrewd presumption, that the cruel operation was not equally performed upon all. The immorality of these two, and the judgment of God, suspending with respect to them the influence of the miracle, do not solve this difficulty entirely, since (as we observed above) many have possessed supernatural gifts without grace; and Christ tells us, that many have cast out devils in his name, whom at the last day he will not acknowledge as his faithful servants.

[d] See Ruinarti Histor. Persequut. Vandal. part ii. cap. vii. p. 482. See Bibliotheque Britannique, tom. iii. part ii. p. 339. tom. v. part i. p. 171.

the same time, true God and true man, yet no council had hitherto decreed anv thing concerning the *manner* and *effect* of this union of the two natures in the divine Saviour, nor had this point yet become a topic of inquiry or dispute among Christians. The consequence of this was, that the Christian doctors expressed themselves differently on the subject of this mystery. Some used such forms of expression as seemed to widen the difference between the Son of God and the son of man, and thus to divide the nature of Christ into two distinct persons. Others, on the contrary, seemed to confound too much the Son of God with the son of man, and to suppose the nature of Christ composed of his divinity and humanity blended into one.

The heresy of Apollinaris had given occasion to these different ways of speaking; for he maintained that the man Christ was not endowed with a human soul, but with the divine nature, which was substituted in its place, and performed its functions; and this doctrine manifestly supposed a confusion of the two natures in the Messiah. The Syrian doctors, therefore, that they might avoid the errors of Apollinaris, and exclude his followers from the communion of the church, were careful in establishing an accurate distinction between the divine and the human nature in the Son of God; and for this purpose they used such forms of expression as seemed to favour the notion of Christ's being composed of two distinct persons. The manner of speaking adopted by the Alexandrians and Egyptians, had a different tendency, and seemed to countenance the doctrine of Apollinaris, and, by a confusion of the two natures, to blend them into one. Nestorius, who was a Syrian, and had adopted the sentiments of the divines of his nation, was a violent enemy to all the sects, but to none so much as to the Apollinarian faction, at whose ruin he aimed with an ardent and inextinguishable zeal. He therefore discoursed of the two natures in Christ after the Syrian manner, and commanded his disciples to distinguish carefully between the actions and perceptions[a] of the Son of God, and those of the son of man.[b]

VI. The occasion of this disagreeable controversy was furnished by the presbyter Anastasius, a friend of Nestorius. This ecclesiastic, in a public discourse, delivered in 428, declaimed warmly against the title of Θεοτόκος, or *mother of God*, which was now more frequently attributed to the Virgin Mary, in the controversy against the Arians, than it had formerly been, and was a favourite term with the followers of Apollinaris. He, at the same time, gave it as his opinion, that the Holy Virgin was rather to be called Χριστοτόκος, i. e. *mother of Christ*, since the Deity can neither be born nor die, and of consequence, the son of man alone could derive his birth from an earthly parent. Nestorius applauded these sentiments, and explained and defended them in several discourses.[c] But both he and his friend Anastasius were keenly opposed by certain monks of Constantinople, who maintained that the son of Mary was God incarnate, and excited the zeal and fury of the populace to maintain this doctrine against Nestorius. Notwithstanding all this, the discourses of the latter were extremely well received in many places, and had the majority on their side. The Egyptian monks had no sooner perused them, than they were persuaded, by the weight of the arguments they contained, to embrace the opinions of Nestorius, and accordingly ceased to call the Blessed Virgin the mother of God.

VII. The prelate who then ruled the see of Alexandria, was Cyril, a man of a haughty, turbulent, and imperious temper, and painfully jealous of the rising power and authority of the bishop of Constantinople. As soon as this controversy came to his knowledge, he censured the Egyptian monks and Nestorius; and, finding the latter little disposed to submit to his censure, he proceeded to violent measures; took counsel with Celestine, bishop of Rome, whom he had engaged on his side; assembled a council at Alexandria in 430; and hurled twelve anathemas at the head of Nestorius. The thunderstricken prelate did not sink under this violent shock; but, seeing himself unjustly accused of derogating from the majesty of Christ, he retorted the same accusation upon his adversary, charged him with the Apollinarian heresy, with confounding the two natures in Christ, and loaded Cyril with as many anathemas as he had received from him. This unhappy contest between prelates of the first order, proceeded rather from corrupt motives of jealousy and ambition, than from a sincere and disinterested zeal for the truth, and was the source of unnumbered evils and calamities.

VIII. When the spirits were so exasperated on both sides, by reciprocal excommunications and polemic writings, that there was no prospect of an amicable issue to this unintelligible controversy, Theodosius the younger called a council at Ephesus, in 431, which was the third general council in the annals of the church. In this council Cyril presided, though he was the party concerned, and the avowed enemy of Nestorius; and he proposed examining and determining the matter in debate before John of Antioch and the other eastern bishops arrived. Nestorius objected to this proceeding, as irregular and unjust; but, his remonstrances being without effect, he refused to comply with the summons which called him to appear before the council. Cyril, on the other hand, pushing on matters with a lawless violence, Nestorius was judged without being heard; and, during the absence of a great number of those bishops who belonged to the council, he was compared with the traitor Judas, charged with blasphemy against the divine majesty, deprived of his episcopal dignity, and sent into exile, where he finished his days.[d] The transactions of this council will appear to the candid and equitable reader in the most unfavorable light, as full of

☞ [a] The original word *perpessio*, which signifies properly *suffering* or *passion*, we have here translated by the general term, *perception*, because suffering or passion cannot be, in any sense, attributed to the divine nature.

[b] The Jesuit Doucin published at Paris, in 1716, a History of Nestorianism; but it is such a history as might be expected from a writer, who was obliged, by his profession, to place the arrogant Cyril among the saints, and Nestorius among the heretics. The ancient writers, on both sides of the controversy, are mentioned by Jo. Franc. Buddeus, in his Isagoge in Theologiam, tom. ii. The accounts given of this dispute by the oriental writers, are collected by Renaudot, in his Historia Patriarch. Alexandrin. and by Jos. Sim. Assemanus, in his Biblioth. Orient. Vatican.

[c] See Harduini Concilia, tom. i.; and the Biblioth. Orient. Vat. tom. iii.

[d] Those who desire a more ample account of this council, may consult the Variorum Patrum Epistolæ ad Concilium Ephesinum pertinentes, published at Louvain in 1682, from some Vatican and other manuscripts, by Christian Lupus. Nestorius, in consequence of the sentence pronounced against him in this council, was banished to Petra in Arabia, and afterwards to Oasis, a solitary place in the deserts of Egypt, where he died in 435. The accounts given of his tragical death by Evagrius, in his Eccl. Hist. lib. i. cap. vii. and by Theodorus the Reader, Hist. Eccl. lib. ii. p. 565, are entirely fabulous. ☞ Dr. Mosheim's account of the time of Nestorius' death is perhaps inexact; for it appears that Nestorius was at Oasis, when Socrates wrote, that is, in 439. See Socrat. lib. vii. cap. xxxiv.

low artifice, contrary to all the rules of justice, and even destitute of the least air of common decency. The doctrine, however, that was established in it concerning Christ, was that which has been always acknowledged and adopted by the majority of Christians, viz. "That Christ was *one divine person*, in whom *two natures* were most closely and intimately united, but without being mixed or confounded."

IX. Nestorius, among accusations of less moment, was charged with dividing the nature of Christ into two distinct persons, and with having maintained, that the divine nature was superadded to the human nature of Jesus, after it was formed, and was no more than an auxiliary support to the man Christ, through the whole of his life. Nestorius denied this charge even to the last, and solemnly professed his entire disapprobation of this doctrine.[a] Nor indeed was this opinion ever proposed by him in any of his writings: it was only charged upon him by his iniquitous adversaries as a consequence drawn from some incautious and ambiguous terms he used, and particularly from his refusing to call the Virgin Mary the *mother of God*.[b] Hence many, and indeed the majority of writers, both ancient and modern, after a thorough examination of this matter, have positively concluded, that the opinions of Nestorius, and of the council which condemned them, were the same in effect; that their difference was in words only, and that the whole blame of this unhappy controversy was to be charged upon the turbulent spirit of Cyril, and his aversion to Nestorius.[c]

This judgment may be just upon the whole; but it is, however, true, that Nestorius committed two faults in the course of this controversy. The first was, his giving offence to many Christians by abrogating a trite and innocent term;[d] and the second, his presumptuously attempting to explain, by uncouth comparisons and improper expressions, a mystery which infinitely surpasses the extent of our imperfect reason. If to these defects we add the despotic spirit and the excessive warmth of this persecuted prelate, it will be difficult to decide who is most to be blamed, as the principal fomenter of this violent contest, Cyril or Nestorius.[e]

X. The council of Ephesus, instead of healing these divisions, only inflamed them more and more, and almost destroyed all hope of restoring concord and tranquillity in the church. John of Antioch, and the other eastern bishops, for whose arrival Cyril had refused to wait, met at Ephesus, and pronounced against him and Memnon, the bishop of that city, who was his creature, as severe a sentence as they had thundered against Nestorius. Hence arose a new and obstinate dissension between Cyril and the Orientals, with the bishop of Antioch at their head. This flame indeed abated in 433, after Cyril had received the articles of faith drawn up by John, and abandoned certain phrases and expressions, of which the litigious might make a pernicious use. But the commotions, which arose from this fatal controversy, were more durable in the east.[f] Nothing could oppose the progress of Nestorianism in those parts. The disciples and friends of the persecuted prelate carried his doctrine through all the Oriental provinces, and erected every where congregations which professed an invincible opposition to the decrees of the council of Ephesus. The Persians, among others, opposed Cyril in the most vigorous manner, maintained that Nestorius had been unjustly condemned at Ephesus, and charged Cyril with removing that distinction which subsists between the two natures in Christ. But nothing tended so much to propagate with rapidity the doctrine of Nestorius, as its being received in the famous school which had for a long time flourished at Edessa. For the doctors of this renowned academy not only instructed the youth in the Nestorian tenets, but translated from the Greek into the Syriac language the books of Nestorius, of his master Theodorus of Mopsuestia, and the writings also of Diodorus of Tarsus, and spread them abroad throughout Assyria and Persia.[g]

XI. Of all the promoters of the Nestorian cause, there was not one to whom it has such weighty obligations as to the famous Barsumas, who was removed from his place in the school of Edessa, and created bishop of Nisibis in 435. This zealous prelate laboured with incredible assiduity and dexterity, from the year 440 to 485, to procure, for the Nestorians, a solid and permanent settlement in Persia; and he was vigorously seconded in this undertaking by Maanes, bishop of Ardascira. So remarkable was the success which crowned the labours of Barsumas, that his fame extended throughout the east; and those Nestorians who still remain in Chaldea, Persia, Assyria, and the adjacent countries, consider him alone, and not without reason, as their parent and founder. This indefatigable ecclesiastic not only persuaded Firouz, the Persian monarch, to expel from his dominions such Christians as had adopted the opinions of the Greeks, and to admit the Nestorians in their place, but he even engaged him to put the latter in possession of the principal seat of ecclesiastical authority in Persia, the see of Seleucia, which the Patriarch, or Catholic of the Nestorians, has always filled even down to our time.[h] The zeal and activity of Barsumas did not

[a] See Garnier's edition of the works of Marius Mercator, tom. ii. p. 286. See also the fragments of some letters from Nestorius, which are to be found in the Biblioth. Oriental. Vatican. tom. ii.

☞ [b] It is remarkable, that Cyril would not hear the explanations which Nestorius offered to give of his doctrine. The latter even offered to grant the title of Mother of God to the Virgin Mary, provided that nothing else was thereby meant, but that the man born of her was united to the divinity. See Socrat. lib. vii. cap. xxxiv.

[c] Luther was the first of the modern writers who thought thus; and he inveighed against Cyril with the greatest bitterness, in his book de Conciliis, tom. viii. op. Altenb. p. 265, 266, 273. See also Bayle's Dictionary, at the articles Nestorius and Rodon.—Christ. August. Salig, de Eutychianismo ante Eutychem, p. 200.—Otto Fred. Schutzius, de Vitâ Chytræi, lib. ii. cap. xxix. p. 190, 191.—Jo. Voigt Biblioth. Historiæ Hæresiologicæ, tom. i. part. iii. p. 457—Paul. Ernest. Jablonsky, Exerc. de Nestorianismo.—Thesaur. Epistolic. Crozianus, tom. i. p. 184, tom. iii. p. 175.—La Vie de la Croze, par Jordan, p. 231, and many others. As to the faults that have been laid to the charge of Nestorius, they are collected by Asseman in his Biblioth. Orient. Vatican. tom. iii. part ii. p. 210.

☞ [d] The title of *Mother of God*, applied to the Virgin Mary, is not perhaps so *innocent* as Dr. Mosheim takes it to be. To the judicious and learned it can present no idea at all; and to the ignorant and unwary it may present the most absurd and monstrous notions. The invention and use of such mysterious terms, as have no place in Scripture, are undoubtedly pernicious to true religion.

☞ [e] There is no difficulty at all in deciding this question. Nestorius, though possessed of an arrogant and persecuting spirit in general, yet does not seem to deserve, in this particular case, the reproaches that are due to Cyril. Anastasius, not Nestorius, was the first who kindled the flame; and Nestorius, was the suffering and persecuted party from the beginning of the controversy to his death. His offers of accommodation were refused, his explanations were not read, his submission was rejected, and he was condemned unheard.

[f] See Christ. Aug. Salig, de Eutychianismo ante Eutychem, p. 243.

[g] See Assemani Biblioth. tom. i. p. 351: tom. iii. part ii. p. 69. This learned author may be advantageously used to correct what Renaudot has said (in the second tome of his Liturgiæ Orientales, p. 99,) concerning the rise of the Nestorian doctrine in the eastern provinces. See also the Ecclesiastical History of Theodorus the Reader, book ii. p. 558.

☞ [h] The bishop of Seleucia was, by the twenty-third canon of the

end here: he erected a famous school at Nisibis, whence issued those Nestorian doctors, who, in this and the following century, spread abroad their tenets through Egypt, Syria, Arabia, India, Tartary, and China.[a]

XII. The Nestorians, before their affairs were thus happily settled, had been divided among themselves with respect to the method of explaining their doctrine. Some maintained, that the manner in which the two natures were united in Christ, was absolutely unknown; others, that the union of the divine nature with the man Jesus was only an union of will, operation, and dignity.[b] This dissension, however, entirely ceased, when the Nestorians were gathered into one religious community, and lived in tranquillity under their own ecclesiastical government and laws. Their doctrine, as it was then determined in several councils assembled at Seleucia, amounts to what follows: "That in the Saviour of the world, there were two persons, or ὑποστάσεις; of which one was divine, even the eternal word; and the other, which was human, was the man Jesus; that these two persons had only one aspect;[c] that the union between the Son of God and the son of man, was formed in the moment of the Virgin's conception, and was never to be dissolved; that it was not, however, an union of nature, or of person, but only of will and affection; that Christ was, therefore, to be carefully distinguished from God, who dwelt in him as in his temple; and that Mary was to be called the mother of Christ, and not the mother of God."

The abettors of this doctrine hold Nestorius in the highest veneration, as a man of singular and eminent sanctity, and worthy to be had in perpetual remembrance; but they maintain, at the same time, that the doctrine he taught was much older than himself, and had been handed down from the earliest times of the Christian church; and for this reason they absolutely refused the title of Nestorians; and, indeed, if we examine the matter attentively, we shall find, that Barsumas and his followers, instead of teaching their disciples precisely the doctrine of Nestorius, rather polished and improved his uncouth system to their own taste, and added to it several tenets of which the good man never dreamed.

XIII. A violent aversion to the Nestorian errors led many into the opposite extreme. This was the case with the famous Eutyches, an abbot at Constantinople, and founder of a sect, which was in direct opposition to that of Nestorius, yet equally prejudicial to the interests of the Christian church, by the pestilential discords and animosities it produced. The opinions of this new faction shot like lightning through the east; and it acquired such strength in its progress, as to create much uneasiness, both to the Greeks and Nestorians, whose most vigorous efforts were not sufficient to prevent its rising to a high degree of credit and splendour. Eutyches began these troubles in 448, when he was far advanced in years; and to exert his utmost force and vehemence in opposing the progress of the Nestorian doctrine, he expressed his sentiments concerning the person of Christ, in the very terms which the Egyptians made use of for that purpose, and taught, that in Christ there was only one nature, namely, that of the incarnate word.[d] Hence he was thought to deny the existence of the human nature in Christ, and was accused of this, by Eusebius of Dorylæum, in the council that was assembled by Flavianus at Constantinople, probably in this same year. By a decree of this council he was ordered to renounce the above-mentioned opinion, which he obstinately refused to do, and was, on this account, excommunicated and deposed; unwilling, however, to acquiesce in this sentence, he appealed to the decision of a general council.

XIV. In consequence of this appeal, the emperor Theodosius assembled an œcumenical council at Ephesus in 449, at the head of which he placed Dioscorus, bishop of Alexandria, the successor of Cyril, the faithful imitator of his arrogance and fury, and a declared enemy to the bishop of Constantinople. Accordingly, by the influence and caballing of this turbulent man, matters were carried on in this assembly with the same want of equity and of decency that had dishonoured a former Ephesian council, and characterized the proceedings of Cyril against Nestorius. Dioscorus, in whose church a doctrine, almost the same with that of the Eutychians, was constantly taught, confounded matters with such artifice and dexterity, that the doctrine of one incarnate nature triumphed, and Eutyches was acquitted of the charge of error that had been brought against him. Flavianus, on the other hand, was, by the order of this unrighteous council, publicly scourged in the most barbarous manner, and banished to Epipas, a city of Lydia, where he soon after ended his days.[e] The Greeks called this Ephesian council a band or *assembly of robbers*, σύνοδον ληστρικὴν, to signify that every thing was carried in it by fraud or violence;[f] and many councils, indeed, both in this and the following ages, are equally entitled to the same dishonourable appellation.

XV. Affairs soon changed, and assumed an aspect utterly unfavourable to that party which the Ephesian council had rendered triumphant. Flavianus and his followers not only engaged Leo the Great, bishop of Rome, in their interests, (for the Roman pontiff was the ordinary refuge of

council of Nice, honoured with peculiar marks of distinction, and among others with the title of Catholic. He was invested with the power of ordaining archbishops (a privilege which belonged to the patriarchs alone,) exalted above all the Grecian bishops, honoured as a patriarch, and, in the œcumenical councils, was the sixth in rank after the bishop of Jerusalem. See Acta Concilii Nicæni Arab. Alphons. Pisan. lib. iii. cap. xxiii. xxxiv.

[a] See, for an ample account of this matter, Assem. Bib. t. iii. pt. ii. p. 77.

[b] Leontius Byzant. adversus Nestorian. et Eutychian. p. 537, tom. i. Lection. Antiquar. Henr. Canisii.—Jac. Basnage, Prolegomen. ad Canisium, tom. i. cap. ii. p. 19.

☞ [c] This is the only way I know of translating the word *barsopa* which was the term used by Nestorius and which the Greeks render by the term πρόσωπον. The word *person* would have done better in this unintelligible phrase, had it not been used immediately before in a different sense from that which Nestorius would convey by the obscure term *aspect*.

[d] That Cyril expressed himself in this manner, and appealed, for his justification in so doing, to the authority of Athanasius, is evident beyond all possibility of contradiction. But it is uncertain whether this manner of expression was adopted by Athanasius or not, since many are of opinion, that the book in which it is found, has been falsely attributed to him. See Mich. Le Quien, Dissert. ii. in Damascenum; and Christ. Aug. Salig, de Eutychianismo ante Eutychem, p. 112. It appears by what we read in the Biblioth. Orient., that the Syrians expressed themselves in this manner before Eutyches, without intending thereby to broach any new doctrine, but rather without well knowing what they said. We are yet in want of a solid and accurate history of the Eutychian troubles, notwithstanding the labours of the learned Salig upon that subject.

[e] See the Concilia Jo. Harduini, tom. i. p. 82.—Liberati Breviarium, cap. xii. p. 76.—Leonis M. Epist. xciii.—Nicephori Hist. Ecclesiast. lib. xiv. cap. lxvii.

☞ [f] Though Flavianus died soon after the council of Ephesus, of the bruises he had received from Dioscorus, and the other bishops of his party in that horrid assembly, yet, before his death, he had appealed to Leo; and this appeal, pursued by the pontiff, occasioned the council; in which Eutyches was condemned, and the sanguinary Dioscorus deposed.

the oppressed and conquered party in this century,) but also remonstrated to the emperor, that a matter of such an arduous and important nature required, in order to its decision, a council composed out of the church universal. Leo seconded the latter request, and demanded of Theodosius a general council, which no entreaties could persuade this emperor to grant. Upon his death, however, his successor Marcian consented to Leo's demand, and called, in 451, the council of Chalcedon,[a] which is reckoned the fourth general or œcumenical council. The legates of Leo, who, in his famous letter to Flavianus, had already condemned the Eutychian doctrine, presided in this grand and crowded assembly. Dioscorus was condemned, deposed, and banished into Paphlagonia; the acts of the council of Ephesus were annulled; the epistle of Leo was received as a rule of faith;[b] Eutyches, who had been already sent into banishment, and deprived of his sacerdotal dignity by the emperor, was now condemned, though absent; and the following doctrine, which is at this time almost generally received, was inculcated upon Christians as an object of faith, viz. "That in Christ two distinct natures were united in one person, without any change, mixture or confusion."

XVI. The remedy applied by this council, to heal the wounds of a torn and divided church, proved really worse than the disease; for a great number of Oriental and Egyptian doctors, though of various characters and different opinions in other respects, united in opposing, with the utmost vehemence, the council of Chalcedon and the epistle of Leo, which that assembly had adopted as a rule of faith, and were unanimous in maintaining an unity of nature, as well as of person, in Jesus Christ. Hence arose deplorable discords and civil wars, whose fury and barbarity were carried to the most excessive and incredible lengths. On the death of the emperor Marcian, the populace assembled tumultuously in Egypt, massacred Proterius, the successor of Dioscorus, and substituted in his place Timotheus Ælurus, who was a zealous defender of the Eutychian doctrine of one incarnate nature in Christ. This latter, indeed, was deposed and banished by the emperor Leo; but, upon his death, was restored by Basilicus both to his liberty and episcopal dignity. After the death of Ælurus, the defenders of the council of Chalcedon chose, as his successor, Timotheus, surnamed Salophaciolus, while the partisans of the Eutychian doctrine elected schismatically Peter Moggus to the same dignity. An edict of the emperor Zeno obliged the latter to yield. The triumph, however, of the Chalcedonians, on this occasion, was but transitory; for, on the death of Timotheus, John Talaia, whom they had chosen in his place, was removed by the same emperor;[c] and Moggus, or Mongus, by an imperial edict, and the favour of Acacius, bishop of Constantinople, was, in 482, raised to the see of Alexandria.

XVII. The abbot Barsumas (whom the reader must be careful not to confound with Barsumas of Nisibis, the famous promoter of the Nestorian doctrines,) having been condemned by the council of Chalcedon,[d] propagated the Eutychian opinions in Syria, and, by the ministry of his disciple Samuel, spread them amongst the Armenians about the year 460. This doctrine, however, as it was commonly explained, had something so harsh and shocking in it, that the Syrians were easily engaged to abandon it by the exhortations of Xenaias, otherwise called Philoxenus, bishop of Hierapolis, and the famous Peter Fullo. These doctors rejected the opinion, attributed to Eutyches, that the human nature of Christ was absorbed by the divine,[e] and modified matters so as to form the following hypothesis: "That in the Son of God there was one nature, which notwithstanding its *unity*, was *double* and *compounded*." This notion was not less repugnant to the decisions of the council of Chalcedon than the Eutychian doctrine, and was therefore strongly opposed by those who acknowledged the authority of that council.[f]

XVIII. Peter, surnamed Fullo, from the trade of a fuller, which he exercised in his monastic state, had usurped the see of Antioch, and after having been several times deposed and condemned on account of the bitterness of his opposition to the council of Chalcedon, was at last fixed in it, in 482, by the authority of the emperor Zeno, and the favour of Acacius, bishop of Constantinople.[g] This troublesome and contentious man excited new discords in the church, and seemed ambitious of forming a new sect under the name of Theopaschites;[h] for, to the words, 'O God most holy,' &c. in the famous hymn which the Greeks called *Tris-agium*, he ordered the following phrase to be added in the eastern churches, 'who hast suffered for us upon the *cross*.' His design in this was manifestly to raise a new sect, and also to fix more deeply, in the minds of the people, the doctrine of one nature in Christ, to which he was zealously attached. His adversaries, and especially Felix the Roman pontiff, interpreted this addition to the above-mentioned hymn in a quite different manner, and charged him with maintaining, that all the three persons of the Godhead were crucified; and hence those who approved his addition were called *Theopaschites*. The consequence of this dispute was, that the western Christians rejected the addition inserted by Fullo, which they judged relative to the whole Trinity, while the Orientals used it constantly after this period, without giving the least offence, because they applied it to Christ alone.[i]

☞ [a] This council was first assembled at Nice, but afterwards removed to Chalcedon, that the emperor, who on account of the irruption of the Huns into Illyricum, was unwilling to go far from Constantinople, might assist at it in person.

☞ [b] This was the letter which Leo had written to Flavianus, after having been informed by him of what had passed in the council of Constantinople. In this epistle, Leo approves the decisions of that council, declares the doctrine of Eutyches heretical and impious, and explains with great appearance of perspicuity, the doctrine of the catholic church upon this perplexed subject; so that this letter was esteemed a masterpiece, both of logic and eloquence, and was constantly read, during the Advent, in the western churches.

[c] See Liberati Breviarium, cap. xvi. xvii. xviii.—Evagr. Hist. Eccles. lib. ii. cap. viii. lib. iii. cap. iii. Le Quien, Oriens Christ. tom. ii. p. 410.

☞ [d] The Barsumas, here mentioned, was he who assisted the bishop of Alexandria (Dioscorus) and the soldiers, in beating Flavianus to death in the council of Ephesus, and to shun whose fury, the orthodox bishops were forced to creep into holes, and hide themselves under benches, in that *pious assembly*.

☞ [e] Eutyches never affirmed what is here attributed to him; he maintained simply, that the two natures, which existed in Christ before his incarnation, became one after it, by the hypostatical union. This miserable dispute about words was nourished by the contending parties having no clear ideas of the terms *person* and *nature*, as also by an invincible ignorance of the subject.

[f] Assemani Biblioth. Orient. Vat. tom. ii.; and the Dissertation of the same author, de Monophysitis.

[g] Valesii Dissertatio de Pet. Fullone, et de Synodis adversus eum collectis, which is added to the 3d vol. of the Scriptor. Hist. Ecclesiast.

☞ [h] This word expresses the enormous error of those frantic doctors, who imagined that the Godhead suffered in and with Christ.

[i] See Norris, Lib. de uno ex Trinitate carne passo, tom. iii. op. diss. i. cap. iii. 782.—Asseman. Biblioth. Orient. Vatican. tom. i. p. 518; tom. ii. p. 36, 180.

XIX. To put an end to this controversy, which had produced the most unhappy divisions both in church and state, the emperor Zeno, by the advice of Acacius, bishop of Constantinople, published, in 482, the famous *Henoticon*, or Decree of Union, which was designed to reconcile the contending parties. This decree repeated and confirmed all that had been enacted in the councils of Nice, Constantinople, Ephesus, and Chalcedon, against the Arians, Nestorians, and Eutychians, without making any particular mention of the council of Chalcedon;[a] for Acacius had persuaded the emperor, that the present opposition was not carried on against the decrees that had passed in the council of Chalcedon, but against the assembly itself; with respect to which, therefore, an entire silence was undoubtedly prudent in a proposal, which, instead of reviving, was designed to put an end to all disputes, and to reconcile the most jarring principles.

In the mean time, Mongus and Fullo, who filled the sees of Alexandria and Antioch, and headed the sect of the Monophysites,[b] subscribed this Decree of Union, which was also approved by Acacius, and by all those of the two contending parties who were at all remarkable for their candour and moderation. But there were on all sides violent and obstinate bigots, who opposed with vigour these pacific measures, and complained of the Henoticon as injurious to the honour and authority of the most holy council of Chalcedon.[c] Hence arose new contests and new divisions, not less deplorable than those which the decree was designed to suppress.

XX. A considerable body of the Monophysites, or Eutychians, looked upon the conduct of Mongus, who had subscribed the decree, as highly criminal, and consequently formed themselves into a new faction, under the title of Acephali, i. e. *headless*, because, by the submission of Mongus, they had been deprived of their chief.[d] This sect was afterwards divided into three others, who were called Anthropomorphites, Barsanuphites, and Esaianists; and these again, in the following century, were the unhappy occasion of new factions of which the ancient writers make frequent mention.[e] It is, however, necessary to observe here, for the information of those whose curiosity interests them in inquiries of this nature, that these subdivisions of the Eutychian sect are not to be adopted with too much facility. Some of them are entirely fictitious; others are characterized by a nominal, and not by a real difference; the division is in *words* and not in *things;* while a third sort are distinguished, not by their peculiar doctrines, but by certain rites and institutions, and matters of a merely circumstantial nature. Be that as it will, these numerous branches of the Eutychian faction did not flourish long; they declined gradually in the following century; and the influence and authority of the famous Baradæus contributed principally to their total extinction, by the union he established among the members of that sect.

XXI. The Roman pontiff, Felix II., having assembled an Italian council, composed of sixty-seven bishops, condemned and deposed Acacius, and excluded him from the communion of the church, as a perfidious enemy to the truth. Several articles were alleged against him to furnish a pretext for the severity of this sentence; such as his attachment to the Monophysites, and their leaders Mongus and Fullo, the contempt with which he treated the council of Chalcedon, and other accusations of a like nature. But the true reasons of these proceedings, and of the irreconcilable hatred which the Roman pontiffs indulged against him, were his denying the supremacy of the bishop of Rome, his opposing it throughout the whole course of his ministry,[f] and his ambitious efforts to enlarge, beyond all bounds, the authority and prerogatives of the see of Constantinople. The Greeks, however, defended the character and memory of their bishop against all the aspersions which were cast upon him by the Romans. Hence arose a new schism and a new contest, which were carried on with great violence, until the following century, when the obstinacy and perseverance of the Latins triumphed over the opposition of the Oriental Christians, and brought about an agreement, in consequence of which, the names of Acacius and Fullo were erased from the diptychs, or sacred registers, and thus branded with perpetual infamy.[g]

XXII. These deplorable dissensions and contests had, for their object, a matter of the smallest importance. Eutyches was generally supposed to have maintained, "That the divine nature of Christ had absorbed the human, and that, consequently, in him there was but one nature, namely, the divine;" but the truth of this supposition is destitute of sufficient evidence. However that may have been, this opinion, and also Eutyches, its pretended author, were rejected and condemned by those who opposed the council of Chalcedon, and principally indeed by Xenaias and Fullo, who are, therefore, improperly called Eutychians, and belong rather to the class of the Monophysites. They, who assumed this latter title, held, "That the divine and human nature of Christ were so united, as to form only one nature, yet without any change, confusion, or mixture, of the two natures:" and that this caution might be carefully observed, and their meaning be well understood, they frequently expressed themselves thus: "In Christ there is one nature; but that nature is two-fold and compounded."[h] They disowned all relation and attachment to Eutyches; but regarded, with the highest veneration, Dios-

[a] Evagrii Hist. Eccl. lib. iii. cap. xiv.—Liberati Breviarium, cap. xviii.

☞ [b] This word expresses the doctrine of those who believed, that in Christ there was but one nature, and is, in most respects, the same with the term Eutychians.

[c] See Facund. Hermian. Defens. trium Capitulor. lib. xii. cap. iv.

[d] Evagr. Hist. Eccles. lib. iii. cap. xiii.—Leontius Byzant. de Sectis, tom. i. Lection. Antiq. Canisii, p. 537.—Timoth. in Cotelerii Monument. Ecclesiæ Græcæ, tom. iii. p. 409.

[e] These sects are enumerated by Basnage, in his Prolegom. ad Canisii Lection. Antiq. cap. iii. and by Asseman, in his Dissertatio de Monophysitis.

☞ [f] This again is one of the periods of ecclesiastical history, in which we find a multitude of events, which are so many proofs how far the supremacy of the pope was from being universally acknowledged. Felix II. deposes and excommunicates Acacius the patriarch of Constantinople, who not only receives this sentence with contempt, but, in his turn, anathematises and excommunicates the pope, and orders his name to be stricken out of the diptychs. This conduct of Acacius is approved by the emperor, the church of Constantinople, by almost all the eastern bishops, and even by Andreas of Thessalonica, who was at that time the pope's vicar for East Illyricum. This was the occasion of that general schism, which continued for twenty-five years, between the eastern and western churches. It is here worthy of observation, that the eastern bishops did not adhere to the cause of Acacius, from any other principle, as appears from the most authentic records of those times, than a persuasion of the illegality of his excommunication by the Roman pontiff, who, in their judgment, had not a right to depose the first bishop of the east, without the consent of a general council.

[g] Hen. Valesius, Dissert. de Synodis Roman. in quibus damnatus est Acacius, ad calcem, tom. iii. Scriptor. Eccles. p. 179.—Basnage, Histoire de l'Eglise, tom. i. p. 301, 380, 381.—Bayle's Dictionary.—David Blondel, de la Primauté dans l'Eglise, p. 279.—Acta Sanctorum, tom. iii. Februar. p. 502.

[h] See the passages drawn from the writings of the Monophysites by

corus, Barsumas, Xenaias, and Fullo, as the pillars of their sect; and rejected, not only the *Epistle* of Leo, but also the decrees of the council of Chalcedon. The opinion of the Monophysites, if we judge of it by the terms in which it is here delivered, does not seem to differ in reality, but only in the manner of expression, from that which was established by the council.[a] But if we attend carefully to the metaphysical arguments and subtleties which the former employed to confirm their doctrine,[b] we shall, perhaps, be induced to think, that the controversy between the Monophysites and Chalcedonians is not merely a dispute about words.

XXIII. A new controversy arose in the church during this century, and its pestilential effects extended themselves through the following ages. The authors of it were Pelagius and Cœlestius, both monks; the former a Briton, and the latter a native of Ireland.[c] They lived at Rome in the greatest reputation, and were universally esteemed for their extraordinary piety and virtue.[d] These monks looked upon the doctrines, which were commonly received, concerning "the original corruption of human nature, and the necessity of divine grace to enlighten the understanding, and purify the heart, as prejudicial to the progress of holiness and virtue, and tending to lull mankind in a presumptuous and fatal security. They maintained, that these doctrines were as false as they were pernicious; that the sins of our first parents were imputed to them alone, and not to their posterity; that we derive no corruption from their fall, but are born as pure and unspotted as Adam came out of the forming hand of his Creator; that mankind, therefore, are capable of repentance and amendment, and of arriving at the highest degrees of piety and virtue by the use of their natural faculties and powers; that, indeed, external grace is necessary to excite their endeavours, but that they have no need of the internal succours of the divine Spirit. These notions, and others intimately connected with them,[e] were propagated at Rome, though in a private manner, by the two monks already mentioned, who, retiring from that city, in 410, upon the approach of the Goths, went first into Sicily, and afterwards into Africa, where they published their doctrine with greater freedom. From Africa Pelagius passed into Palestine, while Cœlestius remained at Carthage with a view to preferment, desiring to be admitted among the presbyters of that city. But the discovery of his opinions having blasted his hopes, and his errors being condemned in a council holden at Carthage, in 412, he departed from that city, and went into the east. It was from this time that Augustin, the famous bishop of Hippo, began to attack the tenets of Pelagius and Cœlestius in his learned and eloquent writings; and to him, indeed, is principally due the glory of having suppressed this sect in its very birth.[f]

XXIV. Things went more smoothly with Pelagius in the east, where he enjoyed the protection and favour of John, bishop of Jerusalem, whose attachment to the sentiments of Origen led him naturally to countenance those of Pelagius, on account of the conformity that seemed to exist between these systems. Under the shadow of this powerful protection, Pelagius made a public profession of his opinions, and formed disciples in several places; and though, in 415, he was accused by Orosius, a Spanish presbyter, whom Augustin had sent into Palestine for that purpose, before an assembly of bishops who met at Jerusalem, yet he was dismissed without the least censure; and not only so, but was soon after fully acquitted of all errors by the council of Diospolis.[g]

This controversy was brought to Rome, and referred by Cœlestius and Pelagius to the decision of Zosimus,[h] who was raised to the pontificate in 417. The new pontiff, gained over by the ambiguous and seemingly orthodox confession of faith, that Cœlestius, who was now at Rome, had artfully drawn up, and also by the letters and protestations of Pelagius, pronounced in favour of these monks, declared them sound in the faith, and unjustly persecuted by their adversaries. The African bishops, with Augustin at their head, little affected with this declaration, continued obstinately to maintain the judgment they had pronounced in this matter, and to strengthen it by their exhortations, their letters, and their writings. Zosimus yielded to the perseverance of the Africans, changed his mind, and condemned, with the utmost severity, Pelagius and Cœlestius, whom he had honoured with his approbation, and covered with his protection. This was followed by a train of evils, which pursued these two monks without interruption. They were condemned by the same Ephesian council which had launched its thunder at the head of Nestorius; in short, the Gauls, Britons, and Africans, by their councils, and the emperors, by their edicts and penal

the most learned, and, frequently, impartial Asseman, in his Biblioth. Orient. Vatic. tom. iii. p. 25, 26, 29, &c.

[a] Many learned men treat this controversy as a mere dispute about words. Gregory Abulpharajius, himself a Monophysite, and the most learned of the sect, declares this as his opinion. See the Biblioth. Itali. tom. xvii. p. 285.—La Croze, Histoire du Christianisme des Indes, p. 23; and the Histoire du Christianisme d'Ethiopie, p. 14. Asseman, though a Roman by birth and by religion, seems, in a good measure, to have adopted the same way of thinking, as appears by p. 297, in his second volume.

[b] See the subtle argumentation of Abulpharajius, in the Biblioth. Orient. tom. ii. p. 288.

☞ [c] Nothing very certain can be advanced with respect to the native country of Cœlestius, which some say was Scotland, and others Campania in Italy. We know, however, that he was descended of an illustrious family; and that, after having applied himself to the study of the law for some time, he retired from the world, and embraced the monastic life. See Gennad. de Script. Eccles. cap. xliv.

☞ [d] The learned and furious Jerome, who never once thought of doing common justice to those who had the misfortune to differ from him in opinion, accused Pelagius of gluttony and intemperance, after he had heard of his errors, though he had admired him before for his exemplary virtue. Augustin, more candid and honest, bears impartial testimony to the truth; and, even while he writes against this heretic, acknowledges that he had made great progress in virtue and piety, that his life was chaste and his manners were blameless; and this, indeed, is the truth.

☞ [e] The doctrines that were more immediately connected with the main principles of Pelagius, were, that infant baptism was not a sign or seal of the remission of sins, but a mark of admission to the kingdom of heaven, which was only open to the pure in heart; that good works were meritorious, and the only conditions of salvation;—with many others too tedious to mention.

[f] The Pelagian controversy has been historically treated by many learned writers, such as Usher, in his Antiquit. Eccles. Britannicæ, Laet. Ger. Vossius; Norris; Garnier, in his Supplement; Oper. Theodoreti; Jansenius in Augustino, and others. Longueval also, a French Jesuit, wrote a History of the Pelagians. See the preface to the ninth volume of his Historia Eccles. Gallicanæ. After all, it must be confessed, that these learned writers have not exhausted this interesting subject, or treated it with a sufficient degree of impartiality.

[g] See Daniel, Histoire du Concile de Diospolis, which is to be found in the Opuscula of that eloquent and learned Jesuit, published at Paris, in 1724. Diospolis was a city in Palestine, known in Scripture by the name of Lydda; and the bishop who presided in this council was Eulogius of Cæsarea, metropolitan of Palestine.

☞ [h] To preserve the thread of the history, and prevent the reader's being surprised to find Pelagius and Cœlestius appealing to Rome after having been acquitted at Diospolis, it is necessary to observe that these monks were condemned anew, in 416, by the African bishops assembled at Carthage, and those of Numidia assembled at Milevum; upon which they appealed to Rome.

laws, demolished this sect in its infancy, and suppressed it entirely before it had acquired any tolerable degree of vigour or consistence.[a]

XXV. The unhappy disputes about the opinions of Pelagius occasioned, as usually happens, other controversies equally prejudicial to the peace of the church, and the interests of true Christianity. In the course of this dispute, Augustin had delivered his opinion, concerning the necessity of divine grace in order to our salvation, and the decrees of God with respect to the future conditions of men, without being always consistent with himself, or intelligible to others. Hence certain monks of Adrumetum, and others, were led into a notion, "That God not only predestinated the wicked to eternal punishment, but also to the guilt and transgression for which they are punished; and that thus both the good and bad actions of all men were determined from eternity by a divine decree, and fixed by an invincible necessity." Those who embraced this opinion, were called Predestinarians. Augustin used his utmost influence and authority to prevent the spreading of this doctrine, and explained his true sentiments with more perspicuity, that it might not be attributed to him. His efforts were seconded by the councils of Arles and Lyons, in which the doctrine in question was publicly rejected and condemned.[b] But we must not omit observing, that the existence of this Predestinarian sect has been denied by many learned men, and looked upon as an invention of the Semi-Pelagians, designed to decry the followers of Augustin, by attributing to them unjustly this dangerous and pernicious error.[c]

XXVI. A new and different modification was given to the doctrine of Augustin by the monk Cassian, who came from the east into France, and erected a monastery near Marseilles. Nor was he the only one who attempted to fix upon a certain temperature between the errors of Pelagius and the opinions of the African oracle; several persons embarked in this undertaking about the year 430, and hence arose a new sect, the members of which were called, by their adversaries, Semi-Pelagians.

The opinions of this sect have been misrepresented, by its enemies, upon several occasions; such is usually the fate of all parties in religious controversies. Their doctrine, as it has been generally explained by the learned, amounted to this: "That inward preventing grace was not necessary to form in the soul the beginnings of true repentance and amendment; that every one was capable of producing these by the mere power of his natural faculties, as also of exercising faith in Christ, and forming the purposes of a holy and sincere obedience." But they acknowledged at the same time, "That none could persevere or advance in that holy and virtuous course which they had the power of beginning, without the perpetual support and the powerful assistance of the divine grace."[d] The disciples of Augustin, in Gaul, attacked the Semi-Pelagians with the utmost vehemence, without being able to extirpate or overcome them.[e] The doctrine of this sect was so suited to the capacities of the generality of men, so conformable to the way of thinking that prevailed among the monastic orders, and so well received among the gravest and most learned Grecian doctors, that neither the zeal nor industry of its adversaries could stop its rapid and extensive progress. Add to its other advantages, that neither Augustin, nor his followers, had ventured to condemn it in all its parts, or to brand it as an impious and pernicious heresy.

XXVII. This was the commencement of those unhappy contests, those subtle and perplexing disputes concerning grace, or the nature and operation of that divine power, which is essentially required in order to salvation, that rent the church into the most deplorable divisions through the whole course of the succeeding age, and which, to the deep sorrow and regret of every true and generous Christian, have been continued to the present time. The doctrine of Augustin, who was of opinion, that, in the work of conversion and sanctification, all was to be attributed to a divine energy, and nothing to human agency, had many followers in all ages of the church, though his disciples have never agreed entirely about the manner of explaining what he taught on that head.[f] The followers of Cassian were, however, much more numerous; and his doctrine, though variously explained, was received in the greatest part of the monastic schools in Gaul, whence it spread itself through other parts of Europe. As to the Greeks, and other Eastern Christians, they had embraced the Semi-Pelagian doctrine before Cassian, and still adhere firmly to it. The generality of Christians looked upon the opinions of Pelagius as daring and presumptuous; and even to those who adopted them in secret, they appeared too free and too far removed from the notions commonly received, to render the public profession of them advisable and prudent. Certain, however, it is, that in all ages of the church there have been several persons, who, in conformity with the doctrine attributed to this heretic, have believed mankind endowed with a *natural power* of paying to the divine laws a *perfect obedience.*

[a] See the Historia Pelagiana of Ger. J. Vossius, lib. i. cap. lv. p. 130; as also the learned observations that have been made upon this controversy, in the Biblio. Ital. tom. v. p. 74. The writers on both sides are mentioned by Jo. Franc. Buddeus, in his Isagoge ad Theologiam, tom. ii. 1071. The learned Wall, in his History of Infant Baptism, vol. i. chap. xix. has given a concise and elegant account of the Pelagian controversy; an account which, though imperfect in several respects, abounds with solid and useful erudition.

[b] See Jac. Sirmondi Historia Prædestinatiana, tom. iv. op. p. 271.—Basnage, Histoire de l'Eglise, tom. i. livr. xii. cap. ii. p. 698. Dion. Petavius, Dogmat. Theol. tom. vi. p. 168, 174, &c.

[c] See Gilb. Mauguini Fabula Prædestinatiana confutata, which he subjoined to the second tome of his learned work, entitled, Collectio variorum Scriptorum qui Sæc. ix. de Prædestinatione et Gratiâ scripserunt.—Fred. Spanhemius, Introd. ad Hist. Eccles. t. i. op. p. 993.—Jac. Basnag. Adnot. ad Prosperi Chronicon et Præf. ad Faustum Regiensem, tom. i. Lection. Antiqu. Canisii, p. 315, 348. Granet (who wrote the life of Launoy) observes, that Sirmond had solicited Launoy to write against Mauguin, who denied the existence of the predestinarian sect; but that the former, having examined the matter with care and application, adopted the sentiment of Mauguin. The whole dispute about the existence of this sect will, when closely looked into, appear to be little more, perhaps, than a dispute about words. ☞ It may be very true, that, about this time, or even from the time of St. Paul, certain persons embraced the predestinarian opinions here mentioned; but there is no solid proof, that the abettors of these opinions ever formed themselves into a sect. See Basnage, tom. i. p. 700.

☞ [d] The leading principles of the Semi-Pelagians were the five following: 1. That God did not dispense his *grace* to one more than another, in consequence of predestination, i. e. an eternal and absolute decree, but was willing to save all men, if they complied with the terms of his Gospel; 2. that Christ died for all men; 3. that the grace purchased by Christ, and necessary to salvation, was offered to all men; 4. that man, before he received grace, was capable of faith and holy desires; 5. that man, born free, was consequently capable of resisting the influences of grace, or complying with its suggestions. See Basnage, tom. i. livr. xii

[e] Basnage, tom. i. livr. xii.—Hist. Literaire de la France, tom. ii. præf. p. 9.—Vossii Histor. Pelagiana, lib. v. p. 538.—Scipio Maffei, (under the fictitious name of Irenæus Veronensis,) de Hæresi Pelagianâ, tom. xxix. —Opuscul. Scientif. Angeli Calogeræ, p. 399.

☞ [f] It is well known that the Jansenists and Jesuits both plead the authority of St. Augustin, in behalf of their opposite systems with respect to predestination and grace. This knotty doctrine severely exercised the pretended infallibility of the popes, and exposed it to the laughter of the wise upon many occasions; and the famous bull *Unigenitus* set Clement XI. in direct opposition to several of the most celebrated Roman pontiffs. Which are we to believe?

THE SIXTH CENTURY.

PART I.

THE EXTERNAL HISTORY OF THE CHURCH.

CHAPTER I.

Concerning the prosperous Events which happened to the Church during this Century.

I. The zeal of the bishops of Constantinople, seconded by the protection and influence of the Grecian emperors, increased the number of Christians in the east, and contributed to the conversion of some barbarous nations; of those particularly who lived upon the borders of the Euxine sea, as appears from the most authentic records of Grecian history. Among these nations were the Abasgi, who inhabited the country lying between the coast of the Euxine and mount Caucasus, and who embraced Christianity under the reign of Justinian;[a] the Heruli, who dwelt beyond the Danube, and who were converted in the same reign;[b] as also the Alans, Lazi, and Zani, with other uncivilized people, whose situation, at this time, is only known by vague and imperfect conjectures. These conversions, indeed, however pompously they may sound, were extremely superficial and imperfect, as we learn from the most credible accounts that have been given of them. All that was required of these darkened nations, amounted to an oral profession of their faith in Christ, to their abstaining from sacrifices to the gods, and their committing to memory certain forms of doctrine, while little care was taken to enrich their minds with pious sentiments, or to cultivate in their hearts virtuous affections; so that even after their conversion to Christianity, they retained their primitive ferocity and savage manners, and continued to distinguish themselves by horrid acts of cruelty and rapine, and the practice of all kinds of wickedness. In the greatest part of the Grecian provinces, and even in the capital of the eastern empire, there were still multitudes who preserved a secret attachment to the Pagan religion. Of these, however, vast numbers were brought over to Christianity under the reign of Justin, by the ministerial labours of John, bishop of Asia.[c]

II. In the western parts, Remigius, or Remi, bishop of *Rheims*, who is commonly called the Apostle of the Gauls, signalized his zeal in the conversion of those who still adhered to the ancient superstition;[d] and his success was considerable, particularly after that auspicious period when Clovis, king of the Franks, embraced the Gospel.

In Britain, several circumstances concurred to favour the propagation of Christianity. Ethelbert, king of Kent, the most considerable of the Anglo-Saxon princes, among whom that island was at this time divided, married Bertha, daughter of Cherebert, king of Paris, toward the conclusion of this century. This princess, partly by her own influence, and partly by the pious efforts of the clergy who followed her into Britain, gradually formed, in the mind of Ethelbert, an inclination to the Christian religion. While the king was in this favourable disposition, Gregory the Great, in 596, sent over forty Benedictine monks, with Augustin at their head,[e] in order to bring to perfection what the pious queen had so happily begun. This monk, seconded by the zeal and assistance of Bertha, converted the king and the greatest part of the inhabitants of Kent, and laid anew the foundations of the British church.[f]

The labours of Columbas, an Irish monk, were attended with success among the Picts and Scots, many of whom embraced the Gospel.[g]

In Germany, the Bohemians, Thuringians, and Boii, are said to have abandoned, in this century, their ancient superstitions,[h] and to have received the light of divine truth; but this assertion appears extremely doubtful to many.

All these conversions and sacred exploits will lose much of their importance in the esteem of such as examine with attention the accounts which have been given of them by the writers of this and the succeeding ages; for by these accounts it appears, that the converted nations now mentioned, retained a great part of their former impiety, superstition, and licentiousness, and that, attached to Christ by a mere outward and nominal profession, they, in effect, renounced the purity of his doctrine and the authority of his Gospel by their flagitious lives, and the superstitious and idolatrous rites and institutions which they continued to observe.[i]

III. A vast multitude of Jews, converted to Christianity in several places, were added to the church during the course of this century. Many of that race, particularly the inhabitants of Borium in Libya, were brought over to the truth by the persuasion and influence of the emperor Justinian.[k] In the west, the zeal and authority of the Gallic and Spanish monarchs, the efforts of Gregory the Great, and the

[a] Procopius, de Bello Gothico, lib. iv. cap. iii.—Le Quien, Oriens Christianus, tom. i. p. 1351.

[b] Procopius, lib. ii. cap. xiv

[c] Asseman. Biblioth. Orient. Vatic. tom. ii. p. 85.

[d] Histoire Literaire de la France, tom. iii. p. 155.

☞ [e] This British apostle was prior of the Benedictine monastery of St. Andrew at Rome. After his arrival in England, he converted the heathen temples into places of Christian worship, erected Christ-Church into a cathedral, opened a seminary of learning, founded the abbey of St. Augustin, received episcopal ordination from the primate of Arles, was invested by pope Gregory with power over all the British bishops and Saxon Prelates, and was the first archbishop of Canterbury.

[f] Bede's Histor. Eccles. Gentis Anglor. lib. i. cap. xxiii.—Rapin's History of England.—Acta Sanctor. tom. iii. Februar. p. 470.

[g] Bede's Histor. Eccles. lib. iii. cap. iv.

[h] Henr. Canisii Lection. Antiquæ, tom. iii. part. ii. p. 208.—Aventin. *Annal. Boiorum.*

[i] This is ingenuously confessed by the Benedictine monks, in the Histoire Literaire de la France, tom. iii. Introduc. See also the orders given to the Anglo-Saxons by Gregory the Great, in his Epist. lib. xi. lxxvi. where we find him permitting them to sacrifice to the saints, on their respective holidays, the victims which they had formerly offered to the gods. See also Wilkins's Concilia Magnæ Britanniæ, tom. i.

[k] Procopius, de Ædificiis Justiniani, lib. vi. cap. ii.

labours of Avitus, bishop of Vienne, engaged numbers to receive the Gospel. It must, however, be acknowledged, that of these conversions, the greatest part arose from the liberality of Christian princes, or the fear of punishment, rather than from the force of argument or the love of truth. In Gaul, the Jews were compelled by Childeric to receive the ordinance of baptism; and the same despotic mode of conversion was practised in Spain.[a] This method, however, was entirely disapproved by Gregory the Great, who, though extremely severe upon the heretics, would suffer no violence to be offered to the Jews.[b]

IV. If credit is to be given to the writers of this century, the conversion of these uncivilized nations to Christianity was principally effected by the prodigies and miracles which the heralds of the Gospel were enabled to work in its behalf. But the conduct of the converted nations is sufficient to invalidate the force of these testimonies; for certainly, if such miracles had been wrought among them, their lives would have been more suitable to their profession, and their attachment and obedience to the doctrines and laws of the Gospel more stedfast and exemplary than they appear to have been. Besides (as we have already had occasion to observe,) in abandoning their ancient superstitions, the greatest part of them were more influenced by the example and authority of their princes, than by force of argument, or the power of a rational conviction; and indeed, if we consider the wretched manner in which many of the first Christian missionaries performed the solemn task they had undertaken, we shall perceive that they wanted not many arguments to enforce the doctrines they taught, and the discipline they recommended; for they required nothing of these barbarous people that was difficult to be performed, or that laid any remarkable restraint upon their appetites and passions. The principal injunctions they imposed upon these rude proselytes were, that they should get by heart certain summaries of doctrine, and pay to the images of Christ and the saints the same religious services which they had formerly offered to the statues of the gods. Nor were they at all delicate or scrupulous in choosing the means of establishing their credit; for they deemed it lawful, and even meritorious, to deceive an ignorant and inattentive multitude, by representing, as prodigies, things that were merely natural, as we learn from the most authentic records of these times.

CHAPTER II.

Concerning the calamitous Events which happened to the Church during this Century.

I. THOUGH the abjuration of Paganism was, by the imperial laws, made a necessary step to preferment, and to the exercising of all public offices, yet several persons, respected for their erudition and gravity of manners, persisted in their adherence to the ancient superstition. Tribonian, the famous compiler of the Roman law, is thought, by some, to have been among the number of those who continued in their prejudices against the Christian religion; and such also, in the opinion of many, was the case of Procopius, the celebrated historian. It is at least certain, that Agathias, who was an eminent lawyer at Smyrna, and who had also acquired a considerable reputation as an historical writer, persevered in his attachment to the pagan worship.

These illustrious Gentiles were exempted from the severities which were frequently employed to engage the lower orders to abandon the service of the gods. The rigour of the laws, as it usually happens in human life, fell only upon those who had neither rank, fortune, nor court-favour, to ward off their execution.

II. Surprised as we may be at the protection granted to the persons now mentioned, at a time when the Gospel was, in many instances, propagated by unchristian methods, it will appear still more astonishing that the Platonic philosophers, whose opposition to Christianity was universally known, should be permitted, in Greece and Egypt, to teach publicly the tenets of their sect, which were absolutely incompatible with the doctrines of the Gospel. These doctors indeed affected (generally speaking) a high degree of moderation and prudence, and for the most part modified their expressions in such a manner as to give to the pagan system an evangelical aspect, extremely adapted to deceive the unwary, as the examples of Chalcidius,[c] and Alexander of Lycopolis, abundantly testify.[d] Some of them, however, were less modest, and carried their audacious efforts against Christianity so far as to revile it publicly. Damascius, in the life of Isidorus, and in other places, cast upon the Christians the most ignominious aspersions;[e] Simplicius, in his illustrations of the Aristotelian philosophy, throws out several malignant insinuations against the doctrines of the Gospel; and the Epicheiremata of Proclus,

---

[a] Greg. Turon. Histor. Francor. lib. vi. cap. xvii. Launoius, de veteri More baptizandi Judæos et Infideles, cap. i. p. 700, 704, tom. ii. part ii. op.

[b] See his Epistles, particularly those which he wrote to Vigilius of Arles, Theodore of Marseilles, and Peter of Terracina.

☞ [c] The religion of Chalcidius has been much disputed among the learned. Cave seems inclined to rank him among the Christian writers, though he expresses some uncertainty about the matter. Huet, G. J. Vossius, Fabricius, and Beausobre, decide with greater assurance that Chalcidius was a Christian. Some learned men have maintained, on the contrary, that many things in the writings of this sage entitle him to a place among the pagan philosophers. Our learned author, in his notes to his Latin translation of Cudworth's Intellectual System, and in a Dissertation 'de turbatâ per recentiores Platonicos Ecclesiâ,' lays down an hypothesis, which holds the middle way between these extremes. He is of opinion that Chalcidius neither rejected nor embraced the whole system of the Christian doctrine, but selected, out of the religion of Jesus and the tenets of Plato, a body of divinity, in which, however, Platonism was predominant; and that he was one of those Syncretist or Eclectic philosophers, who abounded in the fourth and fifth centuries, and who attempted to unite Paganism and Christianity into one motley system. This account of the matter, however, appears too vague to the celebrated author of the Critical History of Philosophy, M. Brucker. This excellent writer agrees with Dr. Mosheim in this, that Chalcidius followed the motley method of the eclectic Platonists, but does not see any thing in this inconsistent with his having publicly professed the Christian religion. The question is not, whether this philosopher was a sound and orthodox Christian, which M. Brucker denies him to have been, but whether he had abandoned the pagan rites, and made a public profession of Christianity; and this our philosophical historian looks upon as evident; for though, in the commentary upon Plato's Timæus, Chalcidius teaches several doctrines that seem to strike at the foundations of our holy religion, yet the same may be said of Origen, Clemens Alexandrinus, Arnobius, and others, who are, nevertheless, reckoned among the professors of Christianity. The reader will find an excellent view of the different opinions concerning the religion of Chalcidius, in the third volume of Brucker's History. The truth of the matter seems to be this, that the Eclectics, before Christianity became the religion of the state, enriched their system from the Gospel, but ranged themselves under the standards of Plato; and that they repaired to those of Christ, without any considerable change of their system, when the examples and authority of the emperors rendered the profession of the Christian religion a matter of prudence, as well as its own excellence rendered it most justly a matter of choice.

☞ [d] Alexander wrote a treatise against the Manicheans, which i published by Combefis, in the second tome of his Auctor. Noviss. Biblioth. PP. Photius, Combefis, and our learned Cave, looked upon Alexander as a proselyte to Christianity; but Beausobre has demonstrated the contrary. See the Histoire du Manicheisme, part. ii. Discour Preliminaire, sect. 13, p. 236.

[e] Photii Bibliotheca, cod. ccxlii. p. 1027.

written expressly against the disciples of Jesus, were universally read, and were, on that account, accurately refuted by Philoponus.[a] All this shows that many of the magistrates, who were witnesses of these calumnious attempts, were not so much Christians in reality, as in appearance; otherwise they would not have permitted the slanders of these licentious revilers to pass without correction or restraint.

III. Notwithstanding the extensive progress of the Gospel, the Christians, even in this century, suffered grievously, in several countries, from the savage cruelty and bitterness of their enemies. The Anglo-Saxons, who were masters of the greater part of Britain, involved a multitude of its ancient inhabitants, who professed Christianity, in the deepest distresses, and tormented them with all that variety of suffering, which the injurious and malignant spirit of persecution could invent.[b] The Huns, in their irruptions into Thrace, Greece, and the other provinces, during the reign of Justinian, treated the Christians with great barbarity; not so much, perhaps, from an aversion to Christianity, as from a spirit of hatred against the Greeks, and a desire of overturning and destroying their empire. The face of affairs was totally changed in Italy, about the middle of this century, by a grand revolution which happened in the reign of Justinian I. This emperor, by the arms of Narses, overturned the kingdom of the Ostrogoths, which had subsisted ninety years; and subdued all Italy. The political state, however, which this revolution introduced, was not of a very long duration; for the Lombards, a fierce and warlike people, headed by Alboinus their king, and joined by several other German nations, issued from Pannonia in 568, under the reign of Justin; invaded Italy; and having made themselves masters of the whole country, except Rome and Ravenna, erected a new kingdom at Ticinum. Under these new tyrants, who, to the natural ferocity of their characters, added an aversion to the religion of Jesus, the Christians, in the beginning, endured calamities of every kind. But the fury of these savage usurpers gradually subsided; and their manners contracted, from time to time, a milder character. Autharis, the third monarch of the Lombards, embraced Christianity, as it was professed by the Arians, in 587; but his successor Agilulf, who married his widow Theudelinda, was persuaded by that princess to abandon Arianism, and to adopt the tenets of the Nicene catholics.[c]

The calamities of the Christians, in all other countries, were light and inconsiderable in comparison of those which they suffered in Persia under Chosroes, the inhuman monarch of that nation. This monster of impiety aimed his audacious and desperate efforts against Heaven itself; for he publicly declared, that he would make war not only upon Justinian, but also upon the God of the Christians; and, in consequence of this blasphemous menace, he vented his rage against the followers of Jesus in the most barbarous manner, and put multitudes of them to the most cruel and ignominious deaths.[d]

[a] See J. A. Fabricii Bibliotheca Græca, vol. iii. p. 522.
[b] Usher's Chron. Index to his Antiquit. Eccles. Britann. ad annum 508.
[c] Paul. Diacon. de Gestis Longobardorum. lib. ii. cap. ii. xxvii.—Muratorii Antiquit. Italiæ, tom. i. ii. Giannone, Historia di Napoli, tom. i.
[d] Procopius, de Bello Persico, lib. ii. cap. xxvi.

PART II.

THE INTERNAL HISTORY OF THE CHURCH.

CHAPTER I.

Concerning the State of Letters and Philosophy during this Century.

I. The incursions of the barbarous nations into the greatest part of the western provinces, were extremely prejudicial to the interests of learning and philosophy, as must be known to all who have any acquaintance with the history of these unhappy times. During these tumultuous scenes of desolation and horror, the liberal arts and sciences would have been totally extinguished, had they not found a place of refuge, such as it was, among the bishops, and the monastic orders. Here they assembled their scattered remains, and received a degree of culture which just served to keep them from perishing. Those churches, which were distinguished by the appellation of cathedrals, had schools erected under their jurisdiction, in which the bishop, or a certain person appointed by him, instructed the youth in the seven liberal arts, as a preparatory introduction to the study of the Scriptures.[a] Persons of both sexes, who had devoted themselves to the monastic life, were obliged, by the founders of their respective orders, to employ daily a certain portion of their time in reading the ancient doctors of the church, whose writings were looked upon as the rich repertories of celestial wisdom, in which all the treasures of theology were centred.[b] Hence libraries were formed in all the monasteries, and the pious and learned productions of the Christian and other writers were copied and dispersed by the diligence of transcribers appointed for that purpose, who were generally such monks as, by weakness of constitution, or other bodily infirmities, were rendered incapable of more severe labour. To these establishments we owe the preservation and possession of all the ancient authors, sacred and profane, who escaped in this manner the savage fury of Gothic ignorance, and are happily transmitted to our times. It is also to be observed, that, beside the schools annexed to the cathedrals, seminaries were opened in the greater part of the monasteries, in which the youth who were set apart for the monastic life were instructed by the abbot, or some of his ecclesiastics, in the arts and sciences.[c]

II. But these institutions and establishments, however laudable, did not produce such happy effects as might have been expected from them. For, not to speak of the indolence of certain abbots and bishops, who neglected entirely the duties of their stations, or of the bitter aversion which others discovered towards every sort of learning and erudition, which they considered as pernicious to the progress of piety;[d] not to speak of the *illiberal ignorance* which several prelates affected, and which they injudiciously confounded with *Christian simplicity;*[e] even those who applied themselves to the study and propagation of the sciences, were, for the most part, extremely unskilful and illiterate; and the branches of learning taught in the schools were inconsiderable, both as to their quality and their number.[f] Greek literature was almost every where neglected; and those who by profession, had devoted themselves to the culture of Latin erudition, spent their time and labour in grammatical subtilties and quibbles, as the pedantic examples of Isidorus and Cassiodorus abundantly show. Eloquence was degraded into a rhetorical bombast, a noisy kind of declamation, which was composed of motley and frigid allegories and barbarous terms, as may even appear from several parts of the writings of those superior geniuses who surpassed their contemporaries in precision and elegance, such as Boethius, Cassiodorus, Ennodius, and others. As to the other liberal arts, they shared the common calamity; and, from the mode in which they were now cultivated, they had nothing very liberal or elegant in their appearance, consisting entirely of a few dry rules, which, instead of a complete and finished system, produced only a ghastly and lifeless skeleton.

III. The state of philosophy was still more deplorable than that of literature; for it was entirely banished from those seminaries which were under the inspection and government of the ecclesiastical order. The greatest part of these zealots looked upon the study of philosophy, not only as useless, but even pernicious to those who had dedicated themselves to the service of religion. The most eminent, indeed almost the only Latin philosopher of this age, was the celebrated Boethius, privy counsellor to Theodoric, king of the Ostrogoths. This illustrious senator had embraced the Platonic philosophy,[g] and approved also, as was usual among the modern Platonists, the doctrine of Aristotle, and illustrated it in his writings; and it was undoubtedly in consequence of the diligence and zeal with which he explained and recommended the Aristotelian philosophy, that it rose now among the Latins to a higher degree of credit than it had before enjoyed.

IV. The state of the liberal arts, among the Greeks, was, in several places, much more flourishing than that in which we have left them among the Latins; and the emperors raised and nourished a spirit of literary emulation, by the noble rewards and the distinguished honours which they attached to the pursuit of all the various branches of learning.[h] It is, however, certain, that, notwithstanding these encouragements, the sciences were cultivated with less ardour, and men of learning and genius were less numerous, than in the preceding century. In the beginning of this, the modern Platonists yet maintained their credit,

[a] Fleury, Discours sur l'Histoire Eccles.—Histoire Liter. de la France, tom. iii.—Herm. Conringii Antiq. Academicæ.

[b] Benedict. Anianensis Concordia Regularum, lib. ii. iii.—Jo. Mabillon, Præf. ad Sæc. i. Act. SS. Ord. Bened. p. 44.

[c] Benedict. Concord. Reg. lib. ii. p. 232.—Mabillon, Acta Ord. Bened. tom. i.

[d] Gregory the Great is said to have been of this number, and to have ordered a multitude of the productions of pagan writers, and among others Livy's history, to be committed to the flames. See Liron's Singularités Hist. et Lit. tom. i.

[e] Mabillon, Præf. ad Sæc. i. Benedict. p. 46.

[f] See M. Aur. Cassiodori Liber de septem Disciplinis, which is extant among his works.

[g] This will appear evident to such as, with a competent knowledge of modern Platonism, read attentively the books of Boethius, de Consolatione, &c. See also, on this subject, Renat. Vallin. p. 10, 50. Holstenius in Vit. Porphyrii, and Mascov. Histor. Germanor. tom. ii.

[h] See the Codex Theodos. tom. ii. lib. vi. and Herm. Conringius, de Studiis Urbis Romæ et Constantinop. in a Dissertation subjoined to his Antiquitates Academicæ.

and their philosophy was in vogue. The Alexandrian and Athenian schools flourished under the direction of Damascius, Isidorus, Simplicius, Eulamius, Hermias, Priscianus, and others, who were placed on the highest summit of literary glory. But when the emperor Justinian, by a particular edict, prohibited the teaching of philosophy at Athens,[a] (which edict, no doubt, was levelled at the modern Platonism already mentioned,) and when his resentment began to flame out against those who refused to abandon the pagan worship, all these celebrated philosophers took refuge among the Persians, who were at that time the enemies of Rome.[b] They, indeed, returned from their voluntary exile, when the peace was concluded between the Persians and the Romans in 533;[c] but they could never recover their former credit, and they gradually disappeared from the public schools and seminaries, which ceased, at length, to be under their direction.

Thus expired that famous sect, which was distinguished by the title of the Modern or Later Platonic; and which, for a series of ages, had produced such divisions and tumults in the Christian church, and been, in other respects, prejudicial to the interests and progress of the Gospel. It was succeeded by the Aristotelian philosophy, which arose impereeptibly out of its obscurity, and was placed in an advantageous light by the illustrations of the learned, but especially and principally by the celebrated commentaries of Philoponus; and, indeed, the knowledge of this philosophy was necessary for the Greeks, since it was from the depths of this peripatetical wisdom that the Monophysites and Nestorians drew the subtilties with which they endeavoured to overwhelm the abettors of the Ephesian and Chalcedonian councils.

V. The Nestorians and Monophysites, who lived in the east, equally turned their eyes toward Aristotle, and, in order to train their respective followers to the field of controversy, and arm them with the subtilties of a contentious logic, translated the principal books of that deep philosopher into their native languages. Sergius, a Monophysite and philosopher, translated the books of Aristotle into Syriac.[d] Uranius, a Syrian, propagated the doctrines of this philosopher in Persia, and disposed in their favour Chosroes, the monarch of that nation, who became a zealous abettor of the peripatetic system.[e] The same prince received from one of the Nestorian faction (which, after having procured the exclusion of the Greeks, triumphed at this time unrivalled in Persia) a translation of the Stagirite's works into the Persian language.[f]

It is, however, to be observed, that among these eastern Christians there were some who rejected both the Platonic and Aristotelian doctrines, and who, unwilling to be obliged to others for their philosophical knowledge, invented systems of their own, which were inexpressibly chimerical and pregnant with absurdities. Of this class of original philosophers was Cosmas, a Nestorian, commonly called Indicopleustes, whose doctrines are singular, and resemble more the notions of the Orientals than the opinions of the Greeks.[g] Such also was the writer, from whose Exposition of the Octateuch, Photius has drawn several citations.[h]

CHAPTER II.

Concerning the Doctors and Ministers of the Church.

I. THE external form of church government continued without any remarkable alteration during the course of this century. But the bishops of Rome and Constantinople, who were considered as the most eminent and principal rulers of the Christian church, were engaged in perpetual disputes about the extent and limits of their respective jurisdictions; and both seemed to aim at the supreme authority in ecclesiastical affairs. The latter prelate not only claimed an unrivalled sovereignty over the eastern churches, but also maintained, that his church was, in point of dignity, no way inferior to that of Rome. The Roman pontiffs beheld, with impatience, these lordly pretensions, and warmly asserted the pre-eminence of their church, and its superiority over that of Constantinople. Gregory the Great distinguished himself in this violent contest; and the following event furnished him with an opportunity of exerting his zeal. In 588, John, bishop of Constantinople, surnamed the Faster, on account of his extraordinary abstinence and austerity, assembled a council, by his own authority, to inquire into an accusation brought against Peter, patriarch of Antioch; and on this occasion assumed the title of œcumenical or universal bishop.[i] Now, although this title had been formerly enjoyed by the bishops of Constantinople, and was also susceptible of an interpretation that might have prevented its giving umbrage or offence to any,[k] yet Gregory suspected, both from the time and the occasion of John's renewing his claim to it, that he was aiming at a supremacy over all the Christian churches; and therefore he opposed his claim in the most vigorous manner, in letters to that purpose addressed to the emperor, and to such persons as he judged proper to second his opposition. But all his efforts were without effect; and the bishops of Constantinople continued to assume the title in question, though not in the sense in which it had alarmed the pope.[l]

II. This pontiff, however, adhered tenaciously to his purpose, opposed with vehemence the bishop of Constantinople, raised new tumults and dissensions among the sacred order, and aimed at no less than an unlimited supre-

---

[a] Johannes Malala, Historia Chronica, part ii. page 187, edit. Oxon. Another testimony concerning this matter is cited from a certain Chronicle, not yet published, by Nic. Alemannus, ad Procopii Histor. Arcanam, cap. xxvi.

[b] Agathias, de Rebus Justiniani, lib. ii.

[c] See Wesselingii Observat. Var. lib. i. cap. xviii.

[d] See the Histor. Dynastiarum, by Abulpharajius, published by Dr. Pocock, p. 94, 172.

[e] See Agathias, de Rebus Justiniani, lib. ii. p. 48. That Uranius made use of the Aristotelian philosophy in the Eutychian controversy, is evident from this circumstance, that Agathias represents him disputing concerning the *passibility and immiscibility* of God (και το παθητον και ασυγχυτον.)

[f] Agathias, ibid.

[g] Bernard de Montfaucon, Præfat. ad Cosmam, p. 10. tom. ii. Collectionis novæ Patrum Græcorum.

[h] Biblioth. cod. xxxvi.

☞ [i] We cannot avoid taking notice of some mistakes which have slipped from the pen of Dr. Mosheim in his narration of this event. First, the council here mentioned was holden under the pontificate of Pelagius II. and not of Gregory the Great, who was not chosen bishop of Rome before the year 590. Secondly, the person accused before this council was not Peter, but Gregory, bishop of Antioch. Thirdly, it does not appear that the council was summoned by John of Constantinople, but by the emperor Mauricius, to whom Gregory had appealed from the governor of the east, before whom he was first accused.

☞ [k] The title of universal bishop, which had been given by Leo and Justinian to the patriarch of Constantinople, was not attended with any accession of power.

[l] Gregor. Magni Epist. lib. iv. v. vii. All the passages in these epistles that relate to this famous contest, have been extracted and illustrated by Launoy, in his Assertio in Privileg. S. Medardi, tom. iii. op. part ii. p. 266. See also Lequien, Oriens Christianus, tom. i. p. 67. Pfaffi Dissertatio de Titulo Œcumen. in the Tempe Helvetica, tom. iv. p. 99.

macy over the Christian church. This ambitious design succeeded in the west; while, in the eastern provinces, his arrogant pretensions were scarcely respected by any but those who were at enmity with the bishop of Constantinople; and this prelate was always in a condition to make head against the progress of his authority in the east. How much the opinions of some were favourable to the lordly demands of the Roman pontiffs, may be easily imagined from an expression of Ennodius, that infamous and extravagant flatterer of Symmachus, who was a prelate of ambiguous fame. This parasitical panegyrist, among other impertinent assertions, maintained, that the pontiff was constituted judge in the place of God, which he filled as the vicegerent of the Most High.[a] On the other hand, it is certain, from a variety of the most authentic records, that both the emperors and the nations in general were far from being disposed to bear with patience the yoke of servitude, which the popes were imposing upon the Christian church.[b] The Gothic princes set bounds to the power of those arrogant prelates in Italy, permitted none to be raised to the pontificate without their approbation, and reserved to themselves the right of judging of the legality of every new election.[c] They enacted spiritual laws, called the religious orders before their tribunals, and summoned councils by their legal authority.[d] In consequence of all this, the pontiffs, amidst all their high pretensions, reverenced the majesty of their kings and emperors, and submitted to their authority with the most profound humility; nor were they yet so lost to all sense of shame, as to aim at the subjection of kings and princes to their spiritual dominion.[e]

III. The rights and privileges of the clergy were very considerable before this period, and the riches, which they had accumulated, immense; and both received daily augmentations from the growth of superstition in this century. The arts of a rapacious priesthood were practised upon the ignorant devotion of the simple; and even the remorse of the wicked was made an instrument of increasing the ecclesiastical treasure; for an opinion was propagated with industry among the people, that a remission of sin was to be purchased by their liberalities to the churches and monks, and that the prayers of departed saints, whose efficacy was victorious at the throne of God, were to be bought by offerings presented to the temples, which were consecrated to these celestial mediators. But, in proportion as the riches of the church increased, the various orders of the clergy were infected with those vices which are too often the consequences of an affluent prosperity. This appears, with the utmost evidence, from the imperial edicts and the decrees of councils, which were so frequently levelled at the immoralities of those who were distinguished by the appellation of *clerks;* for, what necessity would there have been for the enactment of so many laws to restrain the vices, and to preserve the morals of the ecclesiastical orders, if they had fulfilled even the obligations of external decency, or shown, in the general tenor of their lives, a certain degree of respect for religion and virtue? Be that as it will, the effect of all these laws and edicts was so inconsiderable as to be scarcely perceived; for so high was the veneration paid, at this time, to the clergy, that their most flagitious crimes were corrected by the slightest and gentlest punishments; an unhappy circumstance, which added to their presumption, and rendered them more daring and audacious in iniquity.

IV. The bishops of Rome, who considered themselves as the chiefs and fathers of the Christian church, are not to be excepted from this censure, any more than the clergy who were under their jurisdiction. We may form some notion of their *humility* and *virtue* by that long and vehement contention, which arose in 498, between Symmachus and Laurentius, who were on the same day elected to the pontificate by different parties, and whose dispute was, at length, decided by Theodoric king of the Goths. Each of these ecclesiastics maintained obstinately the validity of his election; they reciprocally accused each other of the most detestable crimes; and to their mutual dishonour, their accusations did not appear, on either side, entirely destitute of foundation. Three different councils, assembled at Rome, endeavoured to terminate this odious schism,[f] but without success. A fourth was summoned, by Theodoric, to examine the accusations brought against Symmachus, to whom this prince had, at the beginning of the schism, adjudged the papal chair. This council met about the commencement of the century, and in it the Roman pontiff was acquitted of the crimes laid to his charge. But the adverse party refused to acquiesce in this decision; and this gave occasion to Ennodius of Ticinum (now Pavia) to draw up his adulatory Apology for the Council and Symmachus.[g] In this apology, which disguises the truth under the seducing colours of a gaudy rhetoric, the reader will perceive that the foundations of that enormous power, which the popes afterwards acquired, were now laid; but he will in vain seek, in this laboured production, any satisfactory proof of the injustice of the charge brought against Symmachus.[h]

V. The number, credit, and influence of the monks, augmented daily in all parts of the Christian world. They multiplied so prodigiously in the east, that whole armies might have been raised out of the monastic order, without any sensible diminution of that enormous body. The monastic life was also highly honoured, and had an incredible number of patrons and followers in all the western provinces, as appears from the rules which were prescribed in this century, by various doctors, for directing the conduct of the cloistered monks, and the holy vir-

[a] See his Apologeticum pro Synodo, in the xvth volume of the Bibliotheca Magna Patrum. ☞ One would think that this servile adulator had never read the 4th verse of the 2d chapter of St. Paul's 2d Epistle to the Thessalonians, where the Anti-Christ, or man of sin, is described in the very terms in which he represents the authority of the pontiff Symmachus.

[b] See particularly the truth of this assertion, with respect to Spain, in Geddes' Dissertation on the Papal Supremacy, chiefly with relation to the ancient Spanish Church, which is to be found in vol. ii. of his Miscellaneous Tracts. [c] See Mascovii Hist. German. tom. ii. not. p. 113.

[d] Basnage, Histoire des Eglises Reformées, tom. i. p. 381.

[e] See the citations from Gregory the Great, collected by Launoy, de regiâ Potestate in Matrimon. tom. i. op. part ii. p. 691, and in his Assertio in Privilegium S. Medardi, p. 272, tom. iii. op. part ii. See also Giannone, Historia di Napoli, tom. ii.

☞ [f] This schism may be truly termed *odious*, as it was carried on by assassinations, massacres, and all the cruel proceedings of a desperate civil war. See Paulus Diaconus, lib. xvii.

[g] This apology may be seen in the fifteenth volume of the Magn. Bibl. Patrum, p. 248.

☞ [h] That Symmachus was never fairly acquitted, may be presumed from the first, and proved from the second of the following circumstances: first, that Theodoric, who was a wise and equitable prince, and who had attentively examined the charge brought against him, would not have referred the decision to the bishops, if the matter had been clear, but would have pronounced judgment himself, as he had formerly done with respect to the legality of his election. The second circumstance is, that the council acquitted him without even hearing those who accused him, and he himself did not appear, though frequently summoned.

gins, who had sacrificed their capacity of being useful in the world, to the gloomy charms of a convent.[a] In Great-Britain, a certain abbot, named Congal, is said to have persuaded an incredible number of persons to abandon the affairs, obligations, and duties of social life, and to spend the remainder of their days in solitude, under a rule of discipline, of which he was the inventor.[b] His disciples travelled through many countries, in which they propagated, with such success, the contagion of this monastic devotion that, in a short time, Ireland, Gaul, Germany, and Switzerland, swarmed with those lazy orders, and were, in a manner, covered with convents. The most illustrious disciple of the abbot now mentioned, was Columban, whose singular rule of discipline is yet extant, and surpasses all the rest in simplicity and brevity.[c] The monastic orders, in general, abounded with fanatics and profligates; the latter were more numerous than the former in the western convents, while in those of the east, the fanatics were predominant.

VI. A new order, which in a manner absorbed all the others that were established in the west, was instituted, in 529, by Benedict of Nursia, a man of piety and reputation for the age he lived in. From his rule of discipline, which is yet extant, we learn that it was not his intention to impose it upon all the monastic societies, but to form an order whose discipline should be milder, establishment more solid, and manners more regular, than those of the other monastic bodies; and whose members, during the course of a holy and peaceful life, were to divide their time between prayer, reading, the education of youth, and other pious and learned labours.[d] But in process of time, the followers of this celebrated ecclesiastic degenerated sadly from the piety of their founder, and lost sight of the duties of their station, and the great end of their establishment. Having acquired immense riches from the devout liberality of the opulent, they sunk into luxury, intemperance, and sloth, abandoned themselves to all sorts of vices, extended their zeal and attention to worldly affairs, insinuated themselves into the cabinets of princes, took part in political cabals and court factions, made a vast augmentation of superstitious ceremonies in their order, to blind the multitude and supply the place of their expiring virtue; and among other *meritorious* enterprises, laboured most ardently to swell the arrogance, by enlarging the power and authority of the Roman pontiff. The good Benedict never dreamed that the great purposes of his institution were to be thus perverted; much less did he give any encouragement or permission to such flagrant abuses. His rule of discipline was neither favourable to luxury nor to ambition; and it is still celebrated on account of its excellence, though it has not been observed for many ages.

It is proper to remark here, that the institution of Benedict changed, in several respects, the obligations and duties of the monastic life, as it was regulated in the west. Among other things, he obliged those who entered into his order to promise, at the time of their being received as novices, and afterwards at their admission as members of the society, to persevere in an obedience to the rules he had laid down, without attempting to change them in any respect. As he was exceedingly solicitous about the stability of his institution, this particular regulation was wise and prudent; and it was so much the more necessary, as, before his time, the monks made no scruple of altering the laws and rules of their founders whenever they thought proper.[e]

VII. This new order made a most rapid progress in the west, and soon arrived at the most flourishing state. In Gaul, its interests were promoted by St. Maurus; in Sicily and Sardinia, by Placidus; in England, by Augustin and Mellitus; in Italy, and other countries, by Gregory the Great, who is himself reported to have been for some time a member of this society;[f] and it was afterwards received in Germany by the means of Boniface.[g] This amazing progress of the new order was ascribed by the Benedictines to the wisdom and sanctity of their discipline, and to the miracles wrought by their founder and his followers. But a more attentive view of things will convince the impartial observer, that the protection of the pontiffs, to the advancement of whose grandeur and authority the Benedictines were most servilely devoted, contributed much more to the lustre and influence of their order, than any other circumstances, and indeed more than all other considerations united. But, however general their credit was, they did not reign alone; other orders subsisted in several countries until the ninth century. Then, however, the Benedictines absorbed all the other religious societies, and held unrivalled, the reins of the monastic empire.[h]

VIII. The most celebrated Greek and Oriental writers that flourished in this century, were the following:

Procopius of Gaza, who interpreted with success several books of Scripture.[i]

Maxentius, a monk of Antioch, who, beside several treatises against the sects of his time, composed Scholia on Dionysius the Areopagite.

Agapetus, whose Scheda Regia, addressed to the emperor Justinian, procured him a place among the wisest and most judicious writers of this century.

Eulogius, a presbyter of Antioch, who was the terror of heretics, and a warm and strenuous defender of the orthodox faith.

John, patriarch of Constantinople, who, on account of his austere method of life, was surnamed the Faster, and who acquired a certain degree of reputation by several little productions, and more particularly by his Penitential.

Leontius of Byzantium, whose book against the sects, and other writings, are yet extant.

Evagrius, a scholastic writer, whose Ecclesiastical History is, in many places, corrupted with fabulous narrations.

Anastasius of Sinai, whom most writers consider as the author of a trifling performance, written against a sort of

[a] These rules are extant in Holstenius' Codex Regularum, part ii. published at Rome in 1661. See also Edm. Martenne et Ursin. Durand. Thesaur. Anecdot. Nov. tom. i. p. 4.

[b] Archbishop Usher's Antiq. Eccles. Britan.

[c] Usserii Sylloge Antiq. Epis. Hiber. p. 5—15.—Holstenii Codex Regularum, tom. ii. p. 48.—Mabillon, Præf. ad Sæc. ii. Benedictinum, p. 4.

[d] See Mabillon, Acta Sanctor. Ord. Bened. Sæc. i. and Annales Ordin. Ben. tom. i. See also Helyot, and the other writers who have given accounts of the monastic orders.

[e] See Mabillon, Præf. ad Sæc. iv. Benedict.

[f] See Mabillon's preface last mentioned, and his Dissertation de Vitâ Monast. Gregorii M. This circumstance, however, is denied by some writers; and among others by Gallonius, concerning whose book upon that subject, see Simon's Lettres Choisies, tom. iii. p. 63.

[g] Anton. Dadini Alteserræ, Origines rei Monasticæ, lib. i. cap. ix. The propagation of the Benedictine order, through the different provinces of Europe, is related by Mabillon, Præf. ad Sæc. i. et ad Sæc. iv.

[h] L'Enfant, Histoire du Concile de Constance, tom. ii.

[i] See Simon's Critique de la Bibliotheque Ecclesiastique de M. Du Pin, tom. i. p. 197.

heretics called Acephali, of whom we shall have occasion to speak hereafter.[a]

IX. Among the Latin writers, the following are principally worthy of mention:

Gregory the Great, bishop of Rome, who united the most inconsistent and contradictory qualities; as in some cases he discovered a sound and penetrating judgment, and in others the most shameful and superstitious weakness; and in general manifested an extreme aversion to all kinds of learning, as his Epistles and Dialogues sufficiently testify.[b]

Cæsarius of Arles, who composed some moral writings, and drew up a *rule* of conduct and discipline for the Holy Virgins.[c]

Fulgentius, bishop of Ruspina, who attacked with great warmth the Arians and Pelagians in Africa; but whose style and manner were harsh and uncouth, as was generally the case of the African writers.[d]

Ennodius, bishop of Ticinum, who was not one of the meanest authors of this century, whether we consider his compositions in prose or in verse; though he disgraced his talents, and dishonoured his eloquence, by his infamous adulation of the Roman pontiff, whom he so exalted above all mortals, as to maintain that he was answerable to none upon earth for his conduct, and subject to no human tribunal.[e]

Benedict of Nursia, who acquired an immortal name, by the rules he laid down for the order which he instituted, and the multitude of religious societies that submitted to his discipline.

Dionysius, who was surnamed the Little, on account of his extraordinary humility, and was deservedly esteemed for his Collection of the ancient Canons, and also for his Chronological Researches.

Fulgentius Ferrandus, an African, who acquired a considerable degree of reputation by several treatises, but especially by his Abridgment of the Canons, though his style and diction were entirely destitute of harmony and elegance.

Facundus, a strenuous defender of the Three Chapters, of which we shall give an account in their place.

Arator, who translated, with tolerable success, the Acts of the Apostles into Latin verse.

Primasius of Adrumetum, whose Commentary upon the Epistles of St. Paul, as also his book concerning Heresies, are yet extant.

Liberatus, whose Compendious History of the Nestorian and Eutychian controversies, must entitle him to an eminent rank among the writers of this century.

Fortunatus, a man of various erudition, and whose poetic compositions are far from being destitute of genius.[f]

Gregory of Tours, who is esteemed the father of Gallic history; and who would have descended with honour to posterity, did not his Annals of the Franks, and the rest of his writings, carry so many marks of levity, credulity, and weakness.[g]

Gildas, the most ancient of the British writers, who composed a book concerning the destruction of Britain, in which there are several things not altogether unworthy of the curiosity of the learned.

Columban, a native of Ireland, who became famous on account of the monastic rules he prescribed to his followers, his zeal for establishing religious orders, and his poetical productions.[h]

Isidore, bishop of Seville, whose grammatical, theological, and historical productions, discover more learning and pedantry, than judgment and taste.

We may conclude this enumeration of the Latin writers with the illustrious names of Boethius and Cassiodorus, who far surpassed all their contemporaries in learning and knowledge. The former shone forth with the brightest lustre in the republic of letters, as a philosopher, an orator, a poet, and a divine, and both in elegance and subtilty of genius had no superior, nor indeed any equal in this century; the latter, though in many respects inferior to him, was nevertheless far from being destitute of merit.[i] Several productions of these writers have been transmitted to our times.

CHAPTER III.

Concerning the Doctrine of the Church during this Century.

I. WHEN once the ministers of the church had departed from the ancient simplicity of religious worship, and sullied the native purity of divine truth by a motley mixture of human inventions, it was difficult to set bounds to this growing corruption. Abuses were daily multiplied, and superstition drew from its horrid fecundity an incredible number of absurdities, which were added to the doctrine of Christ and his apostles. The controversial writers in the eastern provinces continued to render perplexed and obscure some of the principal doctrines of Christianity, by the subtile distinctions which they borrowed from a vain and chimerical philosophy. The public teachers and instructors of the people grievously degenerated from the apostolic character. They seemed to aim at nothing else, than to sink the multitude into the most opprobrious ignorance and superstition, to efface from their minds all sense of the beauty and excellence of genuine piety, and to substitute, in the place of religious principles, a blind veneration for the clergy and a stupid zeal for a senseless round of ridiculous ceremonies. This, perhaps, will appear less surprising, when we consider, that the 'blind led the blind;' for the public ministers and teachers of religion were, for the most part, grossly ignorant; indeed, almost as much so as the people whom they were appointed to instruct.

II. To be convinced of the truth of the dismal representation we have here given of the state of religion at this time, nothing more is necessary, than to cast an eye upon the doctrines now taught concerning the worship of images and saints, the fire of purgatory, the efficacy of good

[a] See, for an account of this book, Simon, tom. i. p 232; as also Barat. Bibliotheque Choisie, tom. ii. p. 21.

[b] A splendid edition of the works of Gregory was published at Paris, in 1705, by father St. Marthe, a Benedictine monk. See an account of this pontiff, Acta Sanctor. tom. ii. Martii, p. 121.

[c] Of this writer, the Benedictine monks have given a learned account, in their Histoire Literaire de la France, tom. iii. p. 190.

[d] See, for an account of Fulgentius, the Acta Sanct. tom. i. Jan. p. 32, &c.

[e] Hist. Lit. de la France, tom. iii. p. 96 [f] Ibid. tom. iii. p. 464.

[g] The life of Gregory of Tours is to be found in the work last quoted, and his faults are mentioned by Pagi, in his Dissert. de Dionysio Paris. sect. 25, which is added to the fourth tome of the Breviarium Pontif. Romanor. Launoy defends this historian in many things in his works, tom. i. part ii. p. 131.

[h] No writers have given more accurate accounts of Gildas and Columban, than the learned Benedictines, in the Hist. Lit. de la France, tom. iii. p. 279, 505.

[i] See Simon's Critique de la Bibliotheque de M. Du-Pin, tom. i. p. 211

works, i. e. the observance of human rites and institutions, toward the attainment of salvation, the power of relics to heal the diseases of body and mind; and the like sordid and miserable fancies, which are inculcated in many of the superstitious productions of this century, and particularly in the epistles and other writings of Gregory the Great. Nothing could be more ridiculous on one hand, than the solemnity and liberality with which this good, but silly pontiff, distributed the wonder-working relics; and nothing more lamentable on the other, than the stupid eagerness and devotion with which the deluded multitude received them, and suffered themselves to be persuaded, that a portion of rancid oil, taken from the lamps which burned at the tombs of the martyrs, had a supernatural efficacy to sanctify its possessors, and to defend them from all dangers, both of a temporal and spiritual nature.[a]

III. Several attempts were made in this century to lay down a proper and judicious method of explaining the Scriptures. Of this nature were the two books of Junilius the African, concerning the various parts of the divine law;[b] a work destitute of precision and method, and from which it appears that the author had not sufficient knowledge and penetration for the task he undertook.

Cassiodorus also, in his two books concerning the divine laws, has delivered several rules for the right interpretation of the Scriptures.

Philoxenus the Syrian translated, into his native language, the Psalms of David, and the Books of the New Testament.[c]

Interpreters were numerous in this century. Those who made the greatest figure among the Greeks in this character, were Procopius of Gaza, Severus of Antioch, Julian, and a few others; the first was an expositor of no mean abilities.[d] The most eminent rank, among the Latin commentators, is due to Gregory the Great, Cassiodorus, Primasius,[e] Isidore of Seville,[f] and Bellator.

IV. It must, however, be acknowledged, that these writers scarcely deserve the name of expositors, if we except a small number of them, and among these the eastern Nestorians, who following the example of Theodore of Mopsuestia, were careful in exploring the true sense and the native energy of the words employed in the Scriptures. We may, therefore, divide the commentators of this age into two classes. In the first, we rank those who did nothing more than collect the opinions and interpretations which had been received by the ancient doctors of the church; which collections were afterwards called *chains* by the Latins.[g] Such were the chains of Olympiodorus on Job, and of Victor of Capua on the four Gospels; and the commentary of Primasius on the Epistle to the Romans, which was compiled from the works of Augustin, Jerome, Ambrose, and others. Even Procopius of Gaza may be ranked in this class, though not with so much reason as the mere compilers now mentioned, since, in many cases, he has consulted the dictates of his own judgment, and not followed, with a servile and implicit submission, the voice of antiquity. To the second class belong those fanciful expositors, who, setting up Origen as their great model, neglect and overlook entirely the sense of the words employed by the sacred writers, lose themselves in spiritual refinements and allegorical digressions, and by the aid of a lively and luxuriant imagination, draw from the Scriptures arguments in favour of every whim they have thought proper to adopt. Such was Anastasius the Sinaite, whose Mysterious Contemplations, upon the six-days' Creation,[h] betray the levity and ignorance of their author. Such also was Gregory the Great, whose Moral Observations upon the Book of Job, formerly met with unmerited commendations. Such were Isidore of Seville and Primasius, as manifestly appears from that Book of Allegories upon the Holy Scriptures,[i] which was invented by the former, and from the Mystical Exposition of the book of the Revelation,[k] which was imagined by the latter.

V. It would be needless to expect from the divines of this century, an accurate view, or a clear and natural explanation, of the Christian doctrine. The greatest part of them reasoned and disputed concerning the truths of the Gospel, as the blind would argue about light and colours; and imagined that they had acquitted themselves nobly, when they had thrown out a heap of crude and indigested notions, and overwhelmed their adversaries with a torrent of words.

We may perceive, however, in the writers of this age, evident marks of the three different methods of explaining and inculcating the doctrines of religion which are yet practised among the Greeks and Latins; for some collected a heap, rather than a system of theological opinions, from the writings of the ancient doctors, from the decrees of councils, and from the Scriptures; such were Isidore of Seville among the Latins, (whose three books of sentences or opinions are still extant,) and Leontius the Cyprian among the Greeks, whose common-place book of divinity was much esteemed. These authors gave rise to that species of divinity, which the Latins afterwards distinguished by the name of *positive theology*.

Others endeavoured to explain the various doctrines of Christianity by reasoning upon their nature, their excellency and fitness; and thus it was, with the strong weapons of reason and argument, that many of the Christian doctors disputed against the Nestorians, the Eutychians, and the Pelagians. These metaphysical divines were called *schoolmen*, and their writings were afterwards characterized by the general term of *scholastic divinity*.

A third class of theological teachers, very different from those already mentioned, comprehended a certain species of fanatics, who maintained that the knowledge of divine truth was only to be derived from inward feeling and mental contemplation. This class assumed the appellation of *mystics*. These three methods of deducing and unfolding the doctrines of the Gospel have been transmitted down to our times. No writer of this century composed a judicious or complete system of divinity, though several branches of that sacred science were occasionally illustrated.

VI. Those who consecrated their pious labours to the advancement of practical religion, and moral virtue, aimed

[a] See the List of sacred Oils which Gregory the Great sent to the queen Theudelinda, in the work of Ruinartus, entitled, Acta Martyrum sincera et selecta, p. 619.

[b] See Simon's Critique, tom. i. p. 229.

[c] Asseman. Biblioth. Orient. Vatican. tom. ii. p. 83.

[d] See Simon's Lettres Choisies, tom. iv.

[e] Simon's Critique, tom. i. p. 226; and his Histoire des principaux Commentateurs du N. T. chap. xxiv. p. 337.

[f] Simon's Critique, tom. i. p. 259.

[g] Le Moyne, Prolegomena ad varia Sacra, p. 53.—Fabricii Biblioth. Græca, lib. v. cap. xvii.

[h] The title is, Contemplationes Anagogicæ in Hexaëmeron.

[i] Liber Allegoriarum in Scripturam Sacram.

[k] Expositio Mystica in Apocalypsin.

at the accomplishment of this good purpose, partly by laying down precepts, and partly by exhibiting edifying examples. They who promoted the cause of piety and virtue in the former way modified their instructions according to the state and circumstances of the persons for whom they were designed. Peculiar precepts were addressed to those who had not abandoned the connexions of civil society, but lived amidst the hurry of worldly affairs; while different rules were administered to those who aspired to higher degrees of perfection, and lived in a state of seclusion from the contagion and vanities of the world. The precepts, addressed to the former, represent the Christian life, as consisting in certain external virtues and acts of religion; as appears from the Homilies and Exhortations of Cæsarius, the Capita Parænetica of Agapetus, and especially from the Formula honestæ Vitæ, i. e. the Summary of a virtuous Life, drawn up by Martin, archbishop of Braga.[a] The rules administered to the latter sort of Christians, were more spiritual and sublime: they were exhorted to separate, as far as was possible, the soul from the body by divine contemplation; and for that purpose, to enervate and emaciate the latter by watching, fasting, perpetual prayer, and singing of psalms; as we find in the dissertation of Fulgentius upon fasting, and those of Nicetius, concerning the vigils of the servants of God, and the good effects of psalmody. The Greeks adopted for their leader, in this mystic labyrinth, Dionysius, falsely called the Areopagite, whose pretended writings John of Scythopolis illustrated with annotations in this century. We need not be at any pains in pointing out the defects of these injudicious zealots; the smallest acquaintance with that rational religion, which is contained in the Gospel, will be sufficient to open the eyes of the impartial to the absurdities of that chimerical devotion we have now been describing.

VII. They who enforced the duties of Christianity, by exhibiting examples of piety and virtue to the view of those for whom their instructions were designed, wrote, for this purpose, the Lives of the Saints; and there was a considerable number of this kind of biographers both among the Greeks and Latins. Ennodius, Eugypius, Cyril of Scythopolis, Dionysius the Little, Cogitosus, and others, are to be ranked in this class. But, however pious the intentions of these biographers may have been, it must be acknowledged, that they executed their task in a most contemptible manner. No models of rational piety are to be found among those pretended worthies, whom they propose to Christians as objects of imitation. They amuse their readers with gigantic fables and trifling romances; the examples they exhibit are those of certain delirious *fanatics*, whom they call *saints*, men of a corrupt and perverted judgment, who offered violence to reason and nature by the horrors of an extravagant austerity in their own conduct, and by the severity of those singular and inhuman rules which they prescribed to others. For by what means were these men sainted? By starving themselves with senseless obstinacy, and bearing the useless hardships of hunger, thirst, and inclement seasons with stedfastness and perseverance; by running about the country like madmen, in tattered garments, and sometimes half-naked, or shutting themselves up in a narrow space, where they continued motionless; by standing for a long time in certain postures, with their eyes closed, in the enthusiastic expectation of divine light. All this was 'saint-like and glorious;' and the more any ambitious fanatic departed from the dictates of reason and common sense, and counterfeited the wild gestures and the incoherent conduct of an idiot or a lunatic, the surer was his prospect of obtaining an eminent rank among the heroes and demi-gods of a corrupt and degenerate church.

VIII. Many writers laboured with diligence to terminate the reigning controversies, but none with success. Nor shall we be much surprised, that these efforts were ineffectual, when we consider how they were conducted; for scarcely can we name a single writer, whose opposition to the Eutychians, Nestorians, and Pelagians, was carried on with probity, moderation, or prudence. Primasius and Phi loponus wrote concerning all the sects, but their works are lost; the treatise of Leontius, upon the same extensive subject, is still extant, but is scarcely worth perusing. Isidore of Seville, and Leontius of Neapolis, disputed against the Jews; but with what success and dexterity will be easily imagined by those who are acquainted with the learning and logic of these times. We omit, therefore, any farther mention of the miserable disputants of this century, from a persuasion that it will be more useful and entertaining to lay before the reader a brief account of the controversies that now divided and troubled the Christian church.

IX. Though the credit of Origen, and his system, seemed to lie expiring under the blows it had received from the zeal of the orthodox, and the repeated thunder of synods and councils, yet it was very far from being totally sunk. On the contrary, this great man, and his doctrine, were held by many, and especially by the monks, in the highest veneration, and cherished with a kind of enthusiasm which became boundless and extravagant. In the west, Bellator translated the works of Origen into the Latin language. In the eastern provinces, and particularly in Syria and Palestine, which were the principal seats of Origenism, the monks, seconded by several bishops, and chiefly by Theodore of Cæsarea in Cappadocia, defended the truth and authority of the doctrines of Origen against all his adversaries with incredible vehemence.[b] This cause was at length brought before Justinian, who, in a long and verbose edict, addressed to Mennas, patriarch of Constantinople,[c] passed a severe condemnation upon Origen and his doctrine, and ordered it to be entirely suppressed.[d] The effects of this edict were more violent than durable; for, upon the breaking out of the controversy concerning the *three chapters*,[e] soon after this time, Origenism not only revived in Palestine, but even recovered new vigour, and spread itself far and wide. Hence many commotions were raised in the church, which were, however, terminated by the fifth general council, assembled at Constantinople by

[a] See the Acta Sanctor. Martii, tom. iii. p. 86.

[b] Cyril. Scythop. Vit. Sabæ, which is to be found in Cotelerius, Monumenta Ecclesiæ Græcæ, p. 370.—Henr. Norris, Dissertat. de Synodo Quinta, cap. i. ii. p. 554. tom. i. op.

[c] This edict is published in Harduini Concilia, tom. iii. p. 243.

[d] This edict was procured by the solicitation of Pelagius, who was legate of Vigilius at the court of Constantinople, with a view to confound the Acephali, who were admirers of Origen, and particularly to vex Theodore, of whose credit with the emperor Pelagius was extremely jealous. It was to return this affront, as well as to effect the purposes mentioned in the following section, that Theodore set on foot the controversy concerning the three chapters, which produced such tedious, cruel, and fatal dissensions in the church. See Basnage, Histoire de l'Eglise, livr. x. ch. vi. p. 520.

[e] For an explication of what is meant by the *three chapters*, see note *b* of the xth section.

Justinian, in 533, in which Origen and his followers were again condemned.[a]

X. This controversy produced another, which continued much longer, was carried on with still more excessive degrees of animosity and violence, and the subject of which was of much less moment and importance. The emperor Justinian was eagerly bent upon extirpating that violent branch of the Monophysites, which was distinguished by the name of Acephali; and consulted, upon this matter, Theodore, bishop of Cæsarea, who was a Monophysite, and, at the same time, extremely attached to the doctrine of Origen. The artful prelate considered this as a favourable occasion for procuring repose to the followers of Origen by exciting a new controversy, as also for throwing a reproach upon the council of Chalcedon, and giving a mortal blow to the Nestorians and their cause. In order to effect these three important purposes, he persuaded the emperor, that the Acephali would return to the bosom of the church, under the following easy and reasonable conditions; namely, "That those passages in the acts of the council of Chalcedon, in which Theodore of Mopsuestia, Theodoret of Cyrus, and Ibas of Edessa, had been pronounced orthodox, should be effaced; and that the productions of these prelates, which were known by the appellation of the *three chapters*,[b] as also other writings of theirs, which discovered a manifest propensity toward the Nestorian errors, should be condemned and prohibited." The emperor lent a propitious ear to the counsels of this prelate; and, by an edict, published in 544, ordered the three chapters to be condemned and effaced, without any prejudice, however, to the authority of the council of Chalcedon.[c] This edict was warmly opposed by the African and western bishops, and particularly by Vigilius, the Roman pontiff, who considered it as highly injurious not only to the authority of the council now mentioned, but also to the memory of those holy men whose writings and characters it covered with reproach.[d] Upon this, Justinian ordered Vigilius to repair immediately to Constantinople, that, having him in his power, he might compel him with greater facility to acquiesce in the edict, and reject the three chapters; and this method was attended with success, for the pontiff yielded. On the other hand, the bishops of Africa and Illyricum obliged Vigilius to retract his *judicatum*, by which, in a council of seventy bishops, he had condemned the three chapters in obedience to the emperor; for they separated themselves from the communion of this pope, refused to acknowledge him as one of their brethren, and even treated him as an apostate, until he approved what he had been obliged to condemn. The effect of this retraction redoubled the zeal and violence of Justinian, who, by a second edict, published in 551, condemned anew the three chapters.

XI. After many cabals, commotions, and dissensions, which were occasioned by this trifling controversy, it was thought proper to submit the final decision of it to an assembly of the universal church. This assembly was accordingly convoked at Constantinople by Justinian, in 553, and is considered as the fifth œcumenical or general council. The emperor now gained his point; for, beside the doctrines of Origen,[e] the three chapters, the condemnation of which he had solely in view, were, by the bishops of the east, (for there were very few western prelates present at this council,) declared heretical and pernicious. Vigilius, who was now at Constantinople, refused his assent to the decrees of this council; for which reason, after having received various affronts, he was sent into exile. He was not permitted to return before he had acquiesced in the decisions of this assembly,[f] and, changing his sentiments for the fourth time, had declared the opinions contained in the three chapters to be execrable blasphemies. His successor Pelagius, and all the Roman pontiffs that have since lolled in the papal chair, adhered to the decrees of this council; but neither their authority, nor that of the emperor, could prevail upon the western bishops to follow their example in this respect. Many of these, on the contrary, carried matters so far as to separate themselves from the communion of the pope on this account; and the divisions that hence arose in the church, were too violent to admit an expeditious or easy reconciliation, and could only be healed by length of time.[g]

XII. Another controversy, much more important, had been carried on before this period among the Greeks; it was first kindled in the year 519, and it arose upon the following question: Whether it could be said with propriety, that one of the Trinity suffered on the cross? This was designed to embarrass the Nestorians, who seemed to separate too much the two natures in Christ; and the Scythian monks, who seconded this design, and to whom the rise of this controversy is principally to be imputed, maintained the affirmative of this nice and difficult question. Others asserted, on the contrary, that this manner of speaking ought by no

[a] See Harduini Concilia, tom. iii. p. 283.—Evagrius, Hist. Eccl. lib. iv. cap. xxxviii.—Basnage, livr. x. chap. vi. p. 517, &c.—Pet. Dan. Huetii Origeniana, lib. ii. p. 224.—Doucin's Singular. Dis. subjoined to his Historia Origeniana, p. 345.

☞ [b] The pieces that were distinguished by the appellation of the *three chapters*, were. 1. The writings of Theodore of Mopsuestia; 2. The books which Theodoret of Cyrus wrote against the twelve Anathemas which Cyril had published against the Nestorians; 3. The letter which Ibas of Edessa had written to one Maris a Persian, concerning the council of Ephesus and the condemnation of Nestorius. These writings were supposed to favour the Nestorian doctrine, and such indeed was their tendency. It is, however, to be observed, that Theodore of Mopsuestia lived before the time of Nestorius, and died, not only in the communion of the church, but also in the highest reputation for his sanctity. Nor were the writings of the other two either condemned or censured by the council of Chalcedon; indeed, the faith of Theodoret and of Ibas was there declared entirely orthodox. The decision of the council of Constantinople, in opposition to this, shows that councils, as well as doctors, differ.

[c] See Harduini Concilia, tom. iii. p. 287.—Evagrius, Hist. Ecclesiast. lib. iv. cap. xxxviii. p. 412.

[d] Hen. Norris, de Synodo quintâ, cap. x. p. 579, tom. i. op.—Basnage, tom. i. livr. x. cap. vi.

☞ [e] We do not find in the acts of this council any one which condemns the doctrines of Origen. It is, however, generally imagined, that these doctrines were condemned by this assembly; and what gave rise to this notion was probably the fifteen Greek canons yet extant, in which the principal errors of Origen are condemned, and which are entitled, The canons of the 160 fathers, assembled in the council of Constantinople. The tenets of Origen, which gave the greatest offence, were the following: 1. That, in the Trinity, the Father is greater than the Son, and the Son than the Holy Ghost; 2. The pre-existence of souls, which Origen considered as sent into mortal bodies for the punishment of sins committed in a former state of being; 3. That the soul of Christ was united to the word before the incarnation; 4. That the sun, moon, and stars, &c. were animated and endowed with rational souls; 5. That after the resurrection all bodies will be of a round figure; 6. That the torments of the damned will have an end; and that, as Christ had been crucified in this world to save mankind, he is to be crucified in the next to save the devils.

[f] See Petr. de Marca, Dissert. de Decreto Vigilii pro Confirmatione Synodi V. which is to be found among the Dissertations subjoined to his learned work, de Concordia Sacerdotii et Imperii.

[g] The best account of this matter is to be found in Norris, de Synodo quintâ œcumenicâ, though even this excellent author cannot be vindicated from the imputation of a certain degree of partiality. See also Christ. Lupus, Not. ad Concilium quintum, in his Adnotat. ad Concilia.

means to be adopted, since it bordered upon the erroneous expressions and tenets of the Theopaschites, who composed one of the sects into which the Eutychians were subdivided.[a] The latter opinion was confirmed by Hormisdas the Roman pontiff, to whom the Scythian monks had appealed in vain; but this, instead of allaying the heat of the present controversy, only added new fuel to the flame. John II. who was one of the successors of Hormisdas, approved the proposition which the latter had condemned; and, confirming the opinion of the Scythian monks, exposed the decisions of the papal oracle to the laughter of the wise. His sentence was afterwards sanctioned by the fifth general council; and thus peace was restored to the church by the conclusion of these unintelligible disputes.[b]

With the question now mentioned there was another closely and intimately connected, namely, Whether the person of Christ could be considered as compounded? Of this question the Scythian monks maintained the affirmative and their adversaries the negative.

CHAPTER IV.

Concerning the Rites and Ceremonies used in the Church during this Century.

I. IN this century the cause of true religion sunk apace, and the gloomy reign of superstition extended itself in proportion to the decay of genuine piety. This lamentable decay was supplied by a multitude of rites and ceremonies. In the east the Nestorian and Eutychian controversies gave occasion to the invention of various rites and external institutions, which were used as marks to distinguish the contending parties. The western churches were loaded with rites by Gregory the Great, who had a marvellous fecundity of genius in inventing, and an irresistible force of eloquence in recommending superstitious observances. Nor will this appear surprising to those who know, that in the opinion of this pontiff the *words* of the sacred writings were *images* of mysterious and invisible things; for such as embrace this chimerical system will easily be led to express all the doctrines and precepts of religion by external rites and symbols. Gregory, indeed, is worthy of praise in this, that he did not pretend to force others to the observance of his inventions; though this forbearance, perhaps, was as much occasioned by a want of power, as by a principle of moderation.

II. This prodigious augmentation of rites and ceremonies rendered an augmentation of doctors and interpreters of these mysteries indispensably necessary. Hence a new kind of science arose, which had, for its object, the explication of these ceremonies, and the investigation of the causes and circumstances whence they derived their origin. But most of those, who entered into these researches, never went to the fountain head, to the true sources of these idle inventions. They endeavoured to seek their origin in reason and Christianity; but in this they deceived themselves, or, at least, deluded others, and delivered to the world their own fancies, instead of disclosing the true causes of things. Had they been acquainted with the opinions and customs of remote antiquity, or studied the pontifical law of the Greeks and Romans, they would have discovered the true origin of many institutions, which were falsely looked upon as venerable and sacred.

III. The public worship of God was still celebrated by every nation in its own language, but was enlarged, from time to time, by the addition of various hymns, and other things of that nature, which were considered as proper to enliven devotion by the power of novelty. Gregory the Great prescribed a new method of administering the Lord's supper, with a magnificent assemblage of pompous ceremonies. This institution was called the *canon of the mass;* and, if any are unwilling to give it the name of a new appointment, they must at least acknowledge, that it was a considerable augmentation of the ancient canon for celebrating the eucharist, and occasioned a remarkable change in the administration of that ordinance. Many ages, however, passed before this Gregorian canon was adopted by all the Latin churches.[c]

Baptism, except in cases of necessity, was administered only on great festivals. We omit mentioning, for the sake of brevity, the litanies that were addressed to the saints, the different sorts of supplications, the stations or assemblies of Gregory, the forms of consecration, and other such institutions, which were contrived, in this century, to excite a species of external devotion, and to engage the outward senses in religious worship. An inquiry into these topics would of itself deserve to be made the subject of a separate work.

IV. An incredible number of temples arose in honour of the saints, during this century, both in the eastern and western provinces. The places set apart for public worship were already very numerous; but it was now that Christians first began to consider these sacred edifices as the means of purchasing the favour and protection of the saints, and to be persuaded that these departed spirits defended and guarded, against evils and calamities of every kind, the provinces, lands, cities, and villages, in which they were honoured with temples. The number of festivals, which were now observed in the Christian church, and many of which seem to have been instituted upon a pagan model, nearly equalled the amount of the temples.

To those that were celebrated, in the preceding century were now added the festival of the purification of the blessed Virgin, (invented with a design to remove the uneasiness of the heathen converts on account of the loss of their Lupercalia or feasts of Pan,) the festival of the immaculate conception, the day set apart to commemorate the birth of St. John, and others less worthy of mention.

CHAPTER V.

Concerning the Divisions and Heresies that troubled the Church during this Century.

I. The various sects which had fomented divisions among Christians in the early ages of the church, were far from

[a] The deacon Victor, and those who opposed the Scythian monks, expressed their opinion in the following proposition: viz. One person of the Trinity suffered in the flesh. Both sides received the council of Chalcedon, acknowledged two natures in Christ, in opposition to Eutyches, and only one person in opposition to Nestorius; and yet, by a torrent of jargon, and a long chain of unintelligible syllogisms, the Scythian monks accused their adversaries of Nestorianism, and were accused by them of the Eutychian heresy.

[b] See Historia Controversiæ de uno ex Trinitate passo, by Norris, tom. iii. op. p. 771. The ancient writers who mention this controversy, call the monks who set it on foot, Scythians. But la Croze (Thesaur. Epist. tom. iii.) imagines, that the country of these monks was Egpyt, and not Scythia; and this conjecture is supported by reasons which carry in them, at least, a high degree of probability.

[c] See Theod. Chr. Lilienthal, *de Canone Missæ Gregoriano.*

being effectually suppressed or totally extirpated. Though they had been persecuted and afflicted with a variety of hardships, trials, and calamities, yet they still subsisted, and continued to excite dissensions and tumults in many places. The Manicheans are said to have gained such a degree of influence among the Persians, as to have corrupted even the son of Kobad, the monarch of that nation, who repaid their zeal in making proselytes with a terrible massacre, in which numbers of that impious sect perished in the most dreadful manner. Nor was Persia the only country which was troubled with the attempts of the Manicheans to spread their odious doctrine; other provinces of the empire were undoubtedly infected with their errors, as we may judge from the book that was written against them by Heraclian, bishop of Chalcedon.[a] In Gaul and Africa, dissensions of a different kind prevailed; and the controversy between the Semi-Pelagians and the disciples of Augustin continued to divide the western churches.

II. The Donatists enjoyed the sweets of freedom and tranquillity, as long as the Vandals reigned in Africa; but the scene was greatly changed with respect to them, when the empire of these barbarians was overturned in 534. They, however, still remained in a separate body, and not only held their church, but, toward the conclusion of this century, and particularly from the year 591, defended themselves with new degrees of animosity and vigour, and were bold enough to attempt the multiplication of their sect. Gregory, the Roman pontiff, opposed these efforts with great spirit and assiduity; and as appears from his epistles,[b] tried various methods of depressing this faction, which was pluming its wings anew, and aiming at the revival of those lamentable divisions which it had formerly excited in the church. Nor was the opposition of the zealous pontiff without effect; it seems on the contrary to have been attended with the desired success, since in this century, the church of the Donatists dwindled away to nothing, and after this period no traces of it are to be found.

III. About the commencement of this century, the Arians were triumphant in several parts of Asia, Africa, and Europe. Many of the Asiatic bishops favoured them secretly, while their opinions were openly professed, and their cause maintained by the Vandals in Africa, the Goths in Italy, the Spaniards, the Burgundians, the Suevi, and the greatest part of the Gauls. It is true, that the Greeks, who had received the decrees of the council of Nice, persecuted and oppressed the Arians wherever their influence and authority could reach; but the Nicenians, in their turn, were not less rigorously treated by their adversaries, particularly in Africa and Italy, where they felt, in a very severe manner, the weight of the Arian power, and the bitterness of hostile resentment.[c]

The triumphs of Arianism were, however, transitory, and its prosperous days were entirely eclipsed, when the Vandals were driven out of Africa, and the Goths out of Italy, by the arms of Justinian;[d] for the other Arian princes were easily induced to abandon, themselves, the doctrine of that sect; and not only so, but to employ the force of laws and the authority of councils to prevent its progress among their subjects, and to extirpate it entirely out of their dominions. Such was the conduct of Sigismond king of the Burgundians; also of Theodimir king of the Suevi, who had settled in Lusitania; and Recared king of Spain. Whether this change was produced by the force of reason and argument, or by the influence of hopes and fears, is a question which we shall not pretend to determine. One thing, however, is certain, that, from this period, the Arian sect declined apace, and could never after recover any considerable degree of stability and consistence.

IV. The Nestorians, after having gained a firm footing in Persia, and established the patriarch or head of their sect at Seleucia, extended their views, and spread their doctrines, with a success equal to the ardour of their zeal, through the provinces situated beyond the limits of the Roman empire. There are yet extant authentic records, from which it appears, that throughout Persia, as also in India, Armenia, Arabia, Syria, and other countries, there were vast numbers of Nestorian churches, all under the jurisdiction of the patriarch of Seleucia.[e] It is true, indeed that the Persian monarchs were not all equally favourable to this growing sect, and that some of them even persecuted, with the utmost severity, all those who bore the Christian name throughout their dominions;[f] but it is also true that such of these princes, as were disposed to exercise moderation and benignity toward the Christians, were much more indulgent to the Nestorians, than to their adversaries who adhered to the council of Ephesus, since the latter were considered as spies employed by the Greeks, with whom they were connected by the ties of religion.

V. The Monophysites, or Eutychians, flourished also in this century, and had gained over to their doctrine a considerable part of the eastern provinces. The emperor Anastasius was warmly attached to the doctrine and sect of the Acephali, who were reckoned among the more rigid Monophysites;[g] and, in 513, he created patriarch of Antioch, (in the room of Flavian, whom he had expelled from that see,) Severus, a learned monk, of Palestine, from whom the Monophysites were called Severians.[h] This emperor exerted all his influence and authority to destroy the credit of the council of Chalcedon in the east, and to maintain the cause of those who adhered to the doctrine of one nature in Christ; and by the ardour and vehemence of his zeal, he excited the most deplorable seditions and tumults in the church.[i] After the death of Anastasius, which happened in 518, Severus was expelled in his turn; and the sect which the late emperor had maintained and propagated with such zeal and assiduity, was every where opposed and depressed by his successor Justin, and the following emperors, in such a manner, that

[a] See Photius, Biblioth. cod. cxiv. p. 291.

[b] See his Epis. lib. iv. ep. xxxiv. xxxv. p. 714, 715, lib. vi. ep. lxv. p. 841, ep. xxxvii. p. 821, lib. ix. ep. liii. p. 972. lib. ii. ep. xlviii. p. 611, t. ii. op.

[c] Procopius, de Bello Vandal. lib. i. cap. viii. and de Bello Gothico, lib. ii. cap. ii.—Evagrius, Hist. Ecclesiast. lib. iv. cap. xv.

[d] See Mascovii Historia German. tom. ii. p. 76, 91. See also an account of the barbarian kings, who abandoned Arianism, and received the doctrines of the Nicene council, in the Acta Sanctorum, tom. ii. Martii, p. 275, and April. p. 134.

[e] Cosmas Indicopleustes, Topograph. Christian. lib. ii. p. 125, which is to be found in Montfaucon's Collectio nova PP. Græcorum.

[f] Asseman. Biblioth. Orient. Vatic. tom. iii. part i. p. 109, 407, 411, 441, 449; tom. iii. part ii. cap. v. sect. ii. p. 83.

[g] Evagrius, Hist. Ecclesiast. lib. iii. cap. xxx. xliv., &c. Theodori Hist. Ecclesiast. lib. ii. p. 562. See also the Index Operum Severi, as it stands collected from ancient MSS. in Montfaucon's Bibliotheca Coisliniana, p. 53.

[h] See Asseman. Biblioth. Orient. Vatican. tom. ii. p. 47, 321.—Euseb. Renaudot, Historia Patriarch. Alexandrinor. p. 127, &c.

[i] Evagrius, Hist. Ecclesiast. lib. iii. cap. xxxiii.—Cyrillus, vita Sabæ in Jo. Bapt. Cotelerii Monument. Ecclesiæ Græcæ, tom. iii. p. 312.—Bayle's Dictionary, at the article Anastasius.

it seemed to be on the very brink of ruin, notwithstanding that it had created Sergius patriarch in the place of Severus.[a]

VI. When the affairs of the Monophysites were in such a desperate situation, that almost all hope of their recovery had vanished, and their bishops were reduced, by death and imprisonment, to a very small number, an obscure man whose name was Jacob, and who was distinguished from others so called, by the surname of Baradæus, or Zanzalus, restored this expiring sect to its former prosperity and lustre.[b] This poor monk, the greatness of whose views rose far above the obscurity of his station, and whose fortitude and patience no dangers could daunt, nor any labours exhaust, was ordained to the episcopal office by a handful of captive bishops, travelled on foot through the whole east, established bishops and presbyters every where, revived the drooping spirits of the Monophysites, and produced such an astonishing change in their affairs by the power of his eloquence, and by his incredible activity and diligence, that when he died bishop of Edessa, in 578, he left his sect in a most flourishing state in Syria, Mesopotamia, Armenia, Egypt, Nubia, Abyssinia, and other countries.[c] This dexterous monk had prudence to contrive the means of success, as well as activity to put them in execution; for he almost totally extinguished all the animosities, and reconciled all the factions, that had divided the Monophysites; and when their churches grew so numerous in the east, that they could not all be conveniently comprehended under the sole jurisdiction of the patriarch of Antioch, he appointed, as his assistant, the primate of the east, whose residence was at Tagritis, on the borders of Armenia.[d] The laborious efforts of Jacob were seconded in Egypt and the adjacent countries, by Theodosius bishop of Alexandria; and he became so famous, that all the Monophysites of the east considered him as their second parent and founder, and are to this day called Jacobites, in honour of their new chief.

VII. Thus it happened, that, by the imprudent zeal and violence which the Greeks employed in defending the truth, the Monophysites gained considerable advantages, and, at length, obtained a solid and permanent settlement. From this period their sect has been under the jurisdiction of the patriarchs of Alexandria and Antioch, who, notwithstanding the difference of opinion which subsists, with respect to some points, between the Syrian and Egyptian Monophysites, are exceedingly careful to maintain communion with each other, both by letters, and by the exchange of good offices. The Abyssinian primate is subject to the patriarch of Alexandria; and the primate of the east, who resides at Tagritis, is under the jurisdiction of the patriarch of Antioch. The Armenians are ruled by a bishop of their own, and are distinguished by certain opinions and rites from the rest of the Monophysites.

VIII. The sect of the Monophysites, before it was thus happily established, was torn with factions and intestine disputes, and suffered, in a particular manner, from that nice and subtile controversy concerning the body of Christ which arose at Alexandria. Julian, bishop of Halicarnassus, affirmed, in 519, that the divine nature had so insinuated itself into the body of Christ, from the very moment of the Virgin's conception, that the body of our Lord changed its nature, and became incorruptible. This opinion was also embraced by Caianus, bishop of Alexandria; from whom those who adopted it were called Caianists. They were, however, divided into three sects, two of which debated this question, whether the body of Christ was created or uncreated, while the third asserted, that our Lord's body was indeed corruptible, but never actually corrupted, since the energy of the divine nature must have prevented its dissolution.

This sect was warmly opposed by Severus of Antioch, and Damianus, who maintained that the body of Christ, before his resurrection, was truly *corruptible*, i. e. subject to the affections and changes with which human nature is generally attended. Those who embraced the opinion of Julian, were called Aphthartodocetæ, Docetæ, Phantasiasts, and even Manicheans, because it was supposed to follow from their hypothesis, that Christ did not suffer in reality, but only in appearance, hunger and thirst, pain and death; and that he did not actually assume the common affections and properties of human nature. On the other hand, the votaries of Severus were distinguished by the names Phthartolatræ, Ktistolatræ, and Creaticolæ. This miserable controversy was carried on with great warmth under the reign of Justinian, who favoured the Aphthartodocetæ; soon after, it subsided gradually; and, at length, was happily hushed in silence.[e] Xenaias of Hierapolis struck out an hypothesis upon this knotty matter, which seemed equally remote from those of the contending parties; for he maintained that Christ had, indeed, truly suffered the various sensations to which humanity is exposed, but that he suffered them not in his *nature*, but by a submissive act of his *will*.[f]

IX. Some of the Corrupticolæ, (for so they were called who looked upon the body of Christ to be corruptible,) particularly Themistius, a deacon of Alexandria, and Theodosius, a bishop of that city, were led by the inconsiderate heat of controversy into another opinion, which produced new commotions in the church toward the conclusion of this century. They affirmed, that to the divine nature of Christ all things were known, but that from his human nature many things were concealed. The rest of the sect charged the authors of this opinion with imputing ignorance to the divine nature of Christ, since they held, that there was but one nature in the Son of God. Hence the votaries of this new doctrine were called Agnoëtæ;[g] but their sect was so weak and ill-supported, that, notwithstanding their eloquence and activity, which seemed to promise better success, it gradually declined, and came to nothing.

X. From the controversies with the Monophysites arose the sect of the Tritheists, whose chief was John Ascusnage,

[a] See Abulpharajii Series Patriarch. Antiochen. in Biblioth. Orient. Vatican. tom. ii.

[b] See Biblioth. Orient. &c. tom. ii. cap. viii. p. 62, 72, 326, 331, 414.—Eusebii Renaud. Hist. Patriarch. Alexandr. p. 119, 133, 425, and the Liturgiæ Orient. tom. ii. p. 333, 342.—Faustus Naironus, Euoplia Fidei Catholicæ ex Syrorum Monumentis, part i. p. 40, 41.

[c] With regard to the Nubians and Abyssinians, see the Biblioth. Orient. tom. ii. p. 330.—Lobo, Voyage d'Abyssinie, tom. ii. p. 36.—Ludolph. Commentar. ad Historiam Æthiopicam, p. 451.

[d] Asseman. Biblioth. Orient. tom. ii. p. 410. See also this learned writer's Dissertatio de Monophysitis.

[e] Timotheus, de Receptione Hæreticorum, in Cotelerii Monumentis Ecclesiæ Græcæ, tom. iii. p. 409.—Liberatus, in Breviario Controv. cap. xx.—Forbesii Instructiones Historico-Theologicæ, lib. iii. cap. xviii. p. 108.—Asseman. Biblioth. Oriental. tom. iii. part ii. p. 457.

[f] Biblioth. Orient. tom. ii. p. 22, and 168.

[g] Cotelerius, ad Monumenta Ecclesiæ Græcæ, tom. iii. p. 641.—Mich. le Quien, ad Damascenum de Hæresibus, tom. i. p. 107.—Forbes, Ins-

a Syrian philosopher, and, at the same time, a Monophysite.[a] This man imagined in the Deity three natures, or substances, absolutely equal in all respects, and joined together by no common essence; to which opinion his adversaries gave the name of Tritheism. One of the warmest defenders of this doctrine was John Philoponus, an Alexandrian philosopher, and a grammarian of the highest reputation; and hence he has been considered by many as the author of this sect, whose members have consequently derived from him the title of Philoponists.[b]

This sect was divided into two parties, the Philoponists and the Cononites; the latter of whom were so called from Conon bishop of Tarsus, their chief.[c] They agreed in the doctrine of three persons in the Godhead, and differed only in their manner of explaining what the Scriptures taught concerning the resurrection of the body. Philoponus maintained, that the form and matter of all bodies were generated and corrupted, and that both therefore were to be restored in the resurrection. Conon held, on the contrary, that the body never lost its form: that its matter alone was subject to corruption and decay, and was consequently to be restored when 'this mortal shall put on immortality.'

A third faction was that of the Damianists, who were so called from Damian bishop of Alexandria, and whose opinion concerning the Trinity was different from those already mentioned. They distinguished the divine essence from the three persons, and denied that each person was God, when considered in itself, abstractedly from the other two; but affirmed that there was a common divinity, by the joint participation of which each was God. They therefore called the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, *hypostases*, or persons, and the Godhead, which was common to them all, *substance* or *nature*.[d]

tructiones Historico-Theo. lib. iii. cap. xix. p. 119.—Photius, Bib. Cod. 230.

[a] See Gregor. Abulpharajius, in Biblioth. Orient. tom. i. p. 328.

[b] See Fabricii Biblioth. Græc. lib. v. cap. xxxvii. p. 358.—Harduini Concilia, tom. iii. p. 1288.—Timotheus, de Receptione Hæreticorum, apud Cotelerii Monumenta Ecclesiæ Græcæ, tom. iii. p. 414.—Jo. Damascenus, de Hæresibus, tom. i. op.

[c] Photii Biblioth. Cod. xxiv.—Biblioth. Orient. tom. ii. p. 329.

[d] Biblioth. Orient. tom. ii. p. 78, 332, &c.

THE SEVENTH CENTURY.

PART I.

THE EXTERNAL HISTORY OF THE CHURCH.

CHAPTER I.

Concerning the prosperous Events which happened in the Church during this Century.

I. In this century the progress of Christianity was greatly accelerated both in the eastern and western hemispheres, and its divine light was widely diffused through the darkened nations. The Nestorians who dwelt in Syria, Persia, and India, contributed much to its propagation in the east, by the zeal and diligence, the laborious efforts and indefatigable assiduity, with which they preached it to those fierce and barbarous nations, who lived in the remotest regions and deserts of Asia, and among whom, as we learn from authentic records, their ministry was crowned with remarkable success. It was by the labours of this sect, that the light of the Gospel first penetrated into the immense empire of China, about the year 636, when Jesuiabas of Gadala was at the head of the Nestorians, as will appear probable to those who consider as genuine the famous Chinese monument, which was discovered at Sigenfu by the Jesuits during the last century.[a] Some look, indeed, upon this monument as a mere forgery of the Jesuits, though, perhaps, without reason: there are, however, some unexceptionable proofs, that the northern parts of China, even before this century, abounded with Christians, who, for many succeeding ages, were under the inspection of a metropolitan sent to them by the Chaldean or Nestorian patriarch.[b]

II. The attention and activity of the Greeks were so entirely occupied by their intestine divisions, that they were little solicitous about the progress of Christianity. In the west, Augustin laboured to extend the limits of the church and to spread the light of the Gospel among the Anglo-Saxons; and, after his death, other monks were sent from Rome, to exert themselves in the same glorious cause. Their efforts were attended with the desired success: and the efficacy of their labours was manifested in the conversion of the six Anglo-Saxon kings, who had hitherto remained under the darkness of the ancient superstitions, to the Christian faith, which gained ground by degrees, and was, at length, embraced universally in Britain.[c] We are not, however, to imagine, that this general change in favour of Christianity was wholly due to the discourses of the Roman monks and doctors; for other causes were certainly instrumental in accomplishing this great event; and it is not to be doubted that the influence which some Christian queens, and ladies of high distinction, had over their husbands, and the pains they took to convert them to Christianity, as also the severe and rigorous laws that were afterwards enacted against idolaters,[d] contributed much to the progress of the Gospel.

III. Many of the British, Scotish, and Irish ecclesiastics, travelled among the Batavian, Belgic, and German nations, with the pious intention of propagating the knowledge of the truth, and of erecting churches, and forming religious establishments. This was the true reason which induced the Germans, in after-times, to found so many con vents for the Scotch and Irish, of which some yet remain.[e]

Columban, an Irish monk, seconded by the labours of a few companions, had happily extirpated, in the preceding century, the ancient superstitions in Gaul, and the parts adjacent, where idolatry had taken the deepest root; he also carried the lamp of celestial truth among the Suevi, the Boii, the Franks, and other German nations,[f] and persevered in these pious and useful labours until his death, which happened in 615. St. Gal, who was one of his companions, preached the Gospel to the Helvetii, and the Suevi.[g] St. Kilian set out from Scotland, the place of his nativity, and exercised the ministerial function with such success among the eastern Franks, that vast numbers of them embraced Christianity.[h] Toward the conclusion of this century, the famous Willebrod, by birth an Anglo-Saxon, accompanied with eleven of his countrymen, *viz.* Suidbert, Wigbert, Acca, Wilibald, Unibald, Lebwin, the

[a] This celebrated monument has been published and explained by several learned writers, particularly by Kircher, in his China Illustrata; by Muller, in a treatise published at Berlin in 1672; by Renaudot, in his Relations anciennes des Indes et de la Chine, de deux Voyageurs Mahometans, p. 228—271, published at Paris in 1718; and by Assemanus, in his Biblioth. Orient. tom. iii. in part ii. cap. iv. sect. 7. p. 533. A still more accurate edition of this famous monument was promised to us by the learned Theoph. Sigefred Bayer, the greatest proficient of this age in Chinese erudition; but his death has blasted our expectations. For my part, I see no reason to doubt the genuineness of this monument; nor can I understand what advantage could redound to the Jesuits from the invention of such a fable. See Liron, Singularités Historiques et Literaires, tom. ii. p. 500.

[b] See Renaudot, p. 56, 68, &c. also Assemani Biblioth. cap. ix. p. 522; the learned Bayer, in the Preface to his Museum Sinicum, assures us, that he had in his hands such proofs of the truth of what is here affirmed, as put the matter beyond all doubt. ☞ See on this subject a very learned dissertation published by M. de Guines in the thirtieth vol. of the Memoires de Literature, tirés des Registres de l'Academie Royale des Inscriptions et Belles Lettres, in which he proves that the Christians were settled in China so early as the seventh century. He remarks, indeed, that the Nestorians and other Christians were for a long time confounded in the Chinese annals with the worshippers of Fo, an Indian idol, whose rites were introduced into China about 65 years after the birth of Christ; and that this circumstance has deceived De la Croze, Beausobre, and some other learned men, who have raised specious objections against the hypothesis that maintains the early introduction of Christianity into this great empire. A reader, properly informed, will pay little or no attention to the account given of this matter by Voltaire in the first volume of his Essai sur l'Histoire Generale. A poet, who recounts facts, or denies them, without deigning to produce his authorities, must not expect to meet with the credit that is due to an historian.

[c] Bedæ Historia Ecclesiast. Gentis Anglor. lib. ii. cap. iii. xiv. lib iii. cap. xxi.—Rapin de Thoyras, tom. i.

[d] Wilkins' Concilia Magnæ Britanniæ, tom. i. p. 222.

[e] See the Acta Sanctorum, tom. ii. Febr. p. 362.

[f] Mabillon, Acta Sanctor. Ordinis Benedicti, tom. ii. iii.—Adaman. lib. iii. de S. Columbano, in Canisii Lection. Antiq. tom. i.

[g] Walafridi Strabonis Vit. S. Galli in Actis S. Ord. Benedict. tom. ii. —Canisii Lection. Antiq. tom. i.

[h] Vita S. Kiliani in Canisii Lection. Antiq. tom. iii.—Jo. Pet. de Ludewig, Scriptores Rerum Wurzburgens. p. 966.

two Ewalds, Werenfrid, Marcellin, and Adalbert, crossed over into Batavia, which lay opposite to Britain, in order to convert the Friselanders to the religion of Jesus. Hence, in 692, they went into Fosteland, which most writers look upon to have been the same with the isle of Heligoland, or Heiligland; but, being cruelly treated there by Radbod, king of the Friselanders, who put Wigbert, one of the company, to death, they departed thence for Cimbria, and the adjacent parts of Denmark. They, however, returned to Friseland in 693, and were much more successful than they had formerly been in opposing the ancient superstitions, and propagating the knowledge of divine truth. Willebrod was ordained, by the Roman pontiff, archbishop of Wilteburg, now Utrecht, and died among the Batavians in a good old age, while his associates continued to spread the light of the Gospel among the Westphalians and the neighbouring nations.[a]

IV. These voyages, and many others, undertaken in the cause of Christ, carry, no doubt, a specious appearance of piety and zeal; but the impartial and attentive inquirer after truth will find it impossible to form the same favourable judgment of them all, or to applaud, without distinction, the motives that animated these laborious missionaries. That the designs of some of them were truly pious, and their characters without reproach, is unquestionably certain; but it is equally certain, that this was not the case of them all, or even of the greatest part of them. Many of them discovered, in the course of their ministry, the most turbulent passions, and dishonoured the glorious cause in which they were engaged, by their arrogance and ambition, their avarice and cruelty. They abused the power which they had received from the Roman pontiffs, of forming religious establishments among the superstitious nations; and instead of gaining souls to Christ, they usurped a despotic dominion over their obsequious proselytes, and exercised a princely authority over the countries where their ministry had been successful. Nor are we to consider, as entirely groundless the suspicions of those who allege that many of the monks, desirous of rule and authority, concealed their vices under the mask of religion, and endured for a time the austerities of a rigid mortification and abstinence, merely with a view to rise to the episcopal dignity.

V. The conversion of the Jews seemed at a stand in this century; for few or none of that obstinate nation embraced the Gospel in consequence of an inward conviction of its truth, though in many places they were barbarously compelled, by the Christians, to make an outward and feigned profession of their faith in Christ. The emperor Heraclius, incensed against that miserable people by the insinuations, as it is said, of the Christian doctors, persecuted them in a cruel manner, and ordered multitudes of them to be inhumanly dragged into the Christian churches, in order to be baptized by violence and compulsion.[b] The same odious method of converting was practised in Spain and Gaul, by the monarchs of those nations, against which even the bishops of Rome expressed their displeasure and indignation. Such were the horrid and abominable practices to which an ignorance of the true spirit of Christianity, and the barbarous genius of this age, led the heralds of that divine religion, which was designed to spread abroad *charity* upon earth, and to render mankind truly and rationally free.

CHAPTER II.

Concerning the calamitous Events that happened to the Church during this Century.

I. THE Christians suffered less in this than in the preceding centuries. They were sometimes persecuted by the Persian monarchs, but usually recovered their former tranquillity after transitory scenes of violence and oppression. In England, the new converts to Christianity suffered various calamities under the petty kings, who governed in those boisterous times; but these kings embraced the Gospel themselves, and then the sufferings of the Christians ceased. In the eastern countries, and particularly in Syria and Palestine, the Jews, at certain times, attacked the Christians with a merciless fury,[c] but with so little success, that they always had reason to repent of their temerity, which was severely chastised. It is true, the church had other enemies, even those who, under the treacherous profession of Christianity, were laying secret schemes for the restoration of Paganism; but they were too weak and too inconsiderable to form any attempts that could endanger the Christian cause.

II. But a new and most powerful enemy to the Christian cause started up in Arabia in 612, under the reign of Heraclius. This was Mahomet, or Mohammed, an illiterate man,[d] but endowed by nature with the most flowing and attractive eloquence, and with a vast and penetrating genius,[e] distinguished also by the advantages he enjoyed from the place of his birth, which added a lustre to his name and his undertakings. This adventurous impostor publicly declared, that he was commissioned by God to destroy polytheism and idolatry, and then to reform, first the religion of the Arabians, and afterwards the Jewish and Christian worship. For these purposes he delivered a new law, which is known by the name of the *Koran* i. e. *the book*, by way of eminence;[f] and, having gained several victories over his enemies, he compelled an incredible multitude of persons, both in Arabia and the neighbouring nations, to receive his doctrine, and range themselves under his standard. Elate with this rapid and

[a] Alcuini Vita Willebrodi in Mabillon, Act. SS. Ord. Benedict. and Molleri Cimbria Literatæ, tom. ii. p. 980.

[b] Eutychii Annales Eccles. Alexandr. tom. ii. p. 212.

[c] Eutychii Annales, tom. ii. p. 236. Jo. Henr. Hottingeri Historia Orientalis, lib. i. cap. iii. p. 129.

[d] Mohammed himself expressly declared, that he was totally ignorant of all branches of learning and science, and was even unable either to write or read: and his followers have drawn from this ignorance an argument in favour of the divinity of his mission, and of the religion he taught. It is, however, scarcely credible, that his ignorance was such as it is here described; and several of his sect have called in question the declarations of their chief relating to this point. See Chardin's Voyages en Perse, tom. iv. If we consider that he carried on, for a considerable time, a successful commerce in Arabia and the adjacent countries, this alone will convince us, that he must have been, in some measure, instructed in the arts of reading, writing, and arithmetic, with the knowledge of which a merchant cannot dispense.

[e] The writers, to whom we are indebted for the accounts of the life and religion of Mohammed, are enumerated by Fabricius, in his Delectus et Syllabus Argumentorum, pro Veritate Religionis Christianæ; to which we may add Boulainvilliers' Vie de Mahomet, published at London in 1730, which, however, deserves rather the character of a romance, than of a history; Gagnier's Vie de Mahomet, printed at Amsterdam in 1732, and commendable both for the learning and candour with which it appears to have been composed; and, above all, the learned and judicious Sale's Preliminary Discourse, prefixed to his English translation of the Koran, sect. ii. p. 37.

[f] For an account of the Koran, see principally Sale's preface. See also Vertot's Discours sur l'Alcoran, subjoined to the third volume of his History of the Knights of Malta, and Chardin's Voyages en Perse, tom.

unexpected success, he greatly extended his ambitious views, and formed the vast and arduous project of founding an empire. Here again success crowned his adventurous efforts; and his plan was executed with such intrepidity and impudence, that he died master of all Arabia, beside several adjacent provinces.

III. It is, perhaps, impossible, at this time, to form such an accurate judgment of the character, views, and conduct of Mohammed, as would entirely satisfy the curiosity of a sagacious inquirer after truth. To give entire credit to the Grecian writers in this matter, is neither prudent nor safe, since their bitter resentment against this hostile invader led them to invent, without scruple or hesitation, fables and calumnies to blacken his character. The Arabians, on the other hand, are as little to be trusted to, as their historians are destitute of veracity and candour; they conceal the vices and enormities of their chief, and represent him as the most divine person that ever appeared upon earth, and as the best gift of God to the world. Add to this, that a considerable part of his life, indeed the part of it that would be the most proper to lead us to a true knowledge of his character, and of the motives from which he acted, is absolutely unknown. It is highly probable that he was so deeply affected with the odious and abominable superstition which dishonoured his country, that it threw him into a certain fanatical disorder of mind, and made him really imagine that he was supernaturally commissioned to reform the religion of the Arabians, and to restore among them the worship of one God. It is, however, at the same time, undoubtedly evident, that when he saw his enterprise crowned with the desired success, he made use of impious frauds to establish the work he had so happily begun, deluded the giddy and credulous multitude by various artifices, and even forged celestial visions to confirm his authority, and remove the difficulties that frequently arose in the course of his affairs. This mixture of imposture is by no means incompatible with a spirit of enthusiasm; for the fanatic, through the unguided warmth of zeal, looks often upon the artifices that are useful to his cause as pious and acceptable to the Supreme Being, and therefore deceives when he can do it with impunity.[a] The religion which Mohammed taught, is certainly different from what it would have been, if he had met with no opposition in the propagation of his opinions. The difficulties he had to encounter obliged him to yield, in some respects, to the reigning systems: the obstinate attachment of the Arabians to the religion of their ancestors on one hand, and the fond hope of gaining over to his cause both the Jews and Christians on the other, engaged, no doubt, this fanatical impostor to admit into his system several tenets, which he would have rejected without hesitation, had he been free from the restraints of ambition and artifice.

IV. The rapid success which attended the propagation of this new religion was produced by causes that are plain and evident, and must remove, or rather prevent our surprise, when they are attentively considered. The terror of Mohammed's arms, and the repeated victories which were gained by him and his successors, were, without doubt, the irresistible argument that persuaded such multitudes to embrace his religion, and submit to his dominion. Besides, his law was artfully and wonderfully adapted to the corrupt nature of man, and, in a more particular manner, to the manners and opinions of the eastern nations, and the vices to which they were naturally addicted; for the articles of faith which it proposed were few in number, and extremely simple; and the duties it required were neither many nor difficult, nor such as were incompatible, with the empire of appetites and passions.[b] It is to be observed farther, that the gross ignorance, under which the Arabians, Syrians, Persians, and the greatest part of the eastern nations, laboured at this time, rendered many an easy prey to the artifice and eloquence of this bold adventurer. To these causes of the progress of the Mohammedan faith, we may add the bitter dissensions and cruel animosities that reigned among the Christian sects, particularly the Greeks, Nestorians, Eutychians, and Monophysites, dissensions that filled a great part of the east with carnage, assassinations, and such detestable enormities, as rendered the very name of Christianity odious to many. We might add here, that the Monophysites and Nestorians, full of resentment against the Greeks, from whom they had suffered the bitterest and most injurious treatment, assisted the Arabians in the conquest of several provinces,[c] into which, consequently, the religion of Mohammed was afterwards introduced. Other causes of the sudden progress of that religion will naturally occur to such as consider attentively its spirit and genius, and the state of the world at that time.

V. After the death of the pseudo-prophet, which happened in 632, his followers, led on by an amazing intrepidity and a fanatical fury, and assisted, as we have already observed, by those Christians whom the Greeks had treated with such severity, extended their conquests beyond the limits of Arabia, and subdued Syria, Persia, Egypt, and other countries. On the other hand, the Greeks, exhausted with civil discord, and wholly occupied by intestine troubles, were unable to stop these intrepid conquerors in their rapid career.

For some time these enthusiastic invaders used their prosperity with moderation, and treated the Christians, particularly those who rejected the decrees of the councils of Ephesus and Chalcedon, with the utmost indulgence and lenity. But, as an uninterrupted course of success and prosperity renders, too generally, corrupt mortals insolent and imperious, so the moderation of this victorious sect degenerated by degrees into severity; and they treated the Christians, at length, rather like slaves than citizens, loading them with insupportable taxes, and obliging them

ii. p. 281. The book which the Mohammedans call the Koran, is composed of several papers and discourses of the impostor, which were discovered and collected after his death, and is by no means that same law whose excellence he vaunted so highly. That some parts of the true Koran may be copied in the modern one, is indeed very possible; but that the Koran, or Law, given by Mohammed to the Arabians, is entirely distinct from the modern Koran, is manifest from this, that, in the latter, he appeals to, and extols the former, and therefore they must be two different compositions. May it not be conjectured, that the true Koran was an Arabic poem, which he recited to his followers without giving it to them in writing, ordering them only to commit it to memory? Such were the laws of the Druids in Gaul and Britain, and such also those of the Indians, which the Bramins receive by oral tradition, and get by heart.

[a] This, perhaps, is the best way of adjusting the controversy that has been carried on by some learned men upon this curious question,—whether Mohammed was a fanatic or an impostor? See Bayle's Dictionary; also Ockley's Conquest of Syria, Persia, and Egypt, by the Saracens, vol. i.; and Sale's Preface to his Translation of the Koran, sect. ii.

[b] See Reland, de Religione Mahumedicâ; also Sale's Preliminary Discourse.

[c] See Ockley's Conquest of Syria, Persia, and Egypt, by the Saracens.

to submit to a variety of vexatious and oppressive measures.

VI. The progress, however, of this triumphant sect received a considerable check by the civil dissensions which arose among them immediately after the death of Mohammed. Abubeker and Ali, the former the father-in-law, and the latter the son-in-law, of this pretended prophet, aspired to succeed him in the empire which he had erected. Upon this arose a tedious and cruel contest, whose flame reached to succeeding ages, and produced that schism which divided the Mohammedans into two great factions, whose separation not only gave rise to a variety of opinions and rites, but also excited the most implacable hatred and the most deadly animosities. Of these factions, one acknowledged Abubeker as the true *khalif*, or successor of Mohammed, and its members were distinguished by the name of Sonnites; while the other adhered to Ali, and received the appellation of Shiites.[a] Both, however, adhered to the Koran as a divine law, and as the rule of faith and manners; to which, indeed, the former added, by way of interpretation, the *sonna*, i. e. a certain law which they looked upon as derived from Mohammed by oral tradition, and which the Shiites refused to admit. Among the Sonnites, or followers of Abubeker, we are to reckon the Turks, Tartars, Arabians, Africans, and the greatest part of the Indian Moslems; whereas the Persians, and the subjects of the great Mogul, are generally considered as the followers of Ali; though the latter indeed seem rather to observe a strict neutrality in this contest.

Beside these two grand factions, there are several subordinate sects among the Moslems, which dispute with warmth upon several points of religion, though without violating the rules of mutual toleration.[b] Of these sects there are four, which far surpass the rest in point of reputation and importance.

[a] See Reland, de Religione Turcicâ, lib. i. p. 36, 70, 74, 85; and Chardin's Voyages en Perse, tom. ii. p. 236.

[b] For an account of the Mohammedan sects, see Hottingeri Histor. Orient. lib. ii. cap. vi. p. 340.—Ricaut's Etat de l'Empire Ottoman, liv. ii. p. 242.—Chardin's Voyages en Perse, tom. ii.; and Sale's Preliminary Discourse, sect. viii.

PART II.

THE INTERNAL HISTORY OF THE CHURCH.

CHAPTER I.

Concerning the state of Letters and Philosophy during this Century.

I. NOTHING can equal the ignorance and darkness that reigned in this century; the most impartial and accurate account of which will appear incredible to those who are unacquainted with the productions of this barbarous period. Any remains of learning and philosophy that yet survived, were, a few particular cases excepted, to be found principally among the Latins, in the obscure retreats of cloistered monks. The monastic institutions prohibited the election of any abbot to the government of a convent, who was not a man of learning, or, at least, endowed with some share of the erudition of the times. The monks were obliged to consecrate certain hours every day to reading and study: and, that they might improve this appointment to the most advantageous purposes, there were, in most of the monasteries, stated times marked out, at which they were to assemble, in order to communicate to each other the fruits of their studies, and to discuss the matters upon which they had been reading.[a] The youth also, who were destined for the service of the church, were obliged to prepare themselves for their ministry by a diligent application to study; and in this they were directed by the monks, one of whose principal occupations it was to preside over the education of the rising priesthood.

It must, however, be acknowledged, that all these institutions were of little use to the advancement of solid learning, or of rational theology, because very few in those days were acquainted with the true nature of the liberal arts and sciences, or with the important ends which they were adapted to serve; and the greatest part of those who were looked upon as learned men, threw away their time in reading the marvellous lives of a parcel of fanatical saints, instead of employing it in the perusal of well-chosen and excellent authors. They, who distinguished themselves most by their taste and genius, carried their studies little farther than the works of Augustin and Gregory the Great; and it was of scraps collected out of these two writers, and patched together without much uniformity, that the best productions of this century were composed.

II. The sciences enjoyed no degree of protection, at this time, from kings and princes; nor did they owe any thing to men of high and eminent stations in the empire. On the other hand, the schools which had been committed to the care and inspection of the bishops, whose ignorance and indolence were now become enormous, began to decline apace, and had, in many places, fallen into ruin.[b] The bishops in general were so illiterate, that few of them were capable of composing the discourses which they delivered to the people. Such prelates as were not totally destitute of genius composed, out of the writings of Augustin and Gregory, a certain number of insipid homilies, which they divided between themselves and their stupid colleagues, that they might not be obliged through incapacity to discontinue preaching the doctrines of Christianity to the people, as appears from the examples of Cæsarius bishop of Arles, and Eloi bishop of Noyon.[c] There is yet extant a summary of theological doctrine, which was unskilfully compiled by Taion bishop of Saragossa, from the writings of Augustin and Gregory; and which was so highly extolled in this illiterate age, that its author was called, by the rest of the bishops, the *true salt of the earth*, and a divine light that was sent to illuminate the world.[d] Many such instances of the ignorance and barbarity of this century will occur to those who have any acquaintance with the writers it produced. England, it is true, was happier in this respect than the other nations of Europe, which was principally owing to Theodore Tarsus, of whom we shall have occasion to speak afterwards, who was appointed archbishop of Canterbury, and contributed much to introduce, among the English, a certain taste for literary pursuits, and to excite in that kingdom a zeal for the advancement of learning.[e]

III. In Greece, the fate of the sciences was truly lamentable. A turgid eloquence, and an affected pomp and splendour of style, which cast a perplexing obscurity over subjects in themselves the most clear and perspicuous, now formed the highest point of perfection to which both prose writers and poets aspired. The Latin eloquence was still very considerably below that of the Greeks; it had not spirit enough even to be turgid, and, a few compositions excepted, it had sunk to the very lowest degree of barbarity and corruption. Both the Greek and Latin writers, who attempted historical compositions, degraded most miserably that important science. Moschus and Sophronius among the former; and among the latter Braulio, Jonas an Hibernian, Audoenus, Dado, and Adamannus, wrote the lives of several saints, or rather a heap of insipid and ridiculous fables, void of the least air of probability, and without the smallest tincture of eloquence. The Greeks related, without discernment or choice, the most vulgar reports that were handed about concerning the events of ancient times; and hence arose that multitude of absurd fables, which the Latins afterwards copied from them with the utmost avidity.

IV. Among the Latins, philosophy was at its lowest ebb. If there were any that retained some faint reluctance to abandon it entirely, such confined their studies to the writings of Boethius and Cassiodorus, from which they committed to memory a certain number of phrases and sentences; and that was all their philosophical stock. The Greeks, abandoning Plato to the monks, gave themselves entirely up to the direction of Aristotle, and studied, with eagerness, the subtilties of his logic, which were of signal use in the controversies carried on between the Monophysites, the Nestorians, and Monothelites. All these different

[a] Mabillon, Acta Sanct. Ord. Benedict. tom. ii. p. 479, 513.

[b] Histoire Literaire de la France, tom. iii. p. 428.

☞ [c] In the original we read Eligius Noviomagensis, which is a mistake either of the author, or printer. It is probable that Noviomagensis slipped from the pen of Dr. Mosheim, in the place of Noviodunensis; for Eloi was bishop of Noyon, and not of Nimeguen.

[d] Mabillon, Analecta veteris Ævi, tom. ii. p. 77.

[e] Wilkins' Con. Mag. Brit. tom. i. p. 42.—Conringii Ant. Aca. p. 277.

sects called the Stagirite to their assistance, when they were to plead their cause, and to defend their doctrines. Hence it was, that James, bishop of Edessa, who was a Monophysite, translated, in this century, the dialectics of Aristotle into the Syriac language.[a]

CHAPTER II.

Concerning the Doctors and Ministers of the Church, and its Form of Government during this Century.

I. THE disputes about pre-eminence, that had so long subsisted between the bishops of Rome and Constantinople, proceeded, in this century, to such violent lengths, as laid the foundation of that deplorable schism, which afterwards separated the Greek and Latin churches. The most learned writers, and those who are most remarkable for their knowledge of antiquity, are generally agreed that Boniface III. engaged Phocas, that abominable tyrant, who waded to the imperial throne through the blood of the emperor Mauritius, to take from the bishop of Constantinople the title of *œcumenical* or *universal bishop*, and to confer it upon the Roman pontiff. They relate this, however, upon the sole authority of Baronius; for none of the ancient writers have mentioned it. If, indeed, we are to give credit to Anastasius and Paul the deacon,[b] something like what we have now related was transacted by Phocas: for, when the bishops of Constantinople maintained that their church was not only equal in dignity and authority to that of Rome, but also the head of all the Christian churches, this tyrant opposed their pretensions, and granted the pre-eminence to the church of Rome: and thus was the papal supremacy first introduced.

II. The Roman pontiffs used all sorts of methods to maintain and enlarge the authority and pre-eminence which they had acquired by a grant from the most odious tyrant that ever disgraced the annals of history. We find, however, in the most authentic accounts of the transactions of this century, that not only several emperors and princes, but also whole nations, opposed the ambitious views of the bishops of Rome. The Byzantine history, and the Formulary of Marculfus, contain many proofs of the influence which the civil magistrate yet retained in religious matters, and of the subordination of the Roman pontiffs to the regal authority. It is true, the Roman writers affirm, that Constantine Pogonatus abdicated the privilege of confirming, by his approbation, the election of the bishop of that city; and, as a proof of this, they allege a passage of Anastasius, in which it is said, that according to an edict of Pogonatus, *the pontiff, who should be elected, was to be ordained immediately, and without the least delay.*[c] But every one must see, that this passage is insufficient to prove what these writers assert with such confidence. It is however certain, that this emperor abated, some say remitted, the sum which, from the time of Theodoric, the bishops of Rome had been obliged to pay to the imperial treasury before they could be ordained, or have their election confirmed.[d]

The ancient Britons and Scots persisted long in the maintenance of their religious liberty; and neither the threats nor promises of the legates of Rome could engage them to submit to the decrees and authority of the ambitious pontiff, as appears manifestly from the testimony of Bede. The churches of Gaul and Spain attributed as much authority to the bishop of Rome, as they thought suitable to their own dignity, and consistent with their interests: even in Italy his supreme authority was obstinately rejected, since the bishop of Ravenna, and other prelates, refused an implicit submission to his orders.[e] Beside all this, multitudes of private persons expressed publicly, and without the least hesitation, their abhorrence of the vices, and particularly of the lordly ambition of the Roman pontiffs: and it is highly probable, that the Valdenses or Vaudois had already, in this century, retired into the valleys of Piedmont, that they might be more at liberty to oppose the tyranny of those imperious prelates.[f]

III. The progress of vice, among the subordinate rulers and ministers of the church, was at this time truly deplorable: neither bishops, presbyters, deacons, nor even the cloistered monks, were exempt from the general contagion, as appears from the unanimous confession of all the writers of this century that are worthy of credit. In those very places, that were consecrated to the advancement of piety, and the service of God, there was little to be seen but spiritual ambition, insatiable avarice, pious frauds, intolerable pride, and a supercilious contempt of the natural rights of the people, with many other vices still more enormous. There reigned also in many places the most bitter dissensions between the bishops and the monks. The former had employed the greedy hands of the latter to augment the episcopal treasure, and to draw the contributions from all parts to support them in their luxury, and the indulgence of their lust. The monks perceiving this, and also unwilling to serve the bishops in such a dishonourable character, fled for refuge to the emperors and princes, under whose civil jurisdiction they lived; and afterwards, for their farther security, had recourse to the protection of the Roman pontiff.[g] This protection they readily obtained; and the imperious pontiffs, always fond of exerting their authority, exempted, by degrees, the monastic orders from the jurisdiction of the bishops. The monks, in return for this important service, devoted themselves wholly to advance the interest, and to maintain the dignity of the bishop of Rome. They made his cause their own, and represented him as a sort of god to the ignorant multitude, over whom they had gained a prodigious ascendency by the notion that generally prevailed of the sanctity of the monastic order. It is, at the same time, to be observed, that this *humanity* toward the monks proved a fruitful source of licentious-

[a] See Assemani Biblioth. Oriental. Vatican. tom. i. p. 498.

[b] Anastasius, de vitis Pontificum. Paul. Diacon. de rebus gestis Longobard. lib. iv. cap. xxxvii. apud Muratorii Scriptor. rerum Italicar. tom. i. p. 465.

[c] Anastasii vit. Pontif. in Bened. p. 146, in Muratorii Scriptor. rerum Italicar. tom. iii.

[d] Anastas. vit. Pontif. in Agathone, p. 144, compared with Mascovii Hist. German. tom. ii. p. 121, in the annotations. ☞ It will not be improper to observe here, that by the same edict, which diminished the ordination-money paid by the bishops of Rome to the emperor, Constantine resumed the power of confirming the election of the pope, which his predecessors had invested in the exarchs of Ravenna; so that the bishop elect was not to be ordained till his election was notified to the court of Constantinople, and the imperial decree confirming it was received by the electors at Rome. See Anastasius, in his life of Agatho.

[e] See Geddes' Miscellaneous Tracts, vol. ii. p. 6.

[f] See Antoine Leger's Histoire des Eglises Vaudoises, liv. i. p. 15.

[g] See Launoii Assertio Inquisitionis in Chartam Immunitatis S. Germani, op. tom. iii. par. i. p. 50. Baluzii Miscellan. tom. ii. p. 159; tom. iv. p. 108. Muratorii Antiq. Italic. tom. ii. p. 944, 949.

ness and disorder, and occasioned the greatest part of the vices with which they were afterwards so justly charged. Such, at least, is the judgment of the best writers upon this subject.[a]

IV. In the mean time the monks were every where in high repute, and their cause was accompanied with the most surprising success, particularly among the Latins, through the protection and favour of the Roman pontiff, and their pharisaical affectation of uncommon piety and devotion. The heads of families, striving to surpass each other in their zeal for the propagation and advancement of monkery, dedicated their children to God, by shutting them up in convents, and devoting them to a solitary life, which they looked upon as the highest felicity;[b] nor did they fail to send with these innocent victims a rich dowry. Abandoned profligates, who had passed their days in the most vicious pursuits, and whose guilty consciences filled them with terror and remorse, were comforted with the delusive hopes of obtaining pardon, and making atonement for their crimes, by leaving the greatest part of their fortune to some monastic society. Multitudes, impelled by the unnatural dictates of a gloomy superstition, deprived their children of fertile lands and rich patrimonies, in favour of the monks, by whose prayers they hoped to render the Deity propitious. Several ecclesiastics laid down rules for the direction of the monastic orders. Those among the Latins, who undertook this pious task, were Fructuosus, Isidore, Johannes Gerundinensis, and Columban.[c] The rule of discipline, prescribed by St. Benedict, was not yet universally followed, so as to exclude all others.

V. The writers of this age, who distinguished themselves by their genius or erudition, were very few in number. Among the Greeks, the first rank is due to Maximus, a monk, who disputed with great obstinacy and warmth against the Monothelites, composed some illustrations upon the Holy Scriptures, and was, upon the whole, a man of no mean capacity, though unhappy through the impatience and violence of his natural temper.

Isychius, bishop of Jerusalem, explained several books of Scripture;[d] and left several homilies, and some productions of less importance.

Dorotheus, abbot of Palestine, acquired a considerable name by his Ascetic Dissertations, in which he laid down a plan of monastic life and manners.

Antiochus, a monk of Saba in Palestine, and a monk of a very superstitious complexion, composed a Pandect of the Holy Scriptures, i. e. a summary or system of the Christian doctrine, which is by no means worthy of high commendation.

Sophronius, bishop of Jerusalem, was rendered illustrious and attracted the veneration of succeeding ages, by the controversies he carried on against those who, at this time, were branded with the name of heretics; and particularly against the Monothelites, of whose doctrine he was the first opposer, and also the fomenter of the dispute which it occasioned.[e]

There are yet extant several homilies, attributed to Andrew bishop of Crete, which are destitute of true piety and eloquence, and which are, moreover, considered by some writers as entirely spurious.

Gregory, surnamed Pisides, deacon of Constantinople, besides the History of Heraclius and the Avares, composed several poems, and other pieces, of too little moment to deserve mention.

Theodore, abbot of Raithu, published a book which is still extant, against those sects who seemed to introduce corrupt innovations into the Christian religion by their doctrine relating to the person of Christ.

VI. Among the Latin writers, a certain number were distinguished from the rest by their superior abilities. Ildefonso, archbishop of Toledo, was in repute for his learning; the Spaniards, however, attribute to him without foundation certain treatises concerning the Virgin Mary.[f]

We have yet extant two books of Epistles, written by Desiderius, bishop of Cahors, and published by the learned Canisius.

Eligius, or Eloi, bishop of Limoges, left behind him several homilies, and some other productions.

Marculf, a Gallic monk, composed two books of ecclesiastical forms, which are highly valuable, as they are extremely proper to give us a just idea of the deplorable state of religion and learning in this century.[g]

Aldhelm, an English prelate, composed several poems, concerning the Christian life, which exhibit but indifferent marks of genius and fancy.[h]

Julian Pomerius confuted the Jews, and acquired a name by several other productions, which are neither worthy of much applause nor of utter contempt. To all these we might add Cresconius, whose Abridgment of the Canons is well known; Fredegarius the historian, and a few others.

CHAPTER III.

Concerning the Doctrine of the Christian Church during this Century.

I. IN this barbarous age, religion lay expiring under a motley and enormous heap of superstitious inventions, and had neither the courage nor the force to raise her head, or to display her native charms, to a darkened and deluded world. In the earlier periods of the church, the Christian worship was confined to the one Supreme God, and his Son Jesus Christ; but the Christians of this century multiplied the objects of their devotion, and paid homage to the remains of the true cross, to the images of the saints, and to bones, whose real owners were extremely dubious.[i] The

[a] See Launoii Examen Privilegii S. Germani, tom. iii. par. i. p. 282. Wilkins' Concilia Magnæ Britanniæ, tom. i. p. 43, 44, 49, &c.

[b] Gervais, Histoire de l'Abbé Suger, tom. i. p. 9—16.

[c] Lucæ Holstenii Codex Regular. tom. ii. p. 225.

[d] See Simon's Critique de la Bibliotheque des Auteurs Ecclesiastiques de M. Du-Pin, tom. i. p. 261.

[e] See the Acta Sanctorum, tom. ii. Martii ad d. xi. p. 65.

[f] See the Acta Sanctorum, Januar. tom. ii. p. 535.

[g] Histoire Literaire de la France, tom. iii. p. 565.

☞ [h] This prelate certainly deserved a more honourable mention than is here made of him by Dr. Mosheim. His poetical talents were by no means the most distinguishing part of his character. He was profoundly versed in the Greek, Latin, and Saxon languages. He appeared also with dignity in the paschal controversy, that so long divided the Saxon and British churches. See Collier's Ecclesiastical Hist. vol. i.

[i] It will not be amiss to quote here a remarkable passage out of the Life of St. Eligius, or Eloi, bishop of Noyon, which is to be found in M. d'Achery's Spicilegium veter. Scriptor. tom. ii. p. 92. This passage, which is very proper to give us a just idea of the piety of this age, is as follows: "Huic sanctissimo viro, inter cetera virtutum suarum miracula, id etiam a Domino concessum erat, ut sanctorum martyrum corpora, quæ per tot sæcula abdita populis hactenus habebantur, eo investigante ac nimio ardore fidei indagante, patefacta proderentur." It appears by this passage, that St. Eloi was a zealous relic-hunter; and, if we may give

primitive Christians, in order to excite men to a course of piety and virtue, set before them that heavenly state, and those mansions of misery, which the Gospel has revealed as the different portions of the righteous and the wicked; while the Christians of this century talked of nothing else but a certain fire which effaced the stains of vice, and purified souls from their corruption. The former taught that Christ, by his sufferings and death, had made atonement for the sins of mortals; the latter seemed, by their superstitious doctrine, to exclude, from the kingdom of heaven, such as had not contributed, by their offerings, to augment the riches of the clergy or the church.[a] The former were only studious to attain a virtuous simplicity of life and manners, and employed their principal zeal and diligence in the culture of true and genuine piety, while the latter placed the whole of religion in external rites and bodily exercises. The methods also of solving the difficulties, and dissipating the doubts, which often arose in inquisitive minds, were of a piece with the rest of the superstitious system that now prevailed. The two great and irresistible arguments against all doubts, were the authority of the church and the working of miracles, and the production of these prodigies required no extraordinary degree of dexterity in an age of such gross and universal ignorance.

II. Few, either of the Greeks or Latins, applied themselves to the interpretation of the Scriptures during this century. There are yet extant some commentaries of Isychius, bishop of Jerusalem, upon certain books of the Old Testament, and upon the Epistle to the Hebrews. Maximus published a solution of sixty-five questions relating to the Scriptures, and other productions of the same nature. Julian Pomerius attempted, but without success, to reconcile the seeming contradictions that are to be found in the sacred writings, and to explain the prophecy of Nahum. All these writers were manifestly inferior to the meanest expositors of modern times. The Grecian doctors, particularly those who pretended to be initiated in the most mysterious depths of theology, were continually hunting after fantastic allegories, as is evident from the Questions of Maximus already mentioned. The Latins, on the contrary, were so diffident of their abilities, that they did not dare to enter these allegorical labyrinths, but contented themselves with what flowers they could pluck out of the rich collections of Gregory and Augustin. Of this we see a manifest example in Paterius' Exposition of the Old and New Testament, which is entirely compiled from the writings of Gregory the Great.[b] Among the interpreters of this century, we must not forget Thomas, bishop of Heraclea, who gave a second Syriac version of the New Testament.[c]

III. While philosophy and theology had scarcely any remains of life, any marks of existence among the Latins, the Greeks were wholly occupied with fruitless controversies about particular branches of religion, and did not think of reducing all the doctrines of Christianity into one regular and rational system. It is true, Antiochus, a monk of Palestine, composed a short summary of the Christian doctrine, which he entitled the Pandect of the Holy Scrip-

credit to the writer of his life, he was very successful at this kind of game; for he smelt and unkenneled the carcases of St. Quintin, St. Plato, St. Crispin, St. Crispinian, St. Lucian, and many more. The bishops of this age, who were either ambitiously desirous of popular applause, or intent upon accumulating riches, and filling their coffers with the oblations of a superstitious people, pretended to be endowed with a miraculous sagacity in discovering the bodies of saints and martyrs.*

[a] St. Eloi expresses himself upon this matter in the following manner: "Bonus Christianus est, qui ad ecclesiam frequentius venit, et oblationem, quæ in altari Deo offeratur, exhibet; qui de fructibus suis non gustat, nisi prius Deo aliquid offerat; qui, quoties sanctæ solemnitates adveniunt, ante dies plures castitatem etiam cum propriâ uxore custodit, ut securâ conscientiâ Domini altare accedere possit; qui postremo symbolum vel orationem Dominicam memoriter tenet.—Redimite animas vestras de pœnâ, dum habetis in potestate remedia; oblationes et decimas ecclesiis offerte, luminaria sanctis locis, juxta quod habetis, exhibete; ad ecclesiam quoque frequentius convenite, sanctorum patrocinia humiliter expetite; quod si observaveritis, securi in die judicii ante tribunal æterni judicis venientes dicetis, Da, Domine, quia dedimus." ☞ We see here a large and ample description of the character of a good Christian, in which there is not the least mention of the love of God, resignation to his will, obedience to his laws, or of justice, benevolence, and charity toward men; and in which the whole of religion is made to consist in coming often to the church, bringing offerings to the altar, lighting candles in consecrated places, and the like vain services.†

[b] This useless production has been usually published with the works of Gregory the Great; in consequence of which, the Benedictine monks have inserted it in their splendid edition of the works of that pontiff, tom. iv. part ii.

[c] Assemani Biblioth. Orient. Vatican. tom. ii. p. 93, 94.

* That much imposition was practised in this respect, even the catholics must admit. The biographer of Eloi says, that, 'some relics were honoured with popular worship in places where they did not exist, while no one knew, to a certainty, in what spot they were to be found.' To supply this deficiency of knowledge, it became expedient, in the opinion of the clerical zealots, to point out the places of interment; and thus relics were wantonly multiplied, many saints having two or three heads found for each person, and a great number of arms and legs. This reminds us of the remark of a lady, who, having seen at a museum a relic which was said to be Cromwell's scull, asked the keeper of another repository, whether he could produce a scull of the same great personage. 'No, Madam,' he replied; 'we have nothing of the kind.'—'That seems very odd,' said the lady; 'I saw one at Oxford, and I should have thought that you would have had another.'—EDIT.

† Some modern writers of the Romish persuasion have exclaimed against these strictures in terms of severe reprehension; and Dr. Lingard, in particular, says, 'This citation from the writings of St Eloi holds a distinguished place in every invective which has been published against the clergy of former ages; and this definition of a good Christian has been re-echoed a thousand times by the credulity of writers and their readers;' but it appears, upon due investigation, he adds, that the 'bishop of Noyon has been *foully calumniated*;' for his definition of a good Christian is of the following tenor: "Non vobis sufficit, charissimi, quòd Christianum nomen accepistis, si opera Christiana non facitis. Illi enim prodest, quòd Christianus vocatur, qui semper Christi præcepta mente retinet, et opere perficit; qui furtum, scilicet, non facit; qui falsum testimonium non dicit; qui nec mentitur, nec pejerat; qui adulterium non committit; qui nullum hominem odit, sed omnes sicut semetipsum diligit; qui inimicis suis malum non reddit, sed magis pro ipsis orat; qui lites non concitat, sed discordes ad concordiam revocat." 'It is not sufficient for your characters or your credit, my dearest friends, that you merely bear the name of a christian; you must perform the acts and duties of a Christian. He alone is worthy of the name, who retains in his mind the precepts of religion, and carries them into effect; who avoids, as a crime, the commission of theft; who shuns the guilt of perjury or falsehood; who does not commit adultery; who hates no one, but is ready to serve even his enemies; and who is so far from promoting strife, that he is eager to prevent all disputes, and allay all animosities.' These and other evidences of the Christian character and temper, in the century to which Dr. Mosheim refers, are given by the catholic historian in the words of Audoënus (St. Ouen) bishop of Rouen, who wrote the life of St. Eloi; and we are bound to state, because we have ascertained the point, that he has quoted the original *fairly* and *correctly*, according to the best edition of the Spicilegium. (Paris, 1723, 3 vols. folio.) We are induced to mention this circumstance, because some protestant divines have been so eager to exculpate Dr. Mosheim, that they have accused Dr. Lingard of following a spurious edition, in which various interpolations might have been made by the Romanists to support the credit of the early church. We are aware that papists seem to have a fellow-feeling with their religious ancestors, and are frequently hurried by their zeal into misrepresentation, and sometimes into gross deviations from truth; but it is certainly illiberal to suspect them without cause, or to condemn them without inquiry.

In the present case, we cannot conscientiously decide in favour of Dr. Mosheim. His *general* impartiality we readily admit; but he did not, on this occasion, strictly attend to that duty. In the very page from which he extracted the unfavourable passage, he must, we think, have seen (for he was usually keen in his researches) the detail of religious and moral duties quoted by Dr. Lingard, and he ought to have given one as well as the other. Some blame is also imputable to the translator, for not making due inquiry into the validity of Dr. Mosheim's charge against the churchmen of the seventh century.—EDITOR.

tures. It is, however, easy to perceive what sort of an author he was, how void of dignity and true judgment, from many circumstances, and particularly from that rueful poem which is subjoined to his work; in which he deplores, in lamentable strains, the loss of that precious fragment of the true cross, which is said to have been carried away by the Persians, among other spoils. The most elegant and judicious summary of theology that appeared among the Latins in this century, was the treatise of Ildefonso, de Cognitione Baptismi, which was saved by Baluze from the ruins of time; a work, indeed, which is not extremely necessary, since the ignoble frauds of superstition have been so fully brought to light, though it contains remarkable proofs, that many of the corrupt inventions and practices, which disfigure Christianity in the popish churches, were not contrived till after this period.[a] The dry and insipid body of divinity composed by Taio, or Tago, bishop of Saragossa, under the title of Five Books of Sentences, and compiled from the writings of Gregory and Augustin, is scarcely worthy of mention, though, in this century, it was considered as an admirable and immortal work.[b]

Several particular branches of doctrine were treated by the theological writers of this age: thus Maximus wrote of the nature of Theology, and the Manifestation of the Son in the Flesh, and also upon the Two Natures in Christ; and Theodore Raithu composed a treatise concerning Christ's Incarnation. But a small acquaintance with the state of learning and religion at this period, will enable us to form a just though disadvantageous idea of the merit of these performances, and also of their authors.

IV. The moral writers of this century, and their miserable productions, show too plainly to what a wretched state that noble and important science was now reduced. Among these moralists, the first rank is due to Dorotheus (author of the Ascetic Dissertations,) Maximus, Aldhelm, Hesychius, Thalassius, and some others: yet, even in their productions, what groveling notions do we find! what rubbish, what a heap of superstitious fancies! and how many marks of extravagance, perplexity, and doubt! Besides, the laity had little reason to complain of the severity of their moral directors, whose custom it was to reduce all the obligations of Christianity to the practice of a small number of virtues, as appears from Aldhelm's Treatise concerning the eight principal Virtues. Nor was the neglect of these duties attended with such penalties as were proper to restrain offenders. The false notions also, which prevailed in this age, tended much to diminish a just sense of the nature and obligation of virtue; for the solitude of the monastic life, though accompanied with no marks of solid and genuine piety, was deemed sufficient to atone for all sorts of crimes, and was therefore honoured among the Latins with the title of the second baptism; which circumstance alone may serve to show us the miserable state of Christianity at this time. The greatest part of the Grecian and Oriental monks laboured to arrive at a state of perfection by mere contemplation, and studiously endeavoured to form their tempers and characters after the model of Dionysius, the chief of the Mystics.

V. Theodore of Tarsus, a Grecian monk, restored among the Latins the discipline of *penance*, as it is commonly termed, which had been for a long time almost totally neglected, and enforced it by a body of severe laws borrowed from the Grecian canons. This zealous prelate, being raised beyond his expectation to the see of Canterbury, in 668, formed and executed several pious and laudable projects; and, among other things, reduced to a regular science that branch of ecclesiastical law, which is known by the name of penitential discipline. He published a *Penitential*, which was entirely new to the Latin world, by which the clergy were taught to distinguish sins into various classes, according as they were more or less heinous, private or public: to judge of them, and determine the degrees of their guilt, by their nature and consequences, by the intention of the offender, the time and place in which they were committed, and the circumstances with which they were attended. This new Penitential contained also the methods of proceeding with respect to offenders; pointed out the penalties that were suitable to the various classes of transgressions; prescribed the forms of consolation, exhortation and absolution; and described, in an ample and accurate manner, the duties and obligations of those who were to receive the confessions of the penitent.[c] This new discipline, though of Grecian origin, was eagerly adopted by the Latin churches; and, in a short space of time, passed from Britain into all the western provinces, where the book of Theodore became the model of all other penitentials, and was multiplied in a vast number of copies. The duration of this discipline was transitory; for, in the eighth century, it began to decline, and was, at length, entirely supplanted by what was called the new canon of indulgences.

VI. The doctors who opposed the various sects are scarcely worthy of mention, and would still less deserve an attentive perusal, did not their writings contribute to illustrate the history of the times in which they lived. Nicias composed two books against the Gentiles; and Photius informs us, that a certain writer, whose name is unknown, embarked in the same controversy, and supported the good cause by a prodigious number of arguments drawn from ancient records and monuments.[d] Julian Pomerius exerted his polemic talent against the Jews. The views of Timotheus were yet more extensive; for he gave an ample description and a laboured confutation of all the various *heresies* that divided the church, in his book concerning the reception of Heretics.

As to the dissensions of the catholic Christians among themselves, they produced, at this time, few or no events worthy of mention. We shall, therefore, only observe, that in this century were sown the seeds of those fatal discords, which rent asunder the bonds of Christian communion between the Greek and Latin churches; indeed, these seeds had already taken root in the minds of the Greeks, to whom the Roman power became insupportable, and the pretensions of the sovereign pontiff odious.

[a] See Baluzii Miscellanea, tom. vi. p. 1. From the work of Ildefonso it appears evident, that the monstrous doctrine of Transubstantiation was absolutely unknown to the Latins in this century, and that the Scriptures were in the hands of all Christians, and were perused by them without the least molestation or restraint. Ildefonso, it is true, is zealous for banishing reason and philosophy from religious matters; he, however, establishes the Scriptures, and the writings of the ancient doctors, as the supreme tribunals before which all theological opinions are to be tried, p. 14, 22. [b] See Mabillon's Analecta veteris Ævi, t. ii. p. 68.

[c] The *Penitential* of Theodore is yet extant, though maimed and imperfect, in an edition published at Paris in 1679, by Petit, and enriched with learned dissertations and notes of the editor. We have also the cxx Capitula Ecclesiastica Theodori, published in the Spicilegium of M. d'Achery, and in the Concilia Harduini. [d] Biblioth. cod. clxx. p. 379

In Britain, warm controversies concerning baptism and the tonsure, and particularly the famous dispute concerning the time of celebrating the Easter festival, were carried on between the ancient Britons, and the new converts to Christianity, which Augustin had made among the Anglo-Saxons.[a] The fundamental doctrines of Christianity were not at all affected by these controversies, which, on that account, were more innocent, and less important than they would have otherwise been. Besides, they were entirely terminated in the eighth century, in favour of the Anglo-Saxons, by the Benedictine monks.[b]

CHAPTER IV.

Concerning the Rites and Ceremonies used in the Church during this Century.

I. In the council of Constantinople, which was called *Quinisextum*,[c] the Greeks enacted several laws concerning the ceremonies that were to be observed in divine worship, which rendered their ritual, in some respects, different from that of the Romans. These laws were publicly received by all the churches, which were established in the dominions of the Grecian emperors; and also by those which were joined with them in communion and doctrine, though under the civil jurisdiction of barbarian princes. Nor was this all; for every Roman pontiff added something new to the ancient rites and institutions, as if each supposed it to be an essential mark of zeal for religion, and of a pious discharge of the ministerial functions, to divert the multitude with new shows and new spectacles of devout mummery. These superstitious inventions were, in the time of Charlemagne, propagated from Rome among the other Latin churches, whose subjection to the Roman ritual was necessary to satisfy the ambitious demands of the lordly pontiff.

II. It will not be improper to select here a few, out of the many instances we could produce of the multiplication of religious rites in this century. The number of festivals under which the church already groaned, was now augmented; a new festival was instituted in honour of the true cross on which Christ suffered, and another in commemoration of the Saviour's ascension into heaven. Boniface V. enacted that infamous law, by which the churches became places of refuge to all who fled thither for protection; a law which procured a sort of impunity to the most enormous crimes, and gave indulgence to the licentiousness of the most abandoned profligates. Honorius employed all his diligence and zeal in embellishing churches, and other consecrated places, with the most pompous and magnificent ornaments; for, as neither Christ nor his apostles had left any injunctions of this nature to their followers, their pretended vicar thought it but just to supply this defect by the most splendid display of his ostentatious beneficence. We shall pass in silence the richness and variety of the sacerdotal garments that were now used at the celebration of the eucharist, and in the performance of divine worship, as this would lead us into a tedious detail of minute and unimportant matters.

CHAPTER V.

Concerning the Divisions and Heresies that troubled the Church during this Century.

I. The Greeks were engaged, during this century, in the most bitter and virulent controversy with the Paulicians of Armenia, and the adjacent countries, whom they considered as a branch of the Manichean sect. This dispute was carried to the greatest height under the reigns of Constans, Constantine Pogonatus, and Justinian II.; and the Greeks were not only armed with arguments, but were also aided by the force of military legions, and the terror of penal laws. A certain person, whose name was Constantine, revived, under the reign of Constans, the drooping faction of the Paulicians, now ready to expire; and propagated with great success its pestilential[d] doctrines. But this is not the place to enlarge upon the tenets and history of this sect, whose origin is attributed to Paul and John, two brothers, who revived and modified the doctrine of Manes. As it was in the ninth century that the Paulicians flourished most, and acquired strength sufficient to support the rigours of an open and cruel war with the Greeks, we shall reserve a more particular account of them for our history of that period.

II. In Italy, the Lombards preferred the opinions of the Arians to the doctrine which was established by the council of Nice. In Gaul and in England, the Pelagian and Semi-Pelagian controversies continued to excite the warmest animosities and dissensions. In the eastern provinces, the ancient sects, which had been weakened and oppressed by the imperial laws, but not extirpated or destroyed, began in many places to raise their heads, to recover their vigour, and gain proselytes. The terror of penal laws had obliged them, for some time, to seek safety in obscurity, and therefore to conceal their opinions from the public eye; but, as soon as they saw the fury or the power of their adversaries diminish, their hopes returned, and their courage was renewed.

III. The condition, both of the Nestorians and Monophysites, was much more flourishing under the Saracens, who had now become lords of the east, than it had been hitherto under the Christian emperors, or even the Persian monarchs. These two sects met with a distinguished protection from their new masters, while the Greeks suffered under the same sceptre all the rigours of persecution and banishment. Jesuiabas, the sovereign pontiff of the Nestorians, concluded a treaty, first with Mohammed, and afterwards with Omar, by which he obtained many signal advantages for his sect.[e] There is yet extant a testamentary diploma of the pseudo-prophet, in which he promises and bequeaths to the Christians, in his dominions, the

[a] Cummæni Epistola in Jac. Usserii Sylloge Epistolar. Hibernicar. p. 23.—Bedæ Historia Ecclesiast. gentis Anglor. lib. iii. cap. xxv.—Wilkins' Concilia Magnæ Britann. tom. i. p. 37, 42.—Acta Sanctor. Februar. tom. iii. p. 21, 84. ☞ See also Dr. Warner's Ecclesiastical History of England, books ii. and iii. This history, which has lately appeared, deserves the highest applause, on account of the noble spirit of liberty, candour, and moderation, that seems to have guided the pen of the judicious author. It is, at the same time, to be wished, that this elegant historian had less avoided citing authorities, and been a little more lavish of that erudition which he is known to possess: for then, after having surpassed Collier in all other respects, he would have equalled him in that depth of learning, which is the only meritorious circumstance of his partial and disagreeable history.

[b] Mabillon, Præf. ad Sæc. iii. Benedictinum, p. 2. ☞ See also Dr. Warner's Ecclesiastical Hist. book iii.

☞ [c] This council was called *Quinisextum*, from its being considered as a supplement to the fifth and sixth councils of Constantinople, in which nothing had been decreed concerning the morals of Christians, or religious ceremonies.

[d] Photius, lib. i. contra Manich. p. 61.—Petri Seculi Historia Manich. p. 41.—Georg. Cedrenus, Compend. Hist.

[e] Assemani Biblioth. Orient. Vatican, tom. iii. part ii. p. 94.

quiet and undisturbed enjoyment of their religion, together with their temporal advantages and possessions. Some learned men have, indeed, called in question the authenticity of this deed; it is, however, certain, that the Mohammedans unanimously acknowledge it to be genuine.[a] Accordingly, the successors of Mohammed in Persia employed the Nestorians in the most important affairs, both of the cabinet and of the provinces, and suffered the patriarch of that sect alone to reside in the kingdom of Bagdad.[b] The Monophysites enjoyed in Syria and Egypt an equal degree of favour and protection. Amrou, having made himself master of Alexandria, in 644, fixed Benjamin, the pontiff of the Monophysites, in the episcopal residence of that noble city; and, from this period, the Melchites[c] were without a bishop for almost a whole century.[d]

IV. Though the Greek church was already torn asunder by the most lamentable divisions, yet its calamities were far from being at an end. A new sect arose, in 630, under the reign of the emperor Heraclius, which in a short course of time, excited such violent commotions, as engaged the eastern and western churches to unite their forces in order to its extinction. The source of this tumult was an unseasonable plan of peace and union. Heraclius, considering, with pain, the detriment which the Grecian empire had suffered by the emigration of the persecuted Nestorians, and their settlement in Persia, was ardently desirous of re-uniting the Monophysites to the bosom of the Greek church, lest the empire should receive a new wound by their departure from it. He therefore held a conference during the Persian war, in 622, with Paul, a man of great credit and authority among the Armenian Monophysites; and another, at Hierapolis, in 629, with Athanasius, the Catholic or bishop of that sect, upon the methods that seemed most proper to restore tranquillity and concord to a divided church. Both these persons assured the emperor, that they who maintained the doctrine of one nature might be induced to receive the decrees of the council of Chalcedon, and thereby to terminate their controversy with the Greeks, provided that the latter would give their assent to the truth of the following proposition, namely, that in Jesus Christ there existed, after the union of the two natures, but one will, and one operation. Heraclius communicated this suggestion to Sergius, patriarch of Constantinople, who was a Syrian by birth, and whose parents adhered to the doctrine of the Monophysites. This prelate gave it as his opinion, that the doctrine of one will and one operation, after the union of the two natures, might be safely adopted without the least injury to truth, or the smallest detriment to the authority of the council of Chalcedon. In consequence of this, the emperor published an edict, 630, in favour of that doctrine, and hoped, by this act of authority, to restore peace and concord, both in church and state.[e]

V. The first reception of this new project was promising, and things seemed to go on smoothly; for though some ecclesiastics refused to submit to the imperial edict, Cyrus and Athanasius, the patriarchs of Alexandria and Antioch, received it without hesitation; and the see of Jerusalem was at that time vacant.[f] As to the Roman pontiff, he was entirely overlooked in the matter, as his consent was not deemed necessary in an affair that related only to the eastern church. In the mean time, Cyrus, who had been promoted by Heraclius from the see of Phasis to that of Alexandria, assembled a council, by the seventh decree of which, the doctrine of Monothelitism, or *one will*, which the emperor had introduced by the edict already mentioned, was solemnly confirmed. This new modification of the doctrine of the council of Chalcedon, which seemed to bring it nearer to the Eutychian system, had the desired effect upon the Monothelites, and induced great numbers of them, who were dispersed in Egypt, Armenia, and other remote provinces, to return into the bosom of the church. They, however, explained the perplexed and ambiguous doctrine of one will in Christ, in a manner peculiar to themselves, and not quite conformable to the true principles of their sect.

VI. This smiling prospect of peace and concord was, however, but transitory, and was unhappily succeeded by the most dreadful tumults, excited by a monk of Palestine, whose name was Sophronius. This monk, being present at the council assembled at Alexandria by Cyrus, in 633, had violently opposed the decree, which confirmed the doctrine of one will in Christ. His opposition, which was then treated with contempt, became more formidable in the following year; when, raised to the patriarchal see of Jerusalem, he summoned a council, in which the Monothelites were condemned as heretics, who had revived and propagated the Eutychian errors concerning the mixture and confusion of the two natures in Christ. Multitudes,

[a] This famous *Testament* was brought from the east in the seventeenth century, by Pacificus Scaliger, a Capuchin monk, and was published first in Arabic and Latin at Paris, by Gabriel Sionita, in 1630; afterwards in Latin by the learned Fabricius, in 1638; and also by Hinckelman, in 1690. See Henr. Hottinger. Hist. Orient. lib. ii. cap. xx. p. 237. Assemani Biblioth. tom. iii. part ii. p. 95; and Renaudot, Histor. Patriarchar. Alexandr. p. 168. They who, in comformity with the opinion of Grotius, reject this testament, suppose it to have been forged by the Syrian and Arabian monks, with a view to soften the Mohammedan yoke, under which they groaned, and to render their despotic masters less severe. Nor is this representation of the matter at all incredible; for it is certain, that the monks of mount Sinai formerly showed an edict attributed to Mohammed, of the same nature with the one now under consideration, which they pretend was drawn up by him while he was yet in a private station. This edict was extremely advantageous to them, and was, undoubtedly, an artful piece of forgery. The fraud was plain; but the Moslems, in consequence of their ignorance and stupidity, believed it to be a genuine production of their chief, and continue still in the same opinion. There is an account of this fraud given by Cantemir, in his Histoire de l'Empire Ottoman, tom. ii. p. 269. The argument therefore which Renaudot and others draw in favour of the testament in question from the acknowledgment which the Mohammedans make of its authenticity, is of little or no weight, since those infidels of all others are the most liable to be deceived in things of this nature, by their gross and unparalleled ignorance. On the other hand, several of the arguments used by those who deny its authenticity, are equally unsatisfactory; that particularly, which is drawn from the difference between the style of this deed and that of the Koran, proves absolutely nothing at all, since it is not essential to the genuineness of this testament to suppose it penned by Mohammed himself, because the impostor might have employed a secretary to compose it. But, whether it be genuine or spurious, it is certain that its contents were true, since many learned men have fully proved, that the pseudo-prophet, at his first setting out, prohibited, in the strongest manner, the commission of all sorts of injuries against the Christians, and especially the Nestorians.

[b] Asseman, p. 97.—Renaud. Histor. Patriarch. Alexandr. p. 163, 169.

☞ [c] The Melchites were those Christians in Syria, Egypt, and the Levant, who, though not Greeks, followed the doctrines and ceremonies of the Greek church. They were called Melchites, i. e. Royalists, by their adversaries, by way of reproach, on account of their implicit submission to the edict of the emperor Marcian, in favour of the council of Chalcedon.

[d] Renaud. Hist. Patriarch. Alexandr. p. 168.

[e] The authors, who have written of this sect, are mentioned by Jo. Alb. Fabricius, in his Biblioth. Græc. vol. x. p. 204. The account which I have here given is drawn from the fountain head, and is supported by the best authorities.

[f] See Lequien, Oriens Christianus, tom. iii. p. 264.

alarmed at the cry of heresy raised by this seditious monk, adopted his sentiments; but it was Honorius, the Roman pontiff, that he laboured principally to gain over to his side. His efforts, however, were vain: for Sergius, the patriarch of Constantinople, having informed Honorius, by a long and artful letter, of the true state of the question, determined that pontiff in favour of the doctrine, which maintained one will and one operation in Christ.[a] Hence arose those obstinate contests, which rent the church into two sects, and the state into two factions.

VII. In order to put an end to these commotions, Heraclius promulgated, in 639, the famous edict composed by Sergius, and called the *Ecthesis*, or exposition of the faith, by which all controversies upon the question, whether in Christ there were two operations, or only one, were strictly prohibited, though in the same edict the doctrine of one will was plainly inculcated. A considerable number of the eastern bishops declared their assent to this new law, which was also submissively received by their chief Pyrrhus, who, on the death of Sergius in 639, was raised to the see of Constantinople. In the west, the case was quite different. John, the fourth pontiff of that name, assembled a council at Rome in 639, in which the Ecthesis was rejected, and the Monothelites were condemned. Nor was this all: for, in the progress of this contest, a new edict, known by the name of *Type* or *Formulary*, was published in 648 by the emperor Constans, by the advice of Paul of Constantinople,[b] by which the Ecthesis was suppressed, and the contending parties were commanded to terminate their disputes concerning *one will* and *one operation* in Christ, by observing a profound silence upon that difficult and ambiguous subject. This silence, so wisely commanded in a matter which it was impossible to determine to the satisfaction of the contending parties, appeared highly criminal to the angry and contentious monks. They, therefore, excited Martin, bishop of Rome, to oppose his authority to an edict which hindered them from propagating strife and contention in the church; and their importunities had the desired effect; for this prelate, in a council of a hundred and five bishops assembled at Rome, in 649, condemned both the Ecthesis and the Type, though without any mention of the names of the emperors who had published those edicts, and thundered out the most dreadful anathemas against the Monothelites and their patrons, who were solemnly consigned to the devil and his angels.

VIII. The emperor Constans, justly irritated at these haughty and impudent proceedings of Martin, who treated the imperial laws with such contempt, ordered him to be seised and carried into the isle of Naxos, where he was kept prisoner a whole year. This order, which was followed by much cruel treatment, was executed by Calliopas, exarch of Italy, in 650; and, at the same time, Maximus, the ringleader of the seditious monks, was banished to Bizyca; and other rioters of the same tribe were differently punished in proportion to the part they had acted in this rebellion. These resolute proceedings rendered Eugenius and Vitalianus, the succeeding bishops of Rome, more moderate and prudent than their predecessor had been; especially the latter, who received Constans, on his arrival at Rome in 663, with the highest marks of distinction and respect, and used the wisest precautions to prevent the flame of that unhappy controversy from breaking out a second time. And thus, for several years, it seemed to be extinguished; but it was so only in appearance; it was a lurking flame, which spread itself secretly, and gave reason, to those who examined things with attention, to dread new commotions both in church and state. To prevent these, Constantine Pogonatus, the son of Constans, in pursuance of the advice of Agatho, the Roman pontiff, summoned, in 680, the sixth œcumenical or general council, in which he permitted the Monothelites, and pope Honorius himself, to be solemnly condemned in presence of the Roman legates, who represented Agatho in that assembly, and confirmed the sentence pronounced by the council, by the sanction of penal laws enacted against such as should dare to oppose it.

IX. It is difficult to give a clear and accurate account of the sentiments of those who were called Monothelites; nor is it easy to point out the objections of their adversaries. Neither of the contending parties express themselves consistently with what seem to have been their respective opinions; and they both disavow the errors with which they reciprocally charge each other. The following observations contain the clearest notion we can form of the state of this subtile controversy. 1. The Monothelites declared, that they had no connexion with the Eutychians and Monophysites; but maintained, in opposition to these two sects, that in Christ there were two distinct natures, which were so united, though without the least mixture or confusion, as to form by their union only one person: 2. They acknowledged that the soul of Christ was endowed with a will, or faculty of volition, which it still retained after its union with the divine nature; for they taught that Christ was not only perfect God, but also perfect man; whence it followed, that his soul was endowed with the faculty of volition: 3. They denied that this faculty of volition in the soul of Christ was absolutely inactive, maintaining, on the contrary, that it co-operated with the divine will: 4. They, therefore, in effect, attributed to our Lord two wills, and these, moreover, operating and active: 5. They, however, affirmed, that, in a certain sense, only one will and one manner of operation were in Christ.

X. We must not indeed imagine, that all, who were distinguished by the title of Monothelites, were unanimous in their sentiments with respect to the points now mentioned. Some, as appears from undoubted testimonies, meant no more than this, that the two wills in Christ were *one*, i. e. in perfect harmony; that the human will was in perpetual conformity with the divine, and was, consequently,

[a] The Roman Catholic writers have employed all their art and industry to represent the conduct of Honorius in such a manner, as to save his pretended infallibility from the charge of error in a question of such importance. (See, among others, Harduin, de Sacramento Altaris, published in his Opera Selecta, p. 255.) And, indeed, it is easy to find both matter of accusation and defence in the case of this pontiff. On one hand, it would appear that he himself knew not his own sentiments nor attached any precise and definite meaning to the expressions he used in the course of this controversy. On the other hand, it is certain, that he gave it as his opinion, that in Christ there existed only one will and one operation. It was for this that he was condemned in the council of Constantinople; and he must consequently have been a heretic, if it is true, that general councils cannot err. See Bossuet's Defence of the Declaration made by the Gallican Clergy, in the year 1682, concerning Ecclesiastical Power; and also Basnage, tom. i.

☞ [b] It is proper to observe here that Paul, who was a Monothelite in his heart, and had maintained the Ecthesis with great zeal, devised this prudent measure with a view to appease the Roman pontiff and the African bishops, who were incensed against him to the highest degree, on account of his attachment to the doctrine of one will.

always holy, just, and good; in which opinion there is nothing reprehensible. Others, more nearly approaching the sentiment of the Monophysites, imagined that the two wills or faculties of volition in Christ were blended into one, in that which they called the *personal union:* acknowledging, at the same time, that the distinction between these wills was perceivable by reason, and that it was also necessary to distinguish carefully in this matter. The greatest part of this sect, and those who were also the most remarkable for their subtilty and penetration, were of opinion, that the human will of Christ was the instrument of the divine; or, in other words, never operated or acted of itself, but was always ruled, influenced, and impelled by the divine will; in such a manner, however, that, when it was once set in motion, it decreed and operated with the ruling principle. The doctrine of one will, and of one operation in Christ, which the Monothelites maintained with such invincible obstinacy, was a natural consequence of this hypothesis, since the operation of an instrument and of the being who employs it, is one simple operation, and not two distinct operations or energies. According to this view of things, the Eutychian doctrine was quite out of the question; and the only point of controversy to be determined, was, whether the human will in Christ was a self-moving faculty determined by its own internal impulse, or derived all its motion and operations from the divine.

In the mean time, we may learn from this controversy, that nothing is more precarious, and nothing more dangerous and deceitful, than the religious peace and concord which are founded upon ambiguous doctrines, and cemented by obscure and equivocal propositions, or articles of faith. The partisans of the council of Chalcedon endeavoured to ensnare the Monophysites, by proposing their doctrine in a manner that admitted a double explication; and, by this imprudent piece of cunning, which showed so little reverence for the truth, they involved both the church and state in tedious and lamentable divisions.

XI. The doctrine of the Monothelites, condemned and exploded by the council of Constantinople, found a place of refuge among the Mardaites, a people who inhabited the mounts Libanus and Anti-Libanus, and who, about the conclusion of this century, were called Maronites, from Maro their first bishop, a name which they still retain. No ancient writers give any certain account of the first person who instructed these mountaineers in the doctrine of the Monothelites; it is probable, however, from several circumstances, that it was John Maro, whose name they had adopted.[a] One thing, indeed, we know, with the utmost certainty, from the testimony of Tyrius and other unexceptionable witnesses, as also from the most authentic records,—that the Maronites retained the opinions of the Monothelites until the twelfth century, when, abandoning and renouncing the doctrine of one will in Christ, they were re-admitted, in 1182, to the communion of the Romish church. The most learned of the modern Maronites have left no method unemployed to defend their church against this accusation; they have laboured to prove, by a variety of testimonies, that their ancestors always persevered in the catholic faith and in their attachment to the pope, without ever adopting the doctrines, either of the Monophysites or Monothelites. But all their efforts are insufficient to prove the truth of these assertions to such as have any acquaintance with the history of the church, and the records of ancient times; for, to all such, the testimonies they allege will appear absolutely fictitious and destitute of authority.[b]

XII. Neither the sixth general council, in which the Monothelites were condemned, nor the fifth, which had been assembled in the preceding century, had determined any thing concerning ecclesiastical discipline, or religious ceremonies. To supply this defect, a new episcopal assembly was holden in pursuance of the order of Justinian II. in a spacious hall of the imperial palace called Trullus, i. e. Cupola, from the form of the building. This council, which met in 692, was called Quinisextum, as we had occasion to observe formerly, from its being considered, by the Greeks, as a supplement to the fifth and sixth œcumenical councils, and as having given to the acts of these assemblies the degree of perfection which they had hitherto wanted. There are yet extant a hundred and two laws, which were enacted in this council, and which related to the external celebration of divine worship, the government of the church, and the lives and manners of Christians. Six of these are diametrically opposite to several opinions and rites of the Romish church; for which reason the pontiffs have refused to adopt, without restriction, the decisions of this council, or to reckon it in the number of those called œcumenical, though they consider the greatest part of its decrees as worthy of applause.[c]

[a] This ecclesiastic received the name of Maro, from his having lived in the character of a monk in the famous convent of St. Maro, upon the borders of the Orontes, before his settlement among the Mardaites. For an ample account of this prelate, see Assemani Biblioth. Orient. Clement. Vatic. tom. i. p. 496.

[b] The cause of the Maronites has been pleaded by the writers of that nation, such as Abraham Ecchellensis, Gabriel Sionita, and others; but the most ample defence of their uninterrupted orthodoxy was made by Faustus Nairon, partly in his Dissertatio de Origine, Nomine, ac Religione Maronitarum, published at Rome in 1679, and partly in his Euoplia Fidei Catholicæ ex Syrorum et Chaldæorum Monumentis, published in 1694. None of the learned, however, appeared to be persuaded by his arguments, except Pagi* and La Rocque, of whom the latter has given us, in his Voyages de Syrie et de Mont-Liban, tom. ii. p. 28—128, a long dissertation concerning the origin of the Maronites. Even the learned Assemanus, himself a Maronite, and who has spared no pains to defend his nation† against the reproach in question, ingenuously acknowledges, that among the arguments used by Nairon and others in favour of the Maronites, there are many destitute of force. See Jo. Morinus, de Ordinat. Sacris, p. 380.—Rich. Simon, Histoire Critique des Chretiens Orientaux, chap. xiii. p. 146.—Euseb. Renaudot, Historia Patriarchar. Alexandrinor. p. 179., and Præf. ad Liturgias Orientales.—Le Brun, Explication de la Messe, tom. ii. The arguments of the contending parties are enumerated impartially in such a manner as leaves the decision to the reader, by Le Quien, in his Oriens Christianus, tom. iii.

[c] See Franc. Pagi Breviar. Pontif. Roman. tom. i. p. 486., and Christ. Lupus, Dissertat. de Concilio Trulliano, in Notis et Dissertat. ad Concilia, tom. iii. op. p. 168. The Roman Catholics reject the following decisions of this council: 1. The fifth canon, which approves the eighty-five apostolical canons commonly attributed to Clement: 2. the thirteenth, which allows the priests to marry: 3. the fifty-fifth, which condemns the Sabbath fast, that was an institution of the Latin church: 4. the sixty-seventh, which prescribes the most rigorous abstinence from blood and things strangled: 5. the eighty-second, which prohibits the representing of Christ under the image of a lamb: 6. the thirty-sixth, concerning the equal rank and authority of the bishops of Rome and Constantinople.

* See Critica Baroniana ad A. 694.

† See Biblioth. Oriental. Vatican. tom. i. p. 496.

ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY;

BOOK THE THIRD,

CONTAINING THE

HISTORY OF THE CHURCH

FROM

CHARLEMAGNE TO THE REFORMATION BY LUTHER.

THE EIGHTH CENTURY.

PART I.

THE EXTERNAL HISTORY OF THE CHURCH.

CHAPTER I.

Concerning the prosperous Events which happened to the Church in this Century.

I. While the Mohammedans were infesting with their arms, and adding to their conquests, the most flourishing provinces of Asia, and obscuring, as far as their influence could extend, the lustre and glory of the rising church, the Nestorians of Chaldea were carrying the lamp of Christianity among those barbarous nations, called Scythians by the ancients, and by the moderns, Tartars, who, unsubjected to the Saracen yoke, had fixed their habitations within the limits of mount Imaus.[a] It is now well known, that Timotheus, the Nestorian pontiff, who had been raised to that dignity in 778, converted to the Christian faith, by the ministry of Subchal Jesu, whom he had consecrated bishop, first the Gelæ and Dailamites by whom a part of Hyrcania was inhabited; and afterwards, by the labours of other missionaries, the rest of the nations, who had formed settlements in Hyrcania, Bactria, Margiana, and Sogdia.[b] It is also certain, that Christianity enjoyed, in these vast regions, notwithstanding occasional attacks from the Mohammedans, the advantages of a firm and solid establishment for a long course of ages; while the bishops, by whose ministry it was propagated and supported, were all consecrated by the sole authority of the Nestorian pontiff.

II. If we turn our eyes toward Europe, we find many nations that were yet unenlightened with the knowledge of the Gospel. Almost all the Germans, (if we except the Bavarians, who had embraced Christianity under Theodoric, or Thierry, the son of Clovis, and the eastern Franks, with a few other provinces,) lay buried in the grossest darkness of pagan superstition. Many attempts were made, by pious and holy men, to infuse the truth into the minds of these savage Germans; and various efforts were used for the same purpose by kings and princes, whose interest it was to propagate a religion that was so adapted to mitigate and tame the ferocity of those warlike nations; but neither the attempts of pious zeal, nor the efforts of policy, were attended with success. This great work was, however, effected in this century, by the ministry of Winfred, a Benedictine monk, born in England of illustrious parents, and afterwards known by the name of Boniface. This famous ecclesiastic, attended by two companions of his pious labours, passed over into Friseland in 715, to preach the Gospel to the people of that country; but this first attempt was unsuccessful; and a war breaking out between Radbod, the king of that country, and Charles Martel, our zealous missionary returned to England. He resumed, however, his pious undertaking in 719; and being solemnly empowered by the Roman pontiff, Gregory II., to preach the Gospel, not only in Friseland, but all over Germany, he performed the functions of a christian teacher among the Thuringians, Friselanders, and Hessians, with considerable success.[c]

III. This eminent missionary was, in 723, consecrated bishop by Gregory II., who changed the name of Winfred into that of Boniface: seconded also by the powerful protection, and encouraged by the liberality of Charles Martel, mayor of the palace to Chilperic, king of France, he resumed his ministerial labours among the Hessians and Thuringians, and finished with glory the task he had undertaken, in which he received considerable assistance from a number of pious and learned men, who repaired to him from England and France. As the Christian churches erected by Boniface were too numerous to be governed by one bishop, this prelate was advanced to the dignity of archbishop, in 738, by Gregory III., by whose authority, and the auspicious protection of Carloman and Pepin, the sons of Charles Martel, he founded the bishoprics of Wurtzburg, Buraburg, Erfort, and Eichstadt, to which he added, in 744, the famous monastery of Fulda. His last promotion (the last recompense of his assiduous labours in the propagation of the truth) was his advancement to the archiepiscopal see of Mentz, in 746, by Zachary, bishop of Rome, by whom he was, at the same time, created primate of Germany and Belgium. In his old age, he returned to Friseland, that he might finish his ministry in the same place where he had entered first upon its functions; but his piety was ill rewarded by that barbarous people, by whom he was murdered in 755, while fifty ecclesiastics, who accompanied him in his journey, shared the same unhappy fate.

IV. Boniface, on account of his ministerial labours and holy exploits, was distinguished by the honourable title of the Apostle of the Germans; nor, if we consider impartially the eminent services he rendered to Christianity, will this title appear to have been undeservedly bestowed. But it is necessary to observe, that this eminent prelate was an apostle of modern fashion, and had, in many respects, departed from the excellent model exhibited in the conduct and ministry of the primitive and true apostles. Beside his zeal for the glory and authority of the Roman

☞ [a] The southern regions of Scythia were divided by the ancients (to whom the northern were unknown) into three parts, namely, Scythia within, and Scythia beyond Imaus, and Sarmatia. It is of the first of these three that Dr. Mosheim speaks, as enlightened at this time with the knowledge of the Gospel; and it comprehended Turkestan, the Mongol, Usbeck, Kalmuck, and Nogaian Tartary, which were peopled by the Bactrians Sogdians, Gandari, Sacs, and Massagetes, not to mention the land of Siberia, Samoiedia, and Nova Zembla, which were uninhabited in ancient times.

[b] Thomas Margensis, Historia Monastica, lib. iii. in Assemani Biblioth. Orient. Vatic. tom. iii.

[c] An ample account of this eminent man is to be found in a learned dissertation of Gudenius, de S. Bonifacio German. Apost., published at Helmstadt in 1722. See also Fabricii Bib. Lat. medii Ævi, tom. i. p.

pontiff, which equalled, if it did not surpass, his zeal for the service of Christ and the propagation of his religion,[a] many other things unworthy of a truly Christian minister are laid to his charge. In combating the pagan superstitions, he did not always use those arms with which the ancient heralds of the Gospel gained such victories in behalf of the truth; but often employed violence and terror, and sometimes artifice and fraud, in order to multiply the number of Christians. His epistles, moreover, discover an imperious and arrogant temper, a cunning and insidious turn of mind, an excessive zeal for increasing the honours and pretensions of the sacerdotal order, and a profound ignorance of many things of which the knowledge was absolutely necessary in an apostle, and particularly of the true nature and genius of the Christian religion.

V. The famous prelate, of whom we have been now speaking, was not the only Christian minister who attempted to deliver the German nations from the miserable bondage of pagan superstition; several others signalized their zeal in the same laudable and pious undertaking. Corbinian, a French Benedictine monk, after having laboured with great assiduity and fervour in planting the Gospel among the Bavarians, and in other countries, became bishop of Freysingen.[b] Firmin, a Gaul by birth, preached the Gospel under various kinds of suffering and opposition in Alsatia, Bavaria, and Helvetia, now Switzerland, and had inspection over a considerable number of monasteries.[c] Lebuin, an Englishman, laboured with the most ardent zeal and assiduity to engage the fierce and warlike Saxons, and also the Friselanders, Belgæ, and other nations, to receive the light of Christianity: but his ministry was attended with very little fruit.[d] We pass over in silence several apostles of less fame; nor is it necessary to mention Willibrod, and others of superior reputation, who persisted now with great alacrity and constancy in the labours they had undertaken in the preceding century, in order to the propagation of divine truth.

VI. A war broke out at this time between Charlemagne and the Saxons, which contributed much to the propagation of Christianity, though not by the force of a rational persuasion. The Saxons of that age were a numerous and formidable people, who inhabited a considerable part of Germany, and were engaged in perpetual quarrels with the Franks concerning their boundaries, and other matters of complaint. Hence Charlemagne turned his arms against this powerful nation, in 772, with a design, not only to subdue that spirit of revolt with which they had so often troubled the empire, but also to abolish their idolatrous worship, and engage them to embrace the Christian religion. He hoped, by their conversion, to vanquish their obstinacy, imagining that the divine precepts of the Gospel would assuage their impetuous and restless passions, mitigate their ferocity, and induce them to submit quietly to the government of the Franks. These projects were great in idea, but difficult in execution; accordingly, the first attempt to convert the Saxons, after having subdued them, was unsuccessful, because it was made, without the aid of violence or threats, by the bishops and monks, whom the victor had left among that conquered people, whose obstinate attachment to idolatry no arguments or exhortations could overcome. More forcible means were afterwards used to draw them into the pale of the church, in the wars which Charlemagne carried on, in the years 775, 776, and 780, against that valiant people, whose love of liberty was excessive, and whose aversion to every species of sacerdotal authority was inexpressible.[e] During these wars, their attachment to the superstition of their ancestors was so warmly combated by the allurements of reward, by the terror of punishment, and by the imperious language of victory, that they suffered themselves to be baptised, though with inward reluctance, by the missionaries whom the emperor sent among them for that purpose.[f] Fierce seditions, indeed, were soon after renewed, and fomented by Witekind and Albion, two of the most valiant among the Saxon chiefs, who attempted to abolish the Christian worship by the same violent methods which had contributed to its establishment. But the courage and liberality of Charlemagne, alternately employed to suppress this new rebellion, engaged these chiefs to make a public and solemn profession of Christianity in 785, and to promise an adherence to that divine religion for the rest of their days.[g] To prevent, however, the Saxons from renouncing a religion which they had embraced with reluc-

709.—Hist. Liter. de la France, tom. iv. p. 92, and Mabillon, in Annalibus Benedictinis.

[a] The French Benedictine monks ingenuously confess that Boniface was an over-zealous partizan of the Roman pontiff, and attributed more authority to him than was just and reasonable. Their words, in their Histoire Literaire de la France, tom. iv. p. 106, are as follow: "Il exprime son devouement pour le Saint Siege en des termes qui ne sont pas assez proportionnés à la dignité du caractere episcopal."

[b] Baronius, Annal. Eccles. tom. viii. ad annum 716. sect. 10. Car. Maichelbeck, Historia Frisingensis, tom. i.

[c] Herm. Bruschii, Chronologia Monaster. German. p. 30. Anton. Pagi, Critica in Annales Baronii, tom. ii. ad annum 759, sect. ix. Histoire Literaire de la France, tom. iv. p. 124.

[d] Hucbaldi Vita S. Lebuini in Laur. Surii Vitis Sanctor. d. 12. Nov. p. 277.—Jo. Molleri Cimbria Literata, tom. ii. p. 464.

[e] It will be proper here to transcribe, from the epistles of the famous Alcuin, once abbot of Canterbury, a remarkable passage, which will show us the reasons that contributed principally to give the Saxons an aversion to Christianity, and at the same time will expose the absurd and preposterous manner of teaching used by the ecclesiastics who were sent to convert them. This passage, in the 104th epistle, and 1647th page of his works, is as follows: "Si tanta instantia leve Christi jugum et onus ejus leve durissimo Saxonum populo prædicarentur, quanta decimarum redditivel legalis pro parvissimis quibuslibet culpis edictis necessitas exigebatur, forte baptismatis sacramenta non abhorrerent. Sint tandem aliquando doctores fidei apostolicis eruditi exemplis: sint prædicatores, non prædatores." Here the reader may see a lively picture of the kind of apostles that flourished at this time: apostles who were more zealous in exacting tithes, and extending their authority, than in propagating the sublime truths and precepts of the Gospel; and yet these very apostles are said to have wrought stupendous miracles.

[f] Alcuinus apud Gul. Malmesbur. de Gestis Regum Anglorum, lib. i. cap. iv. p. 23, inter Rer. Anglic. Script. edit. Francof. 1601. In this work we find the following passage, which proves what we have said with respect to the unworthy methods that were used in converting the Saxons. "Antiqui Saxones et omnes Fresonum populi, instante rege Carolo, alios præmiis et alios minis solicitante, ad fidem Christi conversi sunt." See also two passages in the Capitularia Regum Francor. tom. i. p. 246 and 252. From the first we learn, that those Saxons who abandoned the pagan superstitions were "restored to the liberty they had forfeited by the fate of arms, and freed from the obligation of paying tribute;" and in the second, we find the following severe law, that "every Saxon who contemptuously refused to receive the sacrament of baptism, and persisted in his adherence to Paganism, was to be punished with death." While such rewards and punishments were employed in the cause of religion, there was no occasion for miracles to advance its progress; for these motives were sufficient to draw all mankind to an hypocritical and external profession of the Gospel; but it is easy to imagine what sort of Christians the Saxons must have been, who were dragooned into the church in this abominable manner. Compare with the authors mentioned in this note, Launoius, de veteri More baptizandi Judæos et Infideles, cap. v. vi. p. 703, tom. ii. op. part ii. This author assures us, that Adrian, the first Roman pontiff of that name, honoured with his approbation Charlemagne's method of converting the Saxons.

[g] Eginhartus, de Vitâ Caroli M.—Adam Bremensis, lib. i. cap. viii. See also the writers of the history and exploits of Charlemagne, enu-

tance, many bishops were appointed to reside among them, schools also were erected, and monasteries founded, that the means of instruction might not be wanting. The same precautions were employed among the Huns in Pannonia, to maintain in the profession of Christianity that fierce people whom Charlemagne had converted to the faith, when, exhausted and dejected by various defeats, they were no longer able to make head against his victorious arms, and chose rather to be Christians than *slaves*.[a]

VII. Succeeding generations, filled with a grateful sense of the exploits which Charlemagne had performed in the service of Christianity, canonised his memory, and turned this bloody *warrior* into an eminent *saint*. In the twelfth century, Frederic I. emperor of the Romans, ordered Paschal II., whom he had raised to the pontificate, to enroll the name of this mighty conqueror among the tutelary saints of the church;[b] and indeed Charlemagne merited this honour, according to the opinions which prevailed in that dark period; for, to have enriched the clergy with large and magnificent donations,[c] and to have extended the boundaries of the church, no matter by what methods, were then considered as the highest merits, and as sufficient pretensions to the honour of *saintship*; but, in the esteem of those who judge of the nature and characters of sanctity by the decisions of the Gospel upon that head, the sainted emperor will appear to have been utterly unworthy of that dignity; for, not to enter into a particular detail of his vices, the number of which counterbalanced that of his virtues, it is undeniably evident, that his ardent and ill-conducted zeal for the conversion of the Huns, Friselanders, and Saxons, was more animated by the suggestions of ambition, than by a principle of true piety; and that his main view, in these religious exploits, was to subdue the converted nations under his dominion, and to tame them to his yoke, which they supported with impatience, and shook off by frequent revolts. It is, moreover, well known, that this boasted saint made no scruple of seeking the alliance of the infidel Saracens, that he might be more effectually enabled to crush the Greeks, notwithstanding their profession of the Christian religion.[d]

VIII. The many and stupendous miracles which are said to have been wrought by the Christian missionaries, who were sent to convert the barbarous nations, have lost, in our times, the credit they obtained in former ages. The corrupt discipline that then prevailed, admitted those fallacious stratagems, which are very improperly called *pious* frauds; nor did the heralds of the Gospel think it at all unlawful to terrify or allure to the profession of Christianity, by fictitious prodigies, those obdurate hearts which they could not subdue by reason and argument. It is not, however, to be supposed, that all those, who acquired renown by their miracles, were chargeable with this fanatical species of artifice and fraud; for as, on one hand, those ignorant and superstitious nations were disposed to look upon, as miraculous, every event which had an unusual aspect, so, on the other, the Christian doctors themselves were so uninstructed and superficial, so little acquainted with the powers of nature, and the relations and connexions of things in their ordinary course, that uncommon events, however natural, were considered by them as miraculous interpositions of the Most High. This will appear obvious to such as read, without superstition or partiality, the *Acts of the Saints* who flourished in this and the following centuries.

CHAPTER II.

Concerning the Calamitous Events that happened to the Church during this Century.

I. THE eastern empire had now fallen from its former strength and grandeur through the repeated shocks of dreadful revolutions, and the consuming power of intestine calamities. The throne was now become the seat of terror, inquietude, and suspicion; nor was any reign attended with an uninterrupted tranquillity. In this century three emperors were dethroned, loaded with ignominy, and sent into banishment. Under Leo the Isaurian, and his son Constantine, surnamed Copronymus, arose that fatal controversy about the worship of images, which proved a source of innumerable calamities and troubles, and weakened, almost incredibly, the force of the empire. These troubles and dissensions left the Saracens at liberty to ravage the provinces of Asia and Africa, to oppress the Greeks in the most barbarous manner, and to extend their territories and dominion on all sides, as also to oppose every where the progress of Christianity, and, in some places, even to extirpate it. But the troubles of the empire, and the calamities of the church, did not end here: for, about the middle of this century, they were assailed by new enemies, still more fierce and inhuman than those whose usurpations they had hitherto suffered. These were the Turks, a tribe of the Tartars, or at least their descendants, who, breaking forth from the inaccessible wilds about mount Caucasus, overspread Colchis, Iberia, and Albania, rushed into Armenia, and after having subdued the Saracens, turned their victorious arms against the Greeks, whom, in process of time, they reduced under their dominion.

II. In 714, the Saracens crossed the sea which separates Spain from Africa, dispersed the army of Roderic king of the Spanish Goths,[e] whose defeat was principally occasioned by the treachery of their general Julian, and made themselves masters of the greatest part of the territories of this vanquished prince. At that time the empire of the Visigoths, which had subsisted in Spain above three hundred years, was totally overturned by these fierce and savage invaders, who also took possession of all the maritime parts of Gaul, from the Pyrenean mountains to the river Rhone, whence they made frequent excursions, and ravaged the neighbouring countries with fire and sword.

The rapid progress of these bold invaders was, indeed, checked by Charles Martel, who gained a signal victory over them in a bloody action near Poictiers in 732.[f] But the vanquished spoilers soon recovered their strength and

merated by Jo. Alb. Fabricius, in his Bibliotheca Latina medii Ævi, tom. i. p. 950.

[a] Vita S. Rudberti in Henric. Canisii Lectionibus antiquis, tom. iii. part. ii. p. 340.—Pauli Debreceni Historia Ecclesiæ Reformat. in Hungar. et Transylvaniâ, a Lampio edita, cap. ii. p. 10.

[b] Henr. Canisii Lect., tom. iii. par. ii. p. 207.—Walchii Dissert. de Caroli Magni Canonizatione.

[c] Vid. Caroli Testamentum in Steph. Baluzii Capitularibus Regum Francor. tom. i. p. 487.

[d] See Basnage, Histoire des Juifs, tom. ix. chap. ii. p. 40.

[e] Jo. Mariana, Rerum Hispanicarum Hist. lib. vi. cap. xxi.—Renaudot, Historia Patriarch. Alexandrin. p. 253.—Jo. de Ferreras, Hist. de Espana, tom. ii. p. 425.

[f] Paulus Diaconus, de Gestis Longobard. lib. vi. cap. xlvi. liii.—

their ferocity, and returned with new violence to their devastations. This engaged Charlemagne to lead a formidable army into Spain, in the hope of delivering that whole country from the oppressive yoke of the Saracens: but this grand enterprise, though it did not entirely miscarry, was not attended with the signal success that was expected from it.[a]

The inroads of this warlike people were felt by several of the western provinces, beside those of France and Spain. Several parts of Italy suffered from their incursions; the island of Sardinia was reduced under their yoke; and Sicily was ravaged and oppressed by them in the most inhuman manner. Hence the Christian religion in Spain and Sardinia suffered inexpressibly under these violent usurpers.

In Germany, and the adjacent countries, the Christians were assailed by another sort of enemies; for all such as adhered to the pagan superstitions beheld them with the most inveterate hatred, and persecuted them with the most unrelenting violence and fury. Hence, in several places, castles and various fortifications were erected to restrain the incursions of these barbarian zealots.

Mariana, lib. vii. cap. iii.—Bayle's Dictionary, at the article Abderamus.—Ferreras, tom. ii. p. 463.

[a] Henr. de Bunau, Teutsche Keyser-und-Reichs-Historie, tom. ii. p 392.—Ferreras, tom. ii. p. 506. [b] Servati Lupi Vita Wigberti, p. 304.

PART II.

THE INTERNAL HISTORY OF THE CHURCH.

CHAPTER I.

Concerning the State of Letters and Philosophy during this Century.

1. Among the Greeks of this age were some men of genius and talents, who might have contributed to prevent the total decline of literature; but their zeal was damped by the tumults and desolations that reigned in the empire; and while both church and state were menaced with approaching ruin, the learned were left destitute of that protection which gives both vigour and success to the culture of the arts and sciences. Hence few or none of the Greeks were famous, either for elegance of diction, true wit, copious erudition, or a zealous attachment to the study of philosophy, and the investigation of truth. Frigid homilies, insipid narrations of the exploits of pretended saints, vain and subtle disputes about inessential and trivial subjects, vehement and bombastic declamations for or against the erection and worship of images, and histories composed without method or judgment, were the monuments of Grecian learning in this miserable age.

II. It must, however, be observed, that the Aristotelian philosophy was taught every where in the public schools, and was propagated in all places with considerable success. The doctrine of Plato had lost all its credit in the schools, after the repeated sentences of condemnation that had been passed upon the opinions of Origen, and the troubles which the Nestorian and Eutychian controversies had excited in the church; so that Platonism now was almost confined to the solitary retreats of the monastic orders. Of all the writers in this century, who contributed to the illustration and progress of the Aristotelian philosophy, the most eminent was John Damascenus, who composed a concise, yet comprehensive view of the doctrines of the Stagirite, for the instruction of the more ignorant, and in a manner adapted to common capacities. This little work excited numbers, both in Greece and Syria, to the study of that philosophy, whose proselytes increased daily. The Nestorians and Jacobites were also extremely diligent in the study of Aristotle's writings; and from this repository they armed themselves with sophisms and quibbles, which they employed against the Greeks in the controversy concerning the nature and person of Christ.

III. The literary history of the Latins exhibits innumerable instances of the grossest ignorance,[a] which will not, however, appear surprising to such as consider, with attention, the state of Europe in this century. If we except some poor remains of learning, which were yet to be found at Rome, and in certain cities of Italy,[b] the sciences seemed to have abandoned the continent, and fixed their residence in Britain and Ireland.[c] Those, therefore, of the Latin writers, who were distinguished by their learning and genius, were all (a few French and Italians excepted) either Britons or Hibernians, such as Alcuin, Bede, Egbert, Clemens, Dungallus, Acca, and others. Charlemagne, whose political talents were embellished by a considerable degree of learning, and an ardent zeal for the culture of the sciences, endeavoured to dispel the profound ignorance that reigned in his dominions; in which excellent undertaking he was animated and directed by the counsels of Alcuin. With this view he drew, first from Italy, and afterwards from Britain and Ireland, by his liberality, eminent men, who had distinguished themselves in the various branches of literature; and excited the several orders of the clergy and monks, by various encouragements, and the nobility, and others of eminent rank, by his own example, to the pursuit of knowledge in all its branches, human and divine.

IV. In the prosecution of this noble design, the greatest part of the bishops erected, by the express order of the emperor, cathedral schools, (so called from their contiguity to the principal church in each diocese,) in which the youth, set apart for the service of Christ, received a learned and religious education. Those abbots also, who had any zeal for the cause of Christianity, opened schools in their monasteries, in which the more learned of the fraternity instructed such as were designed for the monastic state, or the sacerdotal order, in the Latin language, and other branches of learning, suitable to their future destination. It was formerly believed that the university of Paris was erected by Charlemagne; but this opinion is rejected by such as have studied, with impartiality, the history of this age, though it is undeniably evident, that this great prince had the honour of laying, in some measure, the foundation of that noble institution, and that the beginnings from which it arose may be ascribed to him.[d] However this question be decided, it is certain, that the zeal of this emperor, for the propagation and advancement of letters, was very great, and manifested its ardour by a considerable number of excellent establishments; nor among others must we pass in silence the famous Palatine school, which he erected with a view to banish ignorance from his court, and in which the princes of the blood, and the children of the nobility, were educated by the most learned and illustrious masters of the times.[e]

V. These establishments were not, however, attended with the desired success; nor was the improvement of the youth, in learning and virtue, at all proportioned to the pains that were taken, and the bounty that was bestowed to procure them a liberal education. This, indeed, will not appear surprising, when we consider, that the most learned and renowned masters of these times were men of very little genius and abilities, and that their system of erudition and philosophy was nothing more than a lean and ghastly skeleton, equally unfit for ornament and use. The whole circle of science was composed of, what they

---

[a] See Steph. Baluz. Observat. ad Reginonum Prumiensem, p. 540.
[b] Lud. Ant. Muratori. Antiq. Italicæ medii Ævi, tom. iii. p. 811.
[c] Jac. Usserius, Præf. ad Syllogen Epistolarum Hibernicarum.
[d] The reasons that have been used, to prove Charlemagne the founder of the university of Paris, are accurately collected by Du Boulay, Historia Academiæ Paris. tom. i. p. 91. But they have been refuted by the following learned men in a victorious manner, viz. Mabillon, Act. Sanct. Ord. Benedict. tom. v. Præf. sect. 181, 182. Launoy. Claud. Joly, de Scholis.
[e] Boulay, tom. i. p. 281.—Mabillon, sect. 179.

called, the seven liberal arts, viz. grammar, rhetoric, logic, arithmetic, geometry, music, and astronomy;[a] the three former of which they distinguished by the title of *trivium*, and the four latter by that of *quadrivium*. Nothing can be conceived more wretchedly barbarous than the manner in which these sciences were taught, as we may easily perceive from Alcuin's treatise concerning them,[b] and from the dissertations of St. Augustin on the same subject, which were in the highest repute at this time. In the greatest part of the schools, the public teachers ventured no farther than the trivium, and confined their instructions to grammar, rhetoric, and logic; they, however, who, after passing the trivium and also the quadrivium, were desirous of rising yet higher in their literary pursuits, were exhorted to apply themselves to the study of Cassiodore and Boethius, as if the progress of human knowledge had been bounded by the discoveries of those two learned writers.

CHAPTER II.

Concerning the Doctors and Ministers of the Church, and its Form of Government during this Century.

I. THAT corruption of manners, which dishonoured the clergy in the former century, increased, instead of diminishing, in this, and discovered itself under the most odious characters, both in the eastern and western provinces. In the east there arose the most violent dissensions and quarrels among the bishops and doctors of the church, who, forgetting the duties of their stations, and the cause of Christ in which they were engaged, threw the state into combustion by their outrageous clamours and their scandalous divisions, and even went so far as to stain their hands with the blood of their brethren, who differed from them in opinion. In the western world, Christianity was not less disgraced by the lives and actions of those who pretended to be the luminaries of the church, and who ought to have been so in reality, by exhibiting examples of piety and virtue to their flock. The clergy abandoned themselves to their passions without moderation or restraint: they were distinguished by their luxury, their gluttony, and their lust; they gave themselves up to dissipations of various kinds, to the pleasures of hunting, and, what seemed still more remote from their sacred character, to military studies[c] and enterprises. They had also so far extinguished every principle of fear and shame, that they became incorrigible; nor could the various laws enacted against their vices by Carloman, Pepin, and Charlemagne, at all contribute to set bounds to their licentiousness, or to bring about their reformation.[d]

II. It is, indeed, amazing, that, notwithstanding the shocking nature of such vices, especially in a set of men whose profession required them to display to the world the attractive lustre of virtuous example; and notwithstanding the perpetual troubles and complaints which these vices occasioned; the clergy were still thought worthy of the highest veneration, and honoured, as a sort of deities, by the submissive multitude. This veneration for the bishops and clergy, and the influence and authority it gave them over the people, were, indeed, carried much higher in the west than in the eastern provinces; and the reasons of this difference will appear manifest to such as consider the customs and manners that prevailed among the barbarous nations, which were, at this time, masters of Europe, before their conversion to Christianity. All these nations, during their continuance under the darkness of paganism, were absolutely enslaved to their priests, without whose counsel and authority they transacted nothing of the least importance, either in civil or military affairs.[e] On their conversion to Christianity, they, therefore, thought proper to transfer to the ministers of their new religion, the rights and privileges of their former priests: and the Christian bishops, in their turn, were not only ready to accept the offer, but used all their diligence and dexterity to secure and assert, to themselves and their successors, the dominion and authority which the ministers of paganism had usurped over an ignorant and brutish people.

III. The honours and privileges, which the western nations had voluntarily conferred upon the bishops and other doctors of the church, were now augmented with new and immense accessions of opulence and authority. The endowments of the church and monasteries, and the revenues of the bishops, were hitherto considerable; but in this century a new and ingenious method was found out of acquiring much greater riches to the church, and of increasing its wealth through succeeding ages. An opinion prevailed universally at this time, though its authors are not known, that the punishment which the righteous judge of the world has reserved for the transgressions of the wicked, was to be prevented and annulled by liberal donations to God, to the saints, to the churches and clergy. In consequence of this notion, the great and opulent, who were, generally speaking, the most remarkable for their flagitious and abominable lives, offered, out of the abundance which they had received by inheritance, or acquired by rapine, rich donations to departed saints, their ministers upon earth, and the keepers of the temples that were erected to their honour, in order to avoid the sufferings and penalties annexed by the priests to transgression in this

---

[a] Herm. Conringii Antiquitat. Academicæ, Diss. iii. p. 80.—Jac. Thomasii Programmata, p. 368.—Observat. Halens. tom. vi. Obs. xiv. p. 118.

[b] Alcuini Opera, par. ii. p. 1245, edit. Quercetani. It is, however, to be observed, that the treatise of Alcuin, here referred to, is not only imperfect, but is almost entirely transcribed from Cassiodore.

[c] Steph. Baluzius, ad Reginon. Prumiensem, p. 563.—Wilkins, Concilia Magnæ Britanniæ, tom. i. p. 90.

[d] Steph. Baluz. Capitular. Regum Francor. tom. i. p. 189, 208, 275, 493, &c.

[e] Julius Cæsar, *de bello Gallico*, lib. vi. cap. 13. "Druides magno sunt apud eos honore: nam fere de omnibus controversiis, publicis privatisque, constituunt; et, si quod est admissum facinus, si cædes facta, si de hæreditate, si de finibus controversia est, iidem decernunt, præmia pœnasque constituunt: si quis aut privatus aut publicus eorum decreto non stetit, sacrificiis interdicunt.—Druides a bello abesse consueverunt, neque tributa unà cum reliquis pendunt: militiæ vacationem, omniumque rerum habent immunitatem. Tantis excitati præmiis, et suâ sponte multi in disciplinam conveniunt, et a parentibus propinquisque mittuntur." Tacitus (*de Mor. Germanorum*, cap. 7.) expresses also the power and authority of the priests or Druids in the following terms: "Neque enim animadvertere, neque vincire, neque verberare quidem, nisi sacerdotibus permissum, non quasi in pœnam, nec ducis jussu, sed velut Deo imperante;" and again, cap. ii. "Silentium per sacerdotes, quibus et tum coërcendi jus est, imperatur." Helmoldus (Chron. Sclavorum, lib. i. cap. xxxvi.) expresses himself to the same purpose. "Major flaminis quam regis, apud ipsos, veneratio est;" and again, lib. ii. cap. xii. "Rex apud eos modicæ æstimationis est comparatione flaminis; ille enim responsa perquirit;—rex et populus ad illius nutum pendent." This ancient custom of honouring their priests, and submitting in all things to their decisions, was still preserved by the Germans, and the other European nations, after their conversion to Christianity; and this furnishes a satisfactory answer to the question, how it came to pass that the Christian priesthood obtained in the west that enormous degree of authority, which is so contrary to the positive precepts of Christ, and the nature and genius of his divine religion.

life,[a] and to escape the misery denounced against the wicked in a future state. This new and commodious method of making atonement for iniquity, was the principal source of those immense treasures, which, from this period, began to flow in upon the clergy, the churches, and monasteries, and continued to enrich them through succeeding ages down to the present time.[b]

IV. But here it is highly worthy of observation, that the donations which princes and persons of the first rank presented, in order to make expiation for their sins, and to satisfy the justice of God and the demands of the clergy, did not merely consist of those *private* possessions, which every citizen may enjoy, and with which the churches and convents were already abundantly enriched; for these donations were carried to a much more extravagant length, and the church was endowed with several of those *public* grants, which are peculiar to princes and sovereign states, and which are commonly called *regalia*, or royal domains. Emperors, kings, and princes, signalized their superstitious veneration for the clergy, by investing bishops, churches, and monasteries, with princely possessions. Those who, by their holy profession, were appointed to proclaim to the world the vanity of human grandeur, and to inspire the minds of men, by their instructions and their example, with a noble contempt of sublunary things, became themselves scandalous spectacles of worldly pomp, ambition, and splendour; were created dukes, counts, and marquisses, judges, legislators, and sovereigns; and not only gave laws to nations, but also, upon many occasions, gave battle to their enemies at the head of numerous armies of their own raising. It is here that we are to look for the source of those dreadful tumults and calamities that spread desolation through Europe in after-times, particularly of those bloody wars concerning investitures, and those obstinate contentions and disputes about the *regalia*.

V. The excessive donations that were made to the clergy, and the extravagant liberality that augmented daily the treasures of the European churches, (to which those donations and this liberality were totally confined,) began in this century; nor do we find any examples of the like munificence in preceding times. Hence we may conclude, that these donations were owing to customs peculiar to the European nations, and to the maxims of policy which were established among those warlike people. The kings of these nations, who were employed either in usurpation or self-defence, endeavoured, by all means, to attach warmly to their interests those whom they considered as their friends and clients; and, for this purpose, they distributed among them extensive territories, cities, and fortresses, with the various rights and privileges belonging to them, reserving to themselves only the supreme dominion, and the military service of their powerful vassals. This then being the method of governing customary in Europe, it was esteemed by princes a high instance of political prudence to distribute among the bishops, and other Christian doctors, the same sort of donations that they had formerly made to their generals and clients; for it is not to be believed, that superstition alone was always the principle that drew forth their liberality. They expected greater fidelity and loyalty from a set of men who were bound by the obligations of religion, and consecrated to the service of God, than from a body of nobility, composed of fierce and impetuous warriors, and accustomed to little else but bloodshed and rapine; and they hoped also to check the seditious and turbulent spirits of their vassals, and maintain them in their obedience, by the influence and authority of the bishops, whose commands were highly respected, and whose spiritual thunderbolts, rendered formidable by ignorance, struck terror into the boldest and most resolute hearts.[c]

VI. This prodigious accession to the opulence and authority of the clergy in the west began with their head, the Roman pontiff, and spread gradually from him among the inferior bishops, and also among the sacerdotal and monastic orders. The barbarous nations, who received the Gospel, looked upon the bishop of Rome as the successor of their chief *druid*, or high priest. And as this tremendous druid had enjoyed, under the darkness of paganism, a boundless authority, and had been treated with a degree of veneration, that, through its servile excess, degenerated into terror; so the barbarous nations, on their conversion to Christianity, thought proper to confer upon the chief of the bishops the same honours and the same authority that had formerly been vested in their arch-druid.[d] The pope received, with something more than a mere spiritual delight, these august privileges; and lest, upon any change of affairs, attempts might be made to

[a] The temporal penalties here mentioned were rigorous fasts, bodily pains and mortifications, long and frequent prayers, pilgrimages to the tombs of saints and martyrs, and the like austerities. These were the penalties which the priests imposed upon such as had confessed their crimes; and as they were singularly grievous to those who had led voluptuous lives, and were desirous of continuing in the same course of licentious pleasure, effeminacy, and ease, the richer sort of transgressors embraced eagerly this new method of expiation, and willingly gave a part of their substance to avoid such severe and rigorous penalties.

[b] Hence, by a known form of speech, they who offered donations to the church or clergy were said to do this for *the redemption of their souls*; and the gifts themselves were generally called *the price of transgression*. See Lud. Ant. Muratori Diss. de Redemptione Peccatorum, in his Antiquitates Italicæ medii Ævi, tom. v. p. 712.

[c] The account here given of the rise of the clergy to such enormous degrees of opulence and authority, is corroborated by the following remarkable passage of William of Malmesbury (lib. v. de Rebus gestis Regum Angliæ.) "Carolus Magnus, pro contundendâ gentium illarum ferociâ, omnes pene terras ecclesiis contulerat, consiliosissime perpendens, nolle sacri ordinis homines, tam facile quam laicos, fidelitatem Domini rejicere; præterea, si laici rebellarent, illos posse excommunicationis auctoritate et potentiæ severitate compescere." This is, doubtless, the true reason why Charlemagne, who was far from being a superstitious prince, or a slave to the clergy, augmented so vastly the jurisdiction of the Roman pontiff in Germany, Italy, and the other countries where he had extended his conquests, and accumulated upon the bishops such ample possessions. He expected more loyalty and submission from the clergy, than from the laity; and he augmented the riches and authority of the former, in order to secure his throne against the assaults of the latter. As the bishops were universally held in the highest veneration, he made use of their influence in checking the rebellious spirit of his dukes, counts, and knights, who were frequently very troublesome. For instance, he had much to fear from the dukes of Benevento, Spoleto, and Capua, when the government of the Lombards was overturned; he therefore made over a considerable part of Italy to the Roman pontiff, whose ghostly authority, opulence, and threatenings, were so proper to restrain those powerful and vindictive princes from seditious insurrections, or to quell such tumults as they might venture to excite. Nor was he the only prince who honoured the clergy from such political views; the other kings and princes of Europe acted much in the same manner, and from the same principles, as will appear evident to all who consider, with attention, the forms of government, and the methods of governing, that took place in this century: so that the successive augmentation of sacerdotal opulence and authority, which many look upon as the work of superstition alone, was, in many instances, an effect of political prudence. We shall consider, presently, the terrors of excommunication, which William of Malmesbury touches but cursorily in the latter words of the passage above quoted.

[d] Cæsar speaks thus of the chief or arch-druid: "His omnibus druidibus præest unus, qui summam inter eos (Celtas) habet auctoritatem.

deprive him of them, he strengthened his title to these extraordinary honours, by a variety of passages drawn from ancient history, and (what was still more astonishing) by arguments of a religious nature. This conduct of a superstitious people swelled the arrogance of the Roman druid to an enormous size, and gave to the see of Rome, in civil and political affairs, a high pre-eminence and a despotic authority, unknown to former ages. Hence, among other unhappy circumstances, arose that monstrous and most pernicious opinion, that such persons as were excluded from the communion of the church by the pontiff himself, or any of the bishops, forfeited thereby not only their civil rights and advantages as citizens, but even the common claims and privileges of humanity. This horrid opinion, which was a fatal source of wars, massacres, and rebellions without number, and which contributed more than any other means to augment and confirm the papal authority, was, unhappily for Europe, borrowed by Christians, or rather by the clergy, from the pagan superstitions.[a]

VII. We observe, in the annals of the French nation, the following remarkable and shocking instance of the enormous power that was, at this time, vested in the Roman pontiff. Pepin was mayor of the palace to Childeric III., and, in the exercise of that high office, possessed in reality the royal power and authority; but, not content with this, he aspired to the titles and honours of majesty, and formed the design of dethroning his sovereign. For this purpose, the states of the realm were assembled by Pepin, in 751; and though they were devoted to the interests of this ambitious usurper, they gave it as their opinion, that the bishop of Rome was previously to be consulted, whether the execution of such a project was lawful or not. In consequence of this, ambassadors were sent by Pepin to Zachary, the reigning pontiff, with the following question: Whether the divine law did not permit a valiant and warlike people to dethrone a pusillanimous and indolent monarch, who was incapable of discharging any of the functions of royalty, and to substitute in his place one more worthy to rule, and who had already rendered most important services to the state? The situation of Zachary, who stood much in need of the aid of Pepin against the Greeks and Lombards, rendered his answer such as the usurper desired. When this favourable decision of the Roman oracle was published in France, the unhappy Childeric was stripped of royalty without the least opposition; and Pepin, without the smallest resistance from any quarter, stepped into the throne of his master and his sovereign. Let the abettors of the papal authority see how they can justify, in Christ's pretended vicegerent upon earth, a decision which is so glaringly repugnant to the laws and precepts of the divine Saviour.[b] This decision was solemnly confirmed by Stephen II., the successor of Zachary. He undertook a journey into France, in 754, in order to solicit assistance against the Lombards; dissolved the obligation of the oath of fidelity and allegiance which Pepin had sworn to Childeric, and violated by his usurpation; and, to render his title to the crown as sacred as possible, anointed and crowned him, with his wife and two sons, for the second time.[c]

VIII. This compliance of the Roman pontiffs proved an abundant source of opulence and credit to the church, and to its aspiring ministers. When that part of Italy which was yet subject to the Grecian empire, was involved in confusion and trouble, by the seditions and tumults which arose from the imperial edicts[d] against the erection and worship of images, the kings of the Lombards employed the united influence of their arms and negotiations in order to terminate these contests. Their success, indeed, was only advantageous to themselves; for they managed matters so

---

Hoc mortuo, si qui ex reliquis excellit dignitate, succedit. At, si sunt plures pares, suffragio Druidum adlegitur: nonnunquam etiam armis de principatu contendunt." Jul. Cæsar, de Bello Gallico, lib. vi. cap. xiii.

[a] Though excommunication, from the time of Constantine the Great, was, in every part of the Christian world, attended with many disagreeable effects, yet its highest terrors were confined to Europe, where its aspect was truly formidable and hideous. It acquired also, in the eighth century, new accessions of terror; so that, from that period, the excommunication practised in Europe differed entirely from that which was in use in other parts of Christendom. Excommunicated persons were indeed considered, in all places, as objects of aversion both to God and men; but they were not, on this account, robbed of the privileges of citizens, or of the rights of humanity; much less were those kings and princes, whom an insolent bishop had thought proper to exclude from the communion of the church, supposed to forfeit, on that account, their crown or their territories. But from this century, it was quite otherwise in Europe; excommunication received that infernal power which dissolved all connexions; so that those whom the bishops, or their chief, excluded from church communion, were degraded to a level with the beasts. Under this horrid sentence, the king, the ruler, the husband, the father, and even the *man*, forfeited all their rights, all their advantages, the claims of nature, and the privileges of society. What then was the origin of this unnatural power which excommunication acquired? It was briefly as follows: On the conversion of the barbarous nations to Christianity, those new and ignorant proselytes confounded the excommunication in use among Christians, with that which had been practised in the times of paganism by the priests of the gods, and considered both as of the same nature and effect. The Roman pontiffs, on the other hand, were too artful not to countenance and encourage this error; and, therefore, employed all sorts of means to gain credit to an opinion that tended to gratify their ambition, and to aggrandise, in general, the episcopal order. That this is the true origin of the extensive and horrid influence of the European and papal excommunication, will appear evident to such as cast an eye upon the following passage of Cæsar, de Bello Gallico, lib. vi. cap. xiii. "Si quis aut privatus aut publicus Druidum decreto non stetit, sacrificiis interdicunt. Hæc pœna est apud eos gravissima. Quibus ita est interdictum, ii numero impiorum et sceleratorum habentur, iis omnes decedunt, aditum eorum sermonemque defugiunt, ne quid ex contagione incommodi accipiant; neque iis petentibus jus redditur, neque honos ullus communicatur."

[b] See Le Cointe, Mezeray, Daniel, and other Gallic and German historians, concerning this important event; but particularly Bossuet, Defens. Declarationis Cleri Gallicani, part i. p. 225.—Petr. Rival. Dissertations Histor. et Critiques sur divers Sujets, Diss. ii. p. 70; Diss. iii. p. 156.—Henr. de Bunau, Historia Imperii Germanici, tom. ii. p. 288. This remarkable event is not, indeed, related in the same manner by all historians, and it is generally represented under false colours by those who, from a spirit of blind zeal and excessive adulation, seize every occasion of exalting the dignity and authority of the bishops of Rome. Such writers assert, that it was by Zachary's authority as pontiff, and not in consequence of his opinion as a casuist or divine, that the crown was taken from the head of Childeric, and placed upon that of Pepin. But this the French absolutely and justly deny. Had it, however, been so, the crime of the pontiff would have been much greater than it was in reality.

☞ [c] Pepin had been anointed by the legate Boniface at Soissons, soon after his election; but, thinking that the performance of such a ceremony by the pope would recommend him more to the respect of his subjects, he desired that the unction should be administered anew by Stephen. Pepin was the first French monarch who received this unction as a ceremony of coronation, at least according to the reports of the most credible historians. His predecessors were proclaimed by being lifted up on a shield; and the *holy phial* of Clovis is now universally regarded as fabulous. The custom of anointing kings at their coronation was, however, more ancient than the time of Pepin, and was observed long before that period both in Scotland and Spain. See Edmund Martenne, de Antiq. Eccles. Ritib. tom. iii. cap. x.; and also Bunau, Historia Imperii Germanici, tom. ii. p. 301, 366.

☞ [d] The author has here in view the edicts of Leo Isauricus and Constantine Copronymus. The former published, in 726, a famous edict against the worship of images, which occasioned many contests and much disturbance both in church and state; and the latter assembled at Constantinople, in 754, a council of 358 bishops, who unanimously condemned, not only the *worship*, but even the *use* of images.

as to become, by degrees, masters of the Grecian provinces in Italy, which were subject to the exarch who resided at Ravenna. One of these monarchs, named Aistulphus, carried his views still farther. Elate with these accessions to his dominions, he meditated the conquest of Rome and its territory, and formed the ambitious project of reducing all Italy under the yoke of the Lombards. Stephen now addressed himself to his powerful patron and protector Pepin, represented to him his deplorable condition, and implored his assistance. The French monarch embarked with zeal in the cause of the terrified and suppliant pontiff; crossed the Alps, in 754, with a numerous army; and, having defeated Aistulphus, obliged him, by a solemn treaty, to deliver up to the see of Rome the exarchate of Ravenna, Pentapolis, and all the cities, castles, and territories, which he had seized in the Roman dukedom. It was not, however, long before the Lombard prince violated, without remorse, an engagement which he had contracted with reluctance. In 755, he laid siege to Rome for the second time, but was again obliged to sue for peace by the victorious arms of Pepin, who returned into Italy, and, forcing the Lombard to execute the treaty he had so audaciously violated, made a new grant of the exarchate[a] and of Pentapolis to the pontiff and his successors. And thus was the bishop of Rome raised to the rank of a temporal prince.

IX. After the death of Pepin, a new attack was made upon the patrimony of St. Peter, by Dideric, king of the Lombards, who invaded the territories that had been granted by the French monarch to the see of Rome. In this extremity, pope Adrian I. fled for succour to Charles, the son of Pepin, who, on account of his heroic exploits, was afterwards distinguished by the name of Charlemagne. This prince, whose enterprising genius led him to seize with avidity every opportunity of extending his conquests, and whose veneration for the Roman see was carried very far, as much from the dictates of policy as superstition, adopted immediately the cause of the trembling pontiff. He passed the Alps with a formidable army, in 774; overturned the empire of the Lombards in Italy, which had subsisted above two hundred years; sent their exiled monarch into France, and proclaimed himself king of the Lombards. These conquests offered to Charlemagne an occasion of visiting Rome, where he not only confirmed the grants which had been made by his father to that see, but added to them new donations, and ceded to the Roman pontiffs several cities and provinces in Italy, which had not been contained in Pepin's grant. What those cities and provinces were, is a question difficult to be resolved at this period, as it is perplexed with much obscurity, from the want of authentic records.[b]

X. By this act of liberality, which seems to carry in it the contradictory characters of policy and imprudence, Charlemagne opened for himself a passage to the empire of the west, and to the supreme dominion over the city of Rome and its territory, upon which the western empire seemed then to depend.[c] He had, no doubt, been meditating for a considerable time this arduous project, which his father Pepin had probably formed before him; but the circumstances of the times obliged him to wait for a favourable occasion of putting it in execution. This was offered him in 800, when the affairs of the Greeks were reduced to extremity after the death of Leo III., and the barbarous murder of his son Constantine, and while the

[a] See Car. Sigonius, de Regno Italiæ, lib. iii. p. 202, tom. ii. op.—Bunau, Historia Imperii Germanici, tom. ii. p. 301, 366.—Muratori, Annales Italiæ, tom. iv. p. 310. The real limits of the exarchate granted by Pepin to the Roman pontiff, have been much controverted among the learned, and have, particularly in our times, employed the researches of several eminent writers. The bishops of Rome extend the limits of this territory as far as they can with any appearance of decency or probability, while their adversaries are as zealous in contracting this famous grant within narrower bounds. See Lud. Ant. Murator. Droits de l'Empire sur l'Etat Ecclesiastique, cap. i. ii.; as also his Antiquitat. Ital. medii Ævi, tom. i. p. 64, 68, 986, 987. The same author treats the matter with more circumspection, tom. v. p. 790. This controversy can only be terminated with facility by an inspection of Pepin's grant of the territory in question. Fontanini, in his first Defence of the temporal Jurisdiction of the See of Rome over the City of Commachio, written in Italian, intimates that this grant is yet extant, and even makes use of some phrases that are said to be contained in it (see the pages 242 and 346 of that work.) This, however, will scarcely be believed. Were it indeed true, that such a deed remains, its being published to the world would be, undoubtedly, unfavourable to the pretensions and interests of the church of Rome. It is at least certain, that, in the dispute between the emperor Joseph I. and the Roman pontiff concerning Commachio, the partizans of the latter, though frequently called upon by those of the emperor to produce this grant, refused constantly to comply with this demand. On the other hand, it must be confessed, that Bianchini, in his Prolegom. ad Anastasium de Vitis Pontif. Rom. has given us, from a Farnesian manuscript, a specimen of this grant, which seems to carry the marks of remote antiquity. Be that as it may, a multitude of witnesses unite in assuring us, that the remorse of a wounded conscience was the source of Pepin's liberality, and that his grant to the Roman pontiff was the superstitious remedy by which he hoped to expiate his enormities, and particularly his horrid perfidy to his master Childeric.

[b] See Car. Sigonius, de Regno Italiæ, lib. iii. p. 223. tom. ii. op.—Bunau, Historia Imperii Germanici, tom. ii. p. 368.—Petr. de Marca, de Concordiâ Sacerdotii et Imperii, lib. i. cap. xii. p. 67.—Lud. Anton. Muratori Droits de l'Empire sur l'Etat Ecclesiastique, cap. ii. p. 147.—Conringius, de Imperio Roman. German. cap. vi. The extent of Charlemagne's grant to the see of Rome is as much disputed as the magnitude of Pepin's donation between the partizans of the pope, and those of the emperor. They who plead the cause of the Roman see, maintain that Corsica, Sardinia, Sicily, the territory of Sabino, the duchy of Spoleto, and several other districts, were solemnly granted by Charlemagne to St. Peter and his successors. They, on the other hand, who assert the rights of the emperor, diminish as far as they can the munificence of Charles, and confine this new grant within narrow limits. The reader may consult upon this subject the authors of the present age, who have published their opinions of the pretensions of the emperors and the popes to the cities of Commachio and Florence, and the duchies of Parma and Placentia; but above all, the learned Berret's excellent treatise, entitled Dissertatio Chorographica de Italiâ medii Ævi, f. 33. The spirit of party seems, in this controversy, as in many others, to have blinded the disputants on both sides of the question; and this, together with the difficulty of avoiding mistakes upon a point involved in such deep obscurity, has, in many cases, rendered the truth invisible to both the contending parties. With respect to the motives that induced Charlemagne to make this grant, they are much less doubtful than the extent of the grant itself. Adrian affirms that the monarch's view was to *atone for his sins* by this act of liberality to the church, as we see in a letter from that pontiff to Charlemagne, which is published in Muratori's Scriptores Rerum Italicar. tom. iii. part ii. p. 265, and of which the following passage is remarkable: "Venientes ad nos de Capeâ, quam beato Petro apostolorum principi pro mercede animæ vestræ atque sempiternâ memoriâ cum ceteris civitatibus obtulistis." It is not indeed improbable, that Charlemagne, who affected that kind of piety which was the characteristic of this barbarous age, mentioned this superstitious motive in the act of cession by which he confirmed his donation to the church; but such as are acquainted with the character of this prince, and the history of this period, will be cautious in attributing his generosity to this religious principle alone. His grand motive was, undoubtedly, of an ambitious kind; he was obstinately bent upon adding the western empire to his dominions; and the success of this grand project depended much upon the consent and assistance of the pope, whose approbation, in those times, was sufficient to sanctify the most iniquitous projects. Thus Charlemagne lavished gifts upon the bishops of Rome, that, by their assistance, he might assume, with a certain air of decency, the empire of the west, and confirm his new dominion in Italy. Of this policy we have already taken notice, and it must appear manifest to all who view things with the smallest degree of impartiality and attention.

[c] Charles, in reality, was already emperor of the west, that is, the most powerful of the European monarchs. He wanted, therefore, nothing more than the title of emperor, and the supreme dominion in Rome and its territory, both of which he obtained by the assistance of Leo III.

impious Irene held the reins of empire. This opportunity was seized with avidity by Charles, who set out for Rome, where he was received with lively demonstrations of zeal by the sovereign pontiff,[a] who had entered into his views, and persuaded the people, elate at this time with high notions of their independence and elective power, to unite their suffrages in favour of this prince, and proclaim him emperor of the west.[b]

XI. Charles, on his elevation to the empire of the west and the government of Rome, seems to have reserved to himself the supreme dominion, and the inalienable rights of majesty, while he granted to the church of Rome a subordinate jurisdiction over that great city and its annexed territory.[c] This grant was undoubtedly suggested to him by the ambitious pontiff as a matter of sacred and indispensable obligation; and many fictitious deeds were probably produced to make out the pretensions, and justify the claims of the church to this high degree of temporal authority and civil jurisdiction. In order to reconcile the new emperor to this grant, it was without doubt alleged, that Constantine the Great, his renowned predecessor, when he removed the seat of empire to Constantinople, delivered up Rome, the old metropolis, with its adjacent territories, commonly called the Roman dukedom, to be possessed and governed by the church, with no other restriction, than that this should be no detriment to his supreme dominion; and it was insinuated to Charles, that he could not depart from the rule established by that pious emperor, without incurring the wrath of God, and the indignation of St. Peter.[d]

XII. While the power and opulence of the Roman pontiffs were rising to the greatest height by the events which we have now been relating, they received a mortifying check in consequence of a quarrel which broke out between those haughty priests and the Grecian emperors. Leo the Isaurian, and his son Constantine Copronymus, incensed at the zeal which Gregory II. and III. discovered for the worship of images, not only confiscated the treasures and lands which the church of Rome possessed in Sicily, Calabria, and Apulia, but also withdrew the bishops of these countries, and likewise the various provinces and churches of Illyricum, from the jurisdiction of the Roman see, and subjected them to the spiritual dominion of the bishop of Constantinople. And so inflexibly were the Grecian emperors bent upon humbling the arrogance of the Roman pontiffs, that no entreaties, supplications, or threats, could engage them to abandon their purpose, or to restore this rich and signal portion of St. Peter's patrimony to his greedy successors.[e] It is here that we must look for the original source, and the principal cause of that vehe-

[a] Leo III.

[b] See the historians who have transmitted to us accounts of this century, and more especially Bunau, in his Hist. Imperii Romano-German. tom. ii. p. 537. The partisans of the Roman pontiffs generally maintain that Leo III., by a *divine* right, vested in him as bishop of Rome, transferred the western empire from the Greeks to the Franks, and conferred it upon Charlemagne, the monarch of the latter. Hence they conclude, that the Roman pontiff, as the vicar of Christ, is the supreme lord of the whole earth, and, in a particular manner, of the Roman empire. The temerity of these pretensions, and the absurdity of this reasoning, are exposed with much learning and judgment by the celebrated Fred. Spanheim, de fictâ translatione Imperii in Carolum M. per Leonem III. tom. ii. op. p. 557.

[c] That Charlemagne, in effect, preserved entire his supreme authority over the city of Rome and its adjacent territory, gave law to the citizens by judges of his own appointment, punished malefactors, enjoyed the prerogatives, and exercised all the functions of royalty, has been demonstrated by several of the learned in the most ample and satisfactory manner, and confirmed by the most unexceptionable and authentic testimonies. To be convinced of this, it will be sufficient to consult Muratori's Droits de l'Empire sur l'Etat Ecclesiastique, cap. vi. p. 77. And, indeed, they must have a strange power of resisting the clearest evidence, who are absurd enough to assert, as does Fontanini, in his treatise, entitled Dominio della S. Sede sopra Commachio, Diss. i. c. 95, 96, that Charles sustained at Rome the character of the *advocate* of the Roman church, and not that of its sovereign or its lord, the dominion of the pontiff being unlimited and universal. On the other hand, we must acknowledge ingenuously, that the power of the pontiff, both in the city of Rome and its annexed territory, was very great, and that, in several cases, he seemed to act with a princely authority. But the extent and the foundations of that authority are concealed in the deepest obscurity, and have given occasion to endless disputes. Muratori maintains in his work above cited, p. 102, that the bishop of Rome discharged the function of *exarch* or *vicar*, to the emperor; an opinion which Clement XI. rejected as injurious to the papal dignity, and which, indeed, does not appear to have any solid foundation. After a careful examination of all the circumstances that can contribute toward the solution of this perplexed question, the most probable account of the matter seems to be this: That the Roman pontiff possessed the city of Rome and its territory, by the same right by which he held the exarchate of Ravenna, and the other lands granted by Charlemagne; that is to say, he possessed Rome by a feudal tenure, though charged with fewer marks of dependence than other fiefs generally are, on account of the lustre and dignity of a city which had been so long the capital of the empire. This opinion derives much strength from what we shall have occasion to observe in the following note, and it has the peculiar advantage of reconciling the jarring testimonies of ancient writers, and the various records of antiquity relating to this point.

[d] Most writers are of opinion, that Constantine's pretended grant was posterior to this period, and was forged in the tenth century. It appears to me, on the contrary, that this fictitious grant was in being in the eighth century; and it is extremely probable, that both Adrian and his successor Leo III. made use of it to persuade Charlemagne to that donation. In favour of this opinion we have the unexceptionable testimony of Adrian himself in his letter to Charlemagne, which is published in Muratori's Rerum Italicarum Scriptores, tom. iii. p. ii. p. 194, and which is extremely worthy of an attentive perusal. In this letter, Adrian exhorts Charles, before his elevation to the empire, to order the restitution of all the grants and donations that had formerly been made to St. Peter and to the church of Rome. In this demand also he distinguishes, in the plainest manner, the donation of Constantine from those of the other princes and emperors, and what is particularly remarkable, from the *exarchate* which was the gift of Pepin, and even from the additions that Charles had already made to his father's grant; whence we may justly conclude, that by *the donation of* Constantine, Adrian meant the city of Rome, and its annexed territory. He speaks first of this grant in the following terms: "Deprecamur vestram excellentiam... pro Dei amore et ipsius clavigeri regni cœlorum... ut secundum promissionem quam polliciti estis eidem Dei apostolo pro animæ vestræ mercede et stabilitate regni vestri, omnia nostris temporibus adimplere jubeatis ... et sicut temporibus beati Silvestri Romani pontificis, a sanctæ recordationis piissimo Constantino M. imperatore, per ejus largitatem (here Constantine's donation is evidently mentioned) sancta Dei catholica et apostolica Romana ecclesia elevata atque exaltata est, et potestatem in his Hesperiæ partibus largiri dignatus est; ita et in his vestris felicissimis temporibus atque nostris sancta Dei ecclesia germinet... et amplius atque amplius exaltata permaneat... quia ecce novus Christianissimus Dei gratiâ Constantinus imperator (here we see Charles, who at that time was only a *king*, styled *emperor* by the pontiff, and compared with Constantine) his temporibus surrexit, per quem omnia Deus sanctæ suæ ecclesiæ... largiri dignatus est." So much for that part of the letter that relates to Constantine's grant; as to the other donations which the pontiff evidently distinguishes from it, observe what follows: "Sed et cuncta alia quæ per diversos imperatores patricios, etiam et alios Deum timentes, pro eorum animæ mercede et veniâ delictorum, in partibus Turciæ, Spoleto, seu Benevento, atque Corsicâ, simul et Pavinensi patrimonio, beato Petro apostolo concessa sunt, et per nefandam gentem Longobardorum per annorum spatia abstracta et ablata sunt, vestris temporibus restituantur." (The pontiff intimates farther, that all these grants were carefully preserved in the office of the Lateran, and that he sends them to Charles by his legates.) "Unde et plures donationes in sacro nostro scrinio Lateranensi reconditas habemus, tamen et pro satisfactione Christianissimi regni vestri, per jam fatos viros, ad demonstrandum eas vobis, direximus, et pro hoc petimus eximiam præcellentiam vestram, ut in integro ipsa patrimonia beato Petro et nobis restituere jubeatis." By this it appears that Constantine's grant was now in being among the archives of the Lateran, and was sent to Charlemagne with the other donations of kings and princes, whose examples were adduced with a view of exciting his liberality to the church.

[e] See Mich. Lequien's Oriens Christianus, tom. i. p. 96. Among the Greek writers also Theophanes and others acknowledge the fact; but they are not entirely agreed about the reasons to which it is to be attributed.

ment contest between the Roman pontiff and the bishop of Constantinople, which, in the following century, divided the Greek and Latin churches, and proved so pernicious to the interests and advancement of true Christianity.—These lamentable divisions, which wanted no new incident to foment them, were nevertheless augmented by a controversy which arose, in this century, concerning the derivation of the Holy Spirit, which we shall have occasion to mention more largely in its proper place. It is more than probable that this controversy would have been terminated with the utmost facility, had not the spirits of the contending parties been previously exasperated by disputes founded upon avarice and ambition, and carried on, without either moderation or decency, by the *holy* patriarchs of Rome and Constantinople, in defence of their respective pretensions.

XIII. The monastic discipline was extremely relaxed at this time both in the eastern and western provinces, and, as appears by the concurring testimonies of the writers of this century, had fallen into a total decay. The only monks who escaped this general corruption, were those who passed their days in the deserts of Egypt, Syria, and Mesopotamia, amidst the austerities of a wretched life, remote from all the comforts of human society: yet the merit of having preserved their discipline was sadly counterbalanced by the gross ignorance, the fanatical madness, and the sordid superstition that reigned among these miserable hermits. Those of the monastic orders, who lived nearer to cities and populous towns, frequently disturbed the public tranquillity by the tumults and seditions they fomented among the multitude, so that it became necessary to check their rebellious ambition by the severe laws that were enacted against them by Constantine Copronymus, and other emperors. The greatest part of the western monks followed, at this time, the rule of St. Benedict; though there were every where convents which adopted the discipline of other orders.[a] But, as they increased in opulence, they lost sight of all rules, and submitted, at length, to no other discipline than that of intemperance, voluptuousness, and sloth.[b] Charlemagne attempted, by various edicts, to put a stop to this growing evil; but his efforts were attended with little success.[c]

XIV. This general depravity and corruption of the monks gave rise to a new order of priests in the west, a sort of middle order between the *monks* or *regulars*, and the *secular clergy*. This new species of ecclesiastics adopted the monastic discipline and manner of life, so far as to have their dwelling and their table in common, and to assemble at certain hours for divine service; but they entered not into the vows which were peculiar to the monks, and they were also appointed to discharge the ministerial functions in certain churches which were committed to their pastoral direction. These ecclesiastics were at first called *fratres dominici*, but soon after received the name of *canons*.[d] The common opinion attributes the institution of this order to Chrodegangus, bishop of Metz; nor is this opinion destitute of truth;[e] for though, before this time, there were in Italy, Africa, and other provinces, convents of ecclesiastics, who lived after the manner of the *canons*,[f] yet Chrodegangus, who, toward the middle of this century, subjected to this rule the clergy of Metz, not only added to their religious ceremonies the custom of singing hymns and anthems to God, at certain hours, and probably a variety of rites, but also, by his example, excited the Franks, the Italians, and the Germans, to distinguish themselves by their zeal in favour of the canons, to erect colleges for them, and to introduce their rule into their respective countries.

XV. The supreme dominion over the church and its possessions was vested in the emperors and kings, both in the eastern and western world. The sovereignty of the Grecian emperors, in this respect, has never been contested; and though the partisans of the Roman pontiffs endeavour to render dubious the supremacy of the Latin monarchs over the church, yet this supremacy is too manifest to be disputed by such as have considered the matter attentively;[g] and it is acknowledged by the wisest and most candid writers, even of the Romish communion. Adrian I., in a council of bishops assembled at Rome, conferred upon Charlemagne and his successors the right of election to the see of Rome;[h] and though neither Charlemagne, nor his son Louis, were willing to exercise this power in all its extent, by naming and creating the pontiff upon every vacancy, yet they reserved the right of approving and confirming the person who was elected to that high dignity by the priests and people: nor was the consecration of the elected pontiff of the least validity, unless performed in presence of the emperor's ambassadors.[i] The Roman pontiffs obeyed the laws of the emperors, received their judicial decisions as of indispensable obligation, and executed them with the utmost punctuality and submission.[k] The kings of the Franks appointed extraordinary judges, whom they called *envoys*, to inspect the lives and manners of the clergy, superior and inferior, take cognizance of their contests, terminate their disputes, enact laws concerning the public worship, and punish the crimes of the sacred order, as well as those of the other citizens.[l] All churches also, and monasteries, were obliged to pay to the

[a] See Mabillon, Præf. ad acta SS. Ord. Benedicti, Sæc. i. p. 24. and Sæc. iv. part i. p. 26.

[b] The author mentioned in the preceding note, discourses with a noble frankness and courage concerning the corruption of the monks, and its various causes, in the same work, Præf. ad Sæc. iv. part i. p. 64.

[c] See the Capitularia Caroli, published by Baluze, tom. i. p. 148, 157, 237, 355, 366, 375, 503. Laws so severe, and so often repeated, show evidently that the corruption of the monks must have been truly enormous.

[d] See Le Bœuf, Memoires sur l'Histoire d'Auxerre, tom. i. p. 174, the Paris edition, published in 1743.

[e] See, for an account of Chrodegangus, the Histoire Literaire de la France, tom. iv. p. 128.—Calmet, Histoire de Lorraine, tom. i. p. 513.—Acta Sanctor. tom. i. Martii, p. 452. The rule which he prescribed to his *canons*, may be seen in Le Cointe's Annales Francor. Eccles. tom. v. ad An. 757, sect. 35; as also in the Concilia Labbei, tom. vii. 1444. He is not, however, the author of the rule which is published in his name, in the Spicilegium veter. Scriptor. tom. i. p. 565. Longueval, in his Histoire de l'Eglise Gallicane, tom. iv. p. 435, has given a neat and elegant abridgment of the rule of Chrodegangus.

[f] Murator. Antiq. Italicæ, tom. v. p. 185; as also Lud. Thomassin's Disciplina Ecclesiæ Vet et. Nov. part. i. lib. iii. The design of this institution was truly excellent. The authors of it, justly shocked at the vicious manners of a licentious clergy, hoped that this new institution would have a tendency to prevent the irregularities of that order, by delivering its members from the cares, anxieties, and occupations of this present life. But the event showed how much these pious views have been disappointed.

[g] For an accurate account of the rights of the Grecian emperors in religious matters, we refer the reader to Lequien's Oriens Christianus, tom. i. p. 136.

[h] This Act is mentioned by Anastasius; it has been preserved by Yvo and Gratian, and has been the subject of a multitude of treatises.

[i] See Mabillon, Comm. in Ordinem Romanum, in Museo Ital. tom. ii. p. 113.—Muratori, Droits de l'Empire sur l'Etat Ecclesiastique, p. 87.

[k] This has been amply demonstrated by Baluze, in his Præf. ad Capitularia Regum Francorum, sect. 21.

[l] See Muratori Antiq. Ital. tom. i. Diss. ix. p. 470.—Franc. de Roye, de Missis Dominicis, cap. x. p. 44. cap. viii. p. 118, 134, 168, 195.

the public treasury a tribute proportioned to their respective lands and possessions, except such as, by the pure favour of the supreme powers, were graciously exempted from this general tax.[a]

XVI. It is true, indeed, that the Latin emperors did not assume to themselves the administration of the church, or the cognizance and decision of controversies that were purely of a religious nature. They acknowledged, on the contrary, that these affairs belonged to the tribunal of the Roman pontiff and to the ecclesiastical councils.[b] But this jurisdiction of the pontiff was confined within narrow limits; he could decide nothing by his sole authority, but was obliged to convene a council when any religious differences were to be terminated by an authoritative judgment. Nor did the provinces, when any controversy arose, wait for the decision of the bishop of Rome; but assembled, by their own authority, their particular councils, in which the bishops gave their thoughts with the utmost freedom upon the points in debate, and voted often in direct opposition to what was known to be the opinion of the Roman pontiff; all which is evident from what passed in the councils assembled by the Franks and Germans, in order to determine the celebrated controversy concerning the use and worship of images. It is farther to be observed, that the power of convening councils, and the right of presiding in them, were the prerogatives of the emperors and sovereign princes in whose dominions these assemblies were holden; and that no decrees of any council obtained the force of laws, until they were approved and confirmed by the supreme magistrate.[c] Thus was the spiritual authority of Rome wisely bounded by the civil power; but its ambitious pontiffs fretted under the imperial curb, and, eager to loosen their bonds, left no means unemployed for that purpose. They even formed projects which seemed less the effects of ambition than of phrensy: for they claimed a supreme dominion, not only over the church, but also over kings themselves, and pretended to reduce the whole universe under their ghostly jurisdiction. However extravagant these pretensions were, they were followed by the most vigorous efforts; and the wars and tumults that arose in the following century, contributed much to render these efforts successful.

XVII. If we turn our eyes toward the writers of this century, we shall find very few that stand distinguished in the lists of fame, either on account of erudition or genius. Among the Greeks, the following only seem worthy of mention.

Germanus, bishop of Constantinople, the greatest part of whose high renown was due to his violent zeal for image worship.[d]

Cosmas, bishop of Jerusalem, who acquired some reputation by his lyric vein, consecrated to the service of religion and employed in composing hymns for public and private devotion.

George Syncellus and Theophanes, who are not the least considerable among the writers of the Byzantine history, though they be in all respects infinitely below the ancient Greek and Latin historians.

But the writer, who surpassed all his contemporaries among the Greeks and Orientals, was John Damascenus, a man of genius and eloquence, who, in a variety of productions full of erudition, explained the Peripatetic philosophy, and illustrated the capital points of the Christian doctrine. It must, however, be acknowledged, that the eminent talents of this great man were tainted with that sordid superstition and that excessive veneration for the ancient fathers, which were the reigning defects of the age he lived in, not to mention his wretched method of explaining the doctrines of the Gospel according to the principles of the Aristotelian philosophy.[e]

XVIII. The first place, among the Latin writers, is due to Charlemagne, whose love of letters formed one of the brightest ornaments of his imperial dignity. The laws which are known by the title of Capitularia, with several Epistles, and a Book concerning images, are attributed to this prince; though it seems highly probable that most of these compositions were drawn up by other pens.[f]

After this learned prince, we may justly place the venerable Bede, so called from his illustrious virtues;[g] Alcuin,[h] the preceptor of Charlemagne; Paulinus of Aquileia;[i] who were all distinguished by their laborious application, and their zeal for the advancement of learning and science, and who treated the various branches of literature, known in this century, in such a manner as to convince us, that it was the infelicity of the times, rather than the want of genius, that prevented them from rising to higher degrees of perfection than what they attained to. Add to these, Boniface, of whom we have already spoken: Eginhard, the celebrated author of the Life of Charlemagne, and other productions; Paul, the deacon, who acquired a considerable and lasting reputation by his History of the Lombards, his Book of Homilies, and his miscellaneous labours; Ambrose Authpert, who wrote a commentary on the Revelations; and Theodulphus, bishop of Orleans; and thus we shall have a complete list of all the writers who acquired any degree of esteem in this century by their literary productions, either sacred or profane.

CHAPTER III.

Concerning the Doctrine of the Christian Church during this Century.

I. THE fundamental doctrines of Christianity were, as yet, respected and preserved in the theological writings, both of the Greeks and Latins, as seems evident from the

---

[a] See Muratori Antiq. Ital., tom. i. Dis. xvii. p. 926. See also the collection of the various pieces that were published on occasion of the dispute between Louis XV. and his clergy, relating to the immunities of that order in France. These pieces were printed in 1751, under the following title: Ecrits pour et contre les Immunités pretendues par le Clergé de France.

[b] See the Dissertation of Charlemagne, de Imaginibus, lib. i. cap. iv.

[c] All this is fully and admirably demonstrated by Baluze, in his preface to the Capitularia, or laws of the kings of the Franks, and is also amply illustrated in that work. See also J. Basnage, Histoire de l'Eglise, tom. i. p. 270.

[d] See R. Simon, Critique de la Bib. Eccles. de M. Du-Pin, t. i. p. 270.

[e] Bayle, Diction. tom. ii. p. 950; as also the account of the writings of John Damascenus, which is published in Le Quien's edition of his works, and was composed by Leo Allatius.

[f] See Jo. A. Fabricii Bibliotheca medii Ævi Lat. tom. i. p. 936. Histoire Literaire de la France, tom. iv. p. 368.

[g] See the Acta Sanctorum tom. i. April. p. 866, and the Gen. Dictionary, at the article Bede. A list of the writings of this venerable Briton, composed by himself, is published by Muratori, in his Antiq. Italic. medii Ævi, tom. iii. p. 329.

[h] Hist. Liter. de la France, tom. iv. p. 295.—Gen. Dictionary.

[i] See Hist. Lit. &c. tom. iv. p. 286.—Acta Sanct. tom. i. Januar. p. 713.

discourse of John Damascenus concerning the orthodox faith, and the confession of faith which was drawn up by Charlemagne.[a] The pure seed of celestial truth was, however, choked by a monstrous and incredible quantity of noxious weeds. The rational simplicity of the Christian worship was corrupted by an idolatrous veneration for images, and other superstitious inventions, and the sacred flame of divine charity was extinguished by the violent contentions and animosities which the progress of these superstitions occasioned in the church. All acknowledged the efficacy of our Saviour's merits: and yet all, in one way or another, laboured, in effect, to diminish the persuasion of this efficacy in the minds of men, by teaching, that Christians might appease an offended Deity by voluntary acts of mortification, or by gifts and oblations lavished upon the church, and by exhorting such as were desirous of salvation to place their confidence in the works and merits of the saints. Were we to enlarge upon all the absurdities and superstitions which were invented to flatter the passions of the misguided multitude, and to increase, at the expense of reason and Christianity, the opulence and authority of a licentious clergy, such an immense quantity of odious materials would swell this work to an enormous size.

II. The piety in vogue, during this and some succeeding ages, consisted in building and embellishing churches and chapels, in endowing monasteries, erecting basilics, hunting after the relics of saints and martyrs, and treating them with an excessive and absurd veneration, in procuring the intercession of the saints by rich oblations or superstitious rites, in worshipping images, in pilgrimages to those places which were esteemed holy, and chiefly to Palestine, and the like absurd and extravagant practices and institutions. The pious Christian, and the profligate transgressor, showed equal zeal in the performance of these superstitious services, which were looked upon as of the highest efficacy in order to the attainment of eternal salvation: they were performed by the latter as an expiation for his crimes, and a mean of appeasing an offended Deity; and by the former with a view to obtain, from above, the good things of this life, and an easy and commodious passage to life eternal. The true religion of Jesus, if we except a few of its doctrines contained in the Creed, was utterly unknown in this century, not only to the multitude in general, but also to the doctors of the first rank and eminence in the church; and the consequences of this corrupt ignorance were fatal to the interests of virtue. All orders of men, regardless of the obligations of morality, of the duties of the Gospel, and of the culture and improvement of their minds, rushed headlong with a perfect security into all sorts of wickedness, from the delusive hopes, that by the intercession and prayers of the saints, and the credit of the priests at the throne of God, they might easily obtain the remission of their enormities, and render the Deity propitious. This dismal account of the religion and morals of the eighth century, is confirmed by the unanimous testimony of all the historians who have written of the affairs of that period.

III. The Greeks were of opinion, that the holy scriptures had been successfully interpreted and explained by the ancient commentators, and therefore imagined that they rendered a most important service to the students in divinity, when, without either judgment or choice, they extracted or compiled from the works of these admired sages their explanatory observations on the sacred writings. The commentary of John Damascenus upon the epistles of St. Paul, which was taken from the writings of Chrysostom, is alone sufficient to serve as a proof of the little discernment with which these compilations were generally made.

The Latin expositors may be divided into two classes, according to the different nature of their productions.—In the first, we place those writers who, after the example of the Greeks, employed their labour in collecting into one body the interpretations and commentaries of the ancients. Bede distinguished himself among the expositors of this class, by his explication of the epistles of St. Paul, drawn from the writings of Augustin and others.[b] Still more estimable are the writers of the second class, who made use of their own penetration and sagacity in investigating the sense of the holy scriptures. Such were Alcuin, Ambrose Authpert, the expositor of the Revelations, and Bede also, who belongs, in reality, to both classes. It must, however, be acknowledged, that all these comm tators were destitute of the qualities that are essential to the sacred critic; for we find them in their explications neglecting the natural sense of the words of Scripture, and running blindfold after a certain hidden and mystical meaning, which, to use their jargon, they usually divided into *allegorical*, *anagogical*, and *tropological*;[c] and thus they delivered their own rash fictions and crude fancies, as the true and genuine sentiments of the sacred writers. Of this we are furnished with many examples in Alcuin's Commentary on St. John, Bede's allegorical illustrations of the Books of Samuel, and Charlemagne's Book concerning Images, in which various passages of the holy scriptures are occasionally explained according to the taste of the times.[d]

IV. The veneration of Charlemagne for the sacred writings was so excessive,[e] as to induce him to suppose, that they contained the latent seeds and principles of all arts and sciences; an opinion, no doubt, which he early imbibed from the lessons of his preceptor Alcuin, and the other divines who frequented his court. Hence arose the zeal with which that prince excited and encouraged the more learned among the clergy to direct their pious labours toward the illustration of the holy scriptures. Several laws which he published to encourage this species of learning are yet extant, as also various monuments of his deep solicitude about the advancement and propagation of Christian knowledge.[f] And lest the faults that were to

[a] See the treatise of this prince concerning images, book iii. The reader may also consult Mich. Syncellus' Confession of Faith, published by Montfaucon, in his Bibliotheca Coisliniana, p. 90: and, among the Latins, an Exposition of the principal Doctrines of the Christian Religion, composed by Benedict, abbot of Aniane, and published by Baluze in his Miscellanea, tom. v. p. 56; as also the Creed of Leo III., published in the same work, tom. vii. p. 18.

[b] See for an account of the commentaries of Bede, Rich. Simon's Critique de la Biblioth. Ecclesiast. de M. Du-Pin, tom. i. p. 280. See also Bedæ Explicatio Geneseos ex Patribus, in Martenne's Thesaur. Anecdot. t. v. p. 111, 116, 140, and his interpretation of Habakkuk, ibid. p. 295

[c] See Carolus Magnus de Imaginibus, lib. i. p. 138.

[d] See the same imperial author, book i. p. 84, 91, 123, 127, 131, 133 136, 138, 145, 160, 164, 165, &c.

[e] See Carolus Magnus de Imagin. lib. i. p. 231, 236.

[f] Jo. Frickius, de Canone Scripturæ Sacræ, p. 184.

be found in several places of the Latin translation of the Scriptures should prove an obstacle to the execution and accomplishment of his pious views, he employed Alcuin in correcting these errors,[a] and is said, in the last years of his life, to have spent a considerable part of his time in the same learned and pious work.[b] It is also to his encouragement and direction, that some writers attribute the first German translation of the sacred writings, though others contend that this honour is due to his son and successor Louis, surnamed the Debonnaire.

V. This zeal and industry of the emperor contributed, no doubt, to rouse from their sloth a lazy and ignorant clergy, and to raise up a spirit of application to literary pursuits. We cannot, however, help observing, that this laborious prince imprudently established certain customs, and confirmed others, which had a manifest tendency to defeat, in a great measure, his laudable design of promoting Christian knowledge. He confirmed the practice already in use, of reading and explaining to the people, in the public assemblies, certain portions only of the scriptures; and reduced the different methods of worship, followed in different churches, into one fixed rule, which was to be observed with the most perfect uniformity in all.[c] Persuaded also that few of the clergy were capable of explaining with perspicuity and judgment the portions of Scripture, which are distinguished in the ritual by the name of epistle and gospel, he ordered Paul the deacon, and Alcuin, to compile (from the ancient doctors of the church) homilies or discourses upon the epistles and gospels, which a stupid and ignorant set of priests were to commit to memory, and recite to the people. This gave rise to that famous collection, which went by the title of the homiliarium of Charlemagne,[d] and which, being followed as a model by many productions of the same kind, composed by private persons from a principle of pious zeal, contributed much to nourish the indolence, and to perpetuate the ignorance of a worthless clergy.[e] The zeal and activity of this great prince did not stop here; for he ordered the lives of the principal saints to be written in a moderate volume, of which copies were dispersed throughout his dominions, that the people might have, in the dead, examples of piety and virtue, which were no where to be found among the living. All these projects and designs were certainly formed and executed with upright and pious intentions, and, considering the state of things in this century, were, in several respects, both useful and necessary; they, however, contrary to the emperor's intention, contributed, undoubtedly, to encourage the priests in their criminal sloth, and their shameful neglect of the study of the Scriptures. For the majority of them employed their time and labour only upon those parts of the sacred writings, which the emperor had appointed to be read in the churches, and explained to the people; and never attempted to exercise their capacities upon the rest of the divine word. The greatest part of the clergy also, instead of composing themselves the discourses they recited in public, confined themselves to the book of homilies, published by the authority of their sovereign, and thus suffered their talents to lie uncultivated and unemployed.

VI. None of the Latins carried their theological enterprises so far as to give a complete, connected, and accurate system of the various doctrines of Christianity. It would be absurd to comprehend, under this title, the various discourses concerning the person and nature of Christ, which were designed to refute the errors of Felix[f] and Elipand, or to combat the opinions which were now spread abroad concerning the origin of the Holy Ghost,[g] and several other points; since these discourses afford no proofs either of precision or diligence in their authors. The labours and industry of the divines of this age were wholly employed in collecting the opinions and authorities of the fathers, by whom are meant the theological writers of the first six centuries; and so blind and servile was their veneration for these doctors, that they regarded their dictates as infallible, and their writings as the boundaries of truth, beyond which reason was not permitted to push its researches. The Irish or Hibernians, who in this century were known by the name of Scots, were the only divines who refused to dishonour their reason by subjecting it implicitly to the dictates of authority. Naturally subtle and sagacious, they applied their philo-

[a] Baronius, Annal. ad A. DCCLXXVIII. n. XXVII.—Jo. A. Fabricius, Biblioth. Lat. medii Ævi, tom. i. p. 950.—Hist. Lit. de la France.

[b] J. A. Fabricius, tom. i. p. 950.—Usserius, de sacris Scripturis vernacul. p. 110.

[c] They who imagine that the portions of Scripture which are still explained, every year, to Christians in their religious assemblies, were selected for that purpose by the order of Charlemagne, are undoubtedly in an error; since it is manifest, that in the preceding ages there were certain portions of Scripture set apart for each day of worship in the greatest part of the Latin churches. See Jo. Henr. Thameri Schediasma de Origine et Dignitate Pericoparum quæ Evangelia et Epistolæ vulgo vocantur. See also Jo. Franc. Buddei Isagoge ad Theologiam, tom. ii. p. 1640. It must, however, be confessed, that Charlemagne introduced some new regulations into this part of divine service; for whereas, before his time, the Latin churches differed from each other in several circumstances of the public worship, and particularly in this, that the same portions of Scripture were not read and explained in them all, he published a solemn edict, commanding all the religious assemblies within his territories to conform themselves, in that respect, to the rules established in the church of Rome. With respect to the portions of Scripture which we call the epistles and gospels, and which, from the time of Charlemagne down to us, continue to be used in divine worship, it is certain that they were read in the church of Rome so early as the sixth century. It is also certain, that this prince was extremely careful in reforming the service of the Latin churches, and appointed the form of worship used at Rome to be observed in all of them. Hence the churches which did not adopt the Roman ritual, have different epistles and gospels from those which are used by us, and the other western churches, who were commanded by Charlemagne to imitate the Roman service. The church of Corbetta is an example of this, as may be seen in Muratori's Antiq. Ital. tom. iv. p. 836; and also the church of Milan, which follows the rite of St. Ambrose. If any are desirous to know what epistles and gospels were used by the Franks and other western churches before the time of Charlemagne, they have only to consult the Calendars published by Martenne, in his Thesaur. Anecdot. tom. v. p. 66, the Discourses of Bede published in the same work, tom. v. p. 339, and Mabillon, de Antiquâ Liturgiâ Gallicanâ; to all which may be added Peyret, Antiquités de la Chapelle du Roi de France, p. 566.

[d] See for an account of this book of Homilies, the learned Seelen's Selecta Literaria, p. 252.

[e] Alan, abbot of Farfa in Italy, wrote in this century a very copious Book of Homilies, the preface to which is published by Bernard Pezius, in the Thesaur. Anecdot. tom. vi. part i. p. 83. In the following age several works under the same title were composed by learned men; one by Haymo, of Halberstadt, which is still extant; another by Rabanus Maurus, at the request of the emperor Lothaire; and a third by Hericus, mentioned by Pezius in the work above quoted, p. 93. All these were written in Latin. The famous Ottfrid, of Weissenburg, was the first who composed a Book of Homilies in the Teutonic language; for an account of this work, which was written in the ninth century, see Lambecius, de Biblioth. Vindobon. August. tom. ii. cap. v. p. 419.

☞ [f] The doctrine taught by Felix, bishop of Urgel, and his disciple Elipand archbishop of Toledo, was, that Jesus Christ was the Son of God, not by nature, but by adoption. This doctrine was also intimately connected with the Nestorian hypothesis, and was condemned, in this century, by the synod of Ratisbon, and the councils of Frankfort and Frioul.

☞ [g] The error now published relating to the Holy Ghost was, that it proceeded from the Father only, and not from the Father and the Son.

sophy (such as it was) to the illustration of the truth and doctrines of religion; a method which was almost generally abhorred and exploded by all other nations.[a]

The Greeks were not so destitute of systematical divines as the Latins. John Damascenus composed a complete body of the Christian doctrine in a scientifical method, under the title of Four Books concerning the Orthodox Faith. The two kinds of theology, which the Latins termed scholastic and didactic, were united in this laborious performance, in which the author not only explains the doctrines he delivers by subtle and profound reasoning, but also confirms his explications by the authority of the ancient doctors. This book was received among the Greeks with the highest applause, and was so excessively admired, that at length it came to be acknowledged among that people as the only rule of divine truth. Many, however, complain of this applauded writer, as having consulted more, in his theological system, the conjectures of human reason, and the opinions of the ancients, than the genuine dictates of the sacred oracles, and of having, in consequence of this method, deviated from the true source and the essential principles of theology.[b] To the work of Damascenus now mentioned, we may add his Sacred Parallels, in which he has collected, with uncommon care and industry, the opinions of the ancient doctors concerning various points of the Christian religion. We may, therefore, look upon this writer as the Thomas and Lombard of the Greeks.

VII. None of the moral writers of this century attempted to form a complete system of the duties and virtues of the Christian life. John, surnamed Carpathius, a Greek writer, composed some exhortatory discourses, in which there are scarcely any marks of judgment or genius. Among the monastic orders nothing was relished but the enthusiastic strains of the Mystics, and the doctrines of Dionysius the Areopagite, their pretended chief, whose supposititious writings were interpreted and explained by Johannes Darensis out of complaisance to the monks.[c] The Latin writers confined their labours in morality to some general precepts concerning virtue and vice, which seemed rather intended to regulate the external actions of Christians, than to purify their inward principles, or to fix duty upon its proper foundations. Their precepts also, such as they were, and their manner of explaining them, had now imbibed a strong tincture of the Peripatetic philosophy, as appears from certain tracts of Bede, and the treatise of Alcuin concerning virtue and vice.[d] That the people, however, might be animated to the pursuit of virtue by the commanding power of example, Bede, Florus, Alcuin, Marcellinus, Ambrose, Authpert, and others, employed their pious industry in writing the lives of such as had been eminent for their piety and worthy deeds.

VIII. The controversies that turned upon the main and essential points of religion were, during this century, few in number; and scarcely any of them were managed with tolerable sagacity or judgment. The greatest part of the Greeks were involved in the dispute concerning images, in which their reasonings were utterly destitute of precision and perspicuity, while the Latins employed their chief zeal and industry in confuting and extirpating the doctrine of Elipand concerning the person of Christ. John Damascenus exposed the errors of all the different sects in a short, but useful and interesting treatise; he also attacked the Manichæans and Nestorians with a particular vehemence, and even went so far in his polemic labours, as to combat the erroneous doctrines of the Saracens. In these compositions we find several proofs of subtlety and genius, but very little of that clearness and simplicity that constitute the chief merit of polemic writings. The Jews were left almost unmolested, as the Christians were sufficiently employed by the controversies that had arisen among themselves: Anastasius, abbot of Palestine, however, made some attempts to subdue the infidelity of that obstinate people.

IX. Of all the controversies which agitated and perplexed the Christian church during this century, that which arose concerning the worship of images in Greece, and was thence carried into both the eastern and western provinces, was the most unhappy and pernicious in its consequences. The first sparks of this terrible flame, which threatened ruin both to the interest of religion and government, had already appeared under the reign of Philippicus Bardanes, who was created emperor of the Greeks soon after the commencement of this century. This prince, with the consent of John, patriarch of Constantinople, ordered a picture, which represented the sixth general council, to be pulled down from its place in the church of Sophia, in 712, because this council had condemned the Monotholites, whose cause the emperor espoused with the greatest ardour and vehemence. Nor did Bardanes stop here; but sent immediately an order to Rome to remove all representations of that nature from the

[a] That the Hibernians, who were called Scots in this century, were lovers of learning, and distinguished themselves, in those times of ignorance, by the culture of the sciences beyond all the other European nations, travelling through the most distant lands, both with a view to improve and to communicate their knowledge, is a fact with which I have long been acquainted, as we see them, in the most authentic records of antiquity, discharging, with the highest reputation and applause, the doctorial function in France, Germany, and Italy, both during this and the following century. But that these Hibernians were the first teachers of the scholastic theology in Europe, and, so early as the eighth century, illustrated the doctrines of religion by the principles of philosophy, I learned but lately from the testimony of Benedict, abbot of Aniane, who lived in this period. This learned abbot, in his Letter to Guarnarius, p. 54, expresses himself thus: "Apud modernos scholasticos (i. e. public teachers, or schoolmasters) maxime apud Scotos est syllogismus delusionis, at dicant, Trinitatem, sicut personarum, ita esse substantiarum;" (by this it appears, that the Irish divines made use of a certain syllogism, which Benedict calls delusive, i. e. fallacious and sophistical, to demonstrate that the persons in the Godhead were substances; a captious syllogism this, as we may see from what follows, and also every way proper to throw the ignorant into the greatest perplexity) "quatenus si adsenserit illectus auditor, Trinitatem esse trium substantiarum Deum, trium derogetur cultor Deorum: si autem abnuerit, personarum denegator culpetur." It was with such miserable sophistry, that these subtle divines puzzled and tormented their disciples and hearers, accusing those of Tritheism who admitted their argument, and casting the reproach of Sabellianism upon those who rejected it. For thus they reasoned or rather quibbled; "You must either affirm or deny that the three Persons in the Deity are three substances. If you affirm it, you are undoubtedly a Tritheist, and worship three Gods; if you deny it, this denial implies that they are not three distinct persons, and thus you fall into Sabellianism." Benedict condemns this Hibernian subtlety, and severely animadverts upon the introduction of it into theology; he also recommends in its place that amiable simplicity which is so conformable to the nature and genius of the Gospel: "Sed hæc de fide (says he) et omnis callidi-tatis versutia, simplicitate fidei catholicæ et puritate, vitanda, non captiosâ interjectione linguarum, scævâ impactione interpolanda." Hence it appears, that the philosophical or scholastic theology, among the Latins, is of more ancient date than is commonly imagined.

[b] Jo. Henr. Hottinger. Bibliothecar. Quadripart. lib. iii. cap. ii. sect. iii. p. 372.—Mart. Chemnitius, de Usu et Utilitate Locor. Commun. p. 26.

[c] Assemani Biblioth. Oriental. Vatican. tom. ii. p. 120.

[d] This treatise is extant in the works of Alcuin, published by Quercetanus, tom. ii. p. 1218.

churches and other places of worship. His orders, however, were far from being received with submission, or producing their designed effect: on the contrary, Constantine, the Roman pontiff, not only rejected, by a formal protest, the imperial edict, but resolved to express his contempt of it by his actions as well as his words. He ordered six pictures, representing the six general councils, to be placed in the porch of St. Peter's church; and that no act of rebellion or arrogance might be left unemployed, he assembled a council at Rome, in which he caused the emperor himself to be condemned as an apostate from the true religion. These first tumults were quelled by a revolution, which, in the following year, deprived Bardanes of the imperial throne.[a]

X. The dispute, however, broke out with redoubled fury under Leo the Isaurian, a prince of the greatest resolution and intrepidity; and the new tumults which it excited were both violent and durable. Leo, unable to bear any longer the excessive height to which the Greeks carried their superstitious attachment to the worship of images, and the sharp railleries and serious reproaches which this idolatrous service drew upon the Christians from the Jews and Saracens, resolved, by the most vigorous proceedings, to root out at once this growing evil. For this purpose he issued an edict in 726, by which it was ordered, not only that the worship of images should be abrogated and relinquished, but also that all the images, except that of Christ's crucifixion, should be removed out of the churches.[b] In this proceeding the emperor acted more from the impulse of his natural character, which was warm and vehement, than from the dictates of prudence, which avoids precipitancy where prejudices are to be combated, and destroys and undermines inveterate superstitions rather by slow and imperceptible attacks, than by open and violent assaults. The imperial edict produced such effects as might have been expected from the frantic enthusiasm of a superstitious people. A civil war broke out in the islands of the Archipelago, ravaged a part of Asia, and afterwards reached Italy. The people, partly from their own ignorance, but principally in consequence of the perfidious suggestions of the priests and monks, who had artfully rendered the worship of images a source of opulence to their churches and cloisters, were led to regard the emperor as an apostate; and hence they considered themselves as freed from their oath of allegiance, and from all the obligations which attach subjects to their lawful sovereign.

XI. The Roman pontiffs, Gregory II. and III., were the authors and ringleaders of these civil commotions and insurrections in Italy. The former, on the emperor's refusing to revoke his edict against images, declared him, without hesitation, unworthy of the name and privileges of a Christian, and thus excluded him from the communion of the church; and no sooner was this formidable sentence made public, than the Romans, and other Italian communities, that were subject to the Grecian empire, violated their allegiance, and, rising in arms, either massacred or banished all the emperor's deputies and officers. Leo, exasperated by these insolent proceedings, resolved to chastise the Italian rebels, and to make the haughty pontiff feel in a particular manner the effects of his resentment; but he failed in the attempt. Doubly irritated by this disappointment, he vented his fury against images, and their worshippers, in 730, in a much more terrible manner than he had hitherto done; for, in a council assembled at Constantinople, he degraded from his office Germanus, the bishop of that imperial city, who was a patron of images, put Anastasius in his place, ordered all the images to be publicly burned, and inflicted a variety of severe punishments upon such as were attached to that idolatrous worship. These rigorous measures divided the Christian Church into two violent factions, whose contests were carried on with an ungoverned rage, and produced nothing but mutual invectives, crimes, and assassinations. Of these factions, one adopted the adoration and worship of images, and were on that account called Iconoduli or Iconolatræ; while the other maintained that such worship was unlawful, and that nothing was more worthy of the zeal of Christians, than to demolish and destroy the statues and pictures that were the occasions and objects of this gross idolatry; and hence they were distinguished by the titles of Iconomachi and Iconoclastæ. The furious zeal which Gregory II. had shown in defending the odious superstition of image-worship, was not only imitated, but even surpassed, by his successor, who was the third pontiff of that name; and though, at this distance of time, we are not acquainted with all the criminal circumstances that attended the intemperate zeal of these insolent prelates, we know with certainty that it was their extravagant attachment to image-worship that chiefly occasioned the separation of the Italian provinces from the Grecian empire.[c]

XII. Constantine, to whom the furious tribe of the image-worshippers had given, by way of derision, the name

[a] See Fred. Spanhemii Historia Imaginum restituta; also the Annales Italiæ by Muratori, vol. iv.—Maimbourg's history of the controversy is full of the most absurd and malignant fictions.

☞ [b] In this account of the imperial edict, Dr. Mosheim follows the opinions of Baronius, Fleury, and Le Sueur. Others affirm, with great probability, that this famous edict did not enjoin the pulling down images every where, and casting them out of the churches, but only prohibited the paying to them any kind of adoration or worship. It would seem as if Leo was not, at first, averse to the use of images, as ornaments, or even as helps to devotion and memory; for, at the same time that he forbade them to be worshipped, he ordered them to be placed higher in the churches, some say, to avoid this adoration; but afterwards finding that they were the occasion of idolatry, he caused them to be removed from the churches and broken.

[c] The Greek writers tell us, that both the Gregories carried their insolence so far as to excommunicate Leo and his son Constantine, to dissolve the obligation of the oath of allegiance, which the people of Italy had taken to these princes, and to prohibit their paying tribute to them, or showing them any marks of submission and obedience. These facts are also acknowledged by many of the partisans of the Roman pontiffs, such as Baronius, Sigonius, and their numerous followers. On the other hand, some learned writers, particularly among the French, alleviate considerably the crime of the Gregories, and positively deny that they either excommunicated the emperors above mentioned, or called off the people from their duty and allegiance. See Launoius, Epist. lib. vii. Ep. vii. p. 456. tom. v. op. par. ii.—Nat. Alexander, Select. Histor. Ecclesiast. Capit. Sæc. viii. dissert. i. p. 456.—De Marca, Concordia Sacerdotii et Imperii, lib. iii. cap. xi.—Bossuet, Defens. Declarationis Cleri Gallic. de Potestate Eccles. par. i. lib. vi. cap. xii. p. 197.—Giannone, Historia di Napoli, vol. i. All these found their opinions, concerning the conduct of the Gregories, chiefly upon the authority of the Latin writers, such as Anastasius, Paul the Deacon, and others, who seem to have known nothing of that audacious insolence, with which these pontiffs are said to have opposed the emperors, and even represent them as having given several marks of their submission and obedience to the imperial authority. Such are the contrary accounts of the Greek and Latin writers; and the most prudent use we can make of them is, to suspend our judgment with respect to a matter, which the obscurity that covers the history of this period renders it impossible to clear up. All that we can know with certainty is, that the zeal of the two pontiffs above mentioned for the worship of images, furnished to the people of Italy the occasion of falling from their allegiance to the Grecian emperors.

of Copronymus,[a] succeeded his father Leo in the empire, in 741, and, animated with an equal zeal and ardour against the new idolatry, employed all his influence for the abolition of the worship of images, in opposition to the vigorous efforts of the Roman pontiffs and the superstitious monks. His manner of proceeding was attended with greater marks of equity and moderation, than had appeared in the measures pursued by Leo: for, knowing the respect which the Greeks had for the decisions of general councils, whose authority they considered as supreme and unlimited in religious matters, he assembled at Constantinople, in 754, a council composed of the eastern bishops, in order to have this important question examined with the utmost care, and decided with wisdom, seconded by a just and lawful authority. This assembly, which the Greeks regard as the seventh œcumenical council, gave judgment, as was the custom of those times, in favour of the opinion embraced by the emperor, and solemnly condemned the worship and also the use of images.[b] But this decision was not sufficient to vanquish the blind obstinacy of superstition: many adhered still to their idolatrous worship; and none made a more turbulent resistance to the wise decree of this council than the monks, who still continued to excite commotions in the state, and to blow the flames of sedition and rebellion among the people. Their malignity was, however, chastised by Constantine, who, filled with a just indignation at their seditious practices, punished several of them in an exemplary manner, and by new laws set bounds to the violence of monastic rage. Leo IV., who, after the death of Constantine, was declared emperor, in 775, adopted the sentiments of his father and grandfather, and pursued the measures which they had concerted for the extirpation of idolatry out of the Christian church; for, having perceived that the worshippers of images could not be engaged by mild and gentle proceedings to abandon this superstitious practice, he had recourse to the coercive influence of penal laws.

XIII. A cup of poison, administered by the impious counsel of a perfidious wife, deprived Leo IV. of his life, in 780, and rendered the idolatrous cause of images triumphant. The profligate Irene, after having thus dismissed her husband from the world, held the reins of empire during the minority of her son Constantine; and, to establish her authority on more solid foundations, entered into an alliance with Adrian, bishop of Rome, in 786, and summoned a council at Nice in Bithynia, which is known by the title of the second Nicene council. In this assembly the imperial laws concerning the new idolatry were abrogated, the decrees of the council of Constantinople reversed, the worship of images and of the cross restored, and severe punishments denounced against such as maintained that God was the only object of religious adoration. It is impossible to imagine any thing more ridiculous and trifling than the arguments upon which the bishops, assembled in this council, founded their decrees.[c] The Romans, however, held sacred the authority of these decrees; and the Greeks considered in the light of parricides and traitors all such as refused to submit to them. The other enormities of the flagitious Irene, and her deserved fate, cannot, with propriety, be treated of here.

XIV. In these violent contests, the greater part of the Latins, such as the Britons, Germans, and Gauls, seemed to steer a middle way between the opposite tenets of the contending parties. They were of opinion that images might be lawfully preserved, and even placed in the churches; but, at the same time, they looked upon all worship of them as highly injurious and offensive to the Supreme Being.[d] Such, particularly, were the sentiments of Charlemagne, who distinguished himself in this important controversy. By the advice of the French bishops, who were no friends to this second council of Nice, he ordered some learned and judicious divine to compose Four Books concerning Images, which he sent, in 790, to Adrian, the Roman pontiff, with a view of engaging him to withdraw his approbation of the decrees of that council. In this performance the reasons alleged by the Nicene bishops to justify the worship of images, are refuted with great accuracy and spirit.[e] They were not, however, left without defence: Adrian, who was afraid of acknowledging even an emperor for his master, composed an answer to the four books mentioned above; but neither his arguments, nor his authority, were sufficient to support the superstition he endeavoured to maintain; for, in 794, Charlemagne assembled, at Frankfort on the Maine, a council of three hundred bishops, in order to re-examine this important question; in which the opinions contained in the four books were solemnly confirmed, and the worship of images unanimously condemned.[f] Hence we may conclude, that in this century the Latins deemed it neither impious, nor unlawful, to dissent from the opinion of the Roman pontiff, and even to charge that prelate with error..

XV. While the controversy concerning images was at its height, a new contest arose among the Latins and Greeks about the source whence the Holy Ghost *proceeded*. The Latins affirmed, that this Divine Spirit proceeded from the Father and the Son: the Greeks, on the contrary, asserted, that it proceeded from the Father only. The origin of this controversy is covered with perplexity and doubt. It is, however, certain, that it was agitated in the council of Gentilli, near Paris, in 767, in presence of the emperor's legates;[g] and from this we may conclude, with a high degree of probability, that it arose in Greece at that time when the contest about images was carried on with the greatest vehemence. In this controversy the Latins

[a] This nick-name was given to Constantine, from his having defiled the sacred font at his baptism.

[b] The authority of this council is not acknowledged by the Roman catholics, who also disregard the obligation of the second commandment, which they have prudently struck out of the decalogue.

[c] Mart. Chemnitius, Examen Concilii Tridentini, par. iv. lib. ii. cap. v. p. 52.—L'Enfant, Preservatif contre la Réunion avec le Siege de Rome, par. iii. lettre xvii. p. 446.

[d] The aversion the Britons had to the worship of images, may be seen in Spelman, Concil. Magnæ Britanniæ, tom. i. p. 73.

[e] The books of Charlemagne concerning Images, which deserve an attentive perusal, are yet extant; and, when they were extremely scarce, were republished at Hanover, in 1731, by the celebrated Christopher Aug. Heuman, who enriched this edition with a learned preface. These books are adorned with the venerable name of Charlemagne; but it is easy to preceive that they are the productions of a scholastic divine, and not of an emperor. Several learned men have conjectured, that Charlemagne composed these books with the assistance of his preceptor Alcuin; see Heuman's Pref. p. 51; and Bunau's Historia Imperii German. tom. i. p. 490. This conjecture, though far from being contemptible, cannot be admitted without hesitation, since Alcuin was in England when these books were composed. We learn from the history of his life, that he went into England in 789, and did not thence return before 792.

[f] This event is treated with a degree of candour, not more laudable than surprising, by Mabillon, in Præf. ad Sæculum IV. Actorum SS. Ord. Benedict. part v. See also Jo. Georg. Dorscheus, Collat. ad Concilium Francofordiense.

[g] See Le Cointe, Annales Eccles. Francorum, tom. v. p. 698.

alleged, in favour of their opinions, the creed of Constantinople, which the Spaniards and French had successively corrupted, (upon what occasion is not well known,) by adding the words *filio-que* to that part of it which contained the doctrine concerning the Holy Ghost. The Greeks, on the other hand, made loud complaints of this criminal attempt of the Latins to corrupt by a manifest interpolation a creed, which served as a rule of doctrine for the church universal, and declared this attempt impudent and sacrilegious. Thus, the dispute changed at length its object, and was transferred from the matter to the interpolated words above-mentioned.[a] In the following century it was carried on with still greater vehemence, and added new fuel to the dissensions which already portended a schism between the eastern and western churches.[b]

CHAPTER IV.

Concerning the Rites and Ceremonies used in the Church during this Century.

I. THE religion of this century consisted almost entirely in a motley round of external rites and ceremonies. We are not, therefore, to wonder that more zeal and diligence were employed in multiplying and regulating these outward marks of a superstitious devotion, than in correcting the vices and follies of men, in enlightening their understandings, and forming their hearts. The administration of the sacrament of the Lord's supper, which was deemed the most solemn and important branch of divine worship, was now every where embellished, or rather deformed, with a variety of senseless fopperies, which destroyed the beautiful simplicity of that affecting and salutary institution. We also find manifest traces, in this century, of that superstitious custom of celebrating what were called *solitary masses*,[c] though it be difficult to decide whether they were instituted by a public law, or introduced by the authority of private persons.[d] Be that as it may, this single custom is sufficient to give us an idea of the superstition and darkness that sat brooding over the Christian church in this ignorant age, and renders it unnecessary to enter into a farther detail of the absurd rites with which a designing priesthood continued to disfigure the religion of Jesus.

II. Charlemagne seemed disposed to stem this torrent of superstition, which gathered force from day to day; for, not to mention the zeal with which he opposed the worship of images, there are other circumstances that bear testimony to his intentions in this matter, such as his preventing the multiplication of festivals, by reducing them to a fixed and limited number, his prohibiting the ceremony of consecrating the church bells by the rite of holy aspersion, and his enactment of other ecclesiastical laws, which redound to his honour. Several circumstances, however, concurred to render his designs abortive, and to blast the success of his worthy purposes; and none more than his excessive attachment to the Roman pontiffs, who were the patrons and protectors of those who exerted themselves in the cause of ceremonies. This vehement passion for the lordly pontiff was inherited by the great prince, of whom we are now speaking, from his father Pepin, who had already commanded the manner of singing, and the kind of church-music in use at Rome, to be observed in all Christian churches. It was in conformity with his example, and in compliance with the repeated and importunate solicitation of the pontiff Adrian, that Charlemagne laboured to bring all the Latin churches to follow, as their model, the church of Rome, not only in the article now mentioned, but also in the whole form of their worship, in every circumstance of their religious service.[e] Several churches, however, among which those of Milan and Corbetta distinguished themselves eminently, absolutely rejected this proposal, and could neither be brought by persuasion nor by violence, to change their usual method of worship.

CHAPTER V.

Concerning the Divisions and Heresies that troubled the Church during this Century.

I. THE Arians, Manicheans, and Marcionites, though often depressed by the force of penal laws and the power of the secular arm, gathered strength in the east, amidst the tumults and divisions with which the Grecian empire was perpetually agitated, and drew great numbers into the profession of their opinions.[f] The Monothelites, to whose cause the emperor Philippicus, and many others of the first rank and dignity, were most zealous well-wishers, regained their credit in various countries. The condition also both of the Nestorians and Monophysites was easy and agreeable under the dominion of the Arabians; their power and influence were considerable; nor were they destitute of means of weakening the Greeks, their irreconcilable adversaries, of spreading their doctrines, and extensively multiplying the number of their adherents.

II. In the church which Boniface had newly erected in Germany, he himself tells us, that there were many perverse and erroneous reprobates, who had no true notion of religion; and his friends and adherents confirm this as-

---

[a] Learned men generally imagine that this controversy began about the words *filio-que*, which some of the Latins had added to the creed that had been drawn up by the council of Constantinople, and that from the *words* the dispute proceeded to the *doctrine* itself; see Mabillon (Act. Sanctor. Ord. Bened. Sæc. iv. part i. præf. p. iv.) who is followed by many in this particular. But this opinion is certainly erroneous. The doctrine was the first subject of controversy, which afterwards extended to the words *filio-que*, considered by the Greeks as a manifest interpolation. Among other proofs of this, the council of Gentilli shows evidently, that the doctrine concerning the Holy Spirit had been, for a considerable time, the subject of controversy when the dispute arose about the words now mentioned. Pagi, in his Critica in Baronium, tom. iii. p. 323, is of opinion, that this controversy had both its date and its occasion from the dispute concerning images; for when the Latins treated the Greeks as heretics, on account of their opposition to image worship, the Greeks in their turn charged the Latins also with heresy, on account of their maintaining that the Holy Ghost proceeded from the Father and the Son. The learned critic has, however, advanced this opinion without sufficient proof; and we must therefore consider it as no more than a probable conjecture.

[b] See Pithæi Hist. Controv. de Processione Spiritus St. at the end of his Cod. Canon. Eccles. Roman. p. 355.—Le Quien, Oriens Christian. tom. iii. p. 354.—Ger. J. Vossius, de Tribus Symbolis, Diss. iii. p. 65; and, above all, Jo. Georg. Walchius, Histor. Controv. de Processione Spiritus St. published at Jena, in 1751.

[c] Solitary or private masses were such as were celebrated by the priests alone in behalf of souls detained in purgatory, as well as on some other particular occasions. These masses were prohibited by the laws of the church; but they were a rich source of profit to the clergy. They were condemned by the canons of a synod assembled at Mentz under Charlemagne, as criminal innovations, and as the fruits of avarice and sloth.

[d] See the Treatise concerning Images, attributed to Charlemagne, p. 245; as also George Calixtus, de Missis Solitariis, sect. 12.

[e] See the Treatise concerning Images, p. 52; and Eginhard, de Vitâ Caroli Magni, cap. 26.

[f] In Europe also Arianism prevailed greatly among the barbarous nations that embraced the Christian faith.

sertion. But the testimony is undoubtedly partial, and unworthy of credit, since it appears from the most evident proofs, that the persons here accused of errors and heresies were Irish and French divines, who refused that blind submission to the church of Rome, which Boniface was so zealous to propagate every where. Adalbert, a Gaul, and Clement, a native of Ireland, were the persons whose opposition gave the most trouble to the ambitious legate. The former procured himself to be consecrated bishop, without the consent of Boniface; excited seditions and tumults among the eastern Franks; and appears, indeed, to have been both flagitious in his conduct, and erroneous in his opinions. Among other irregularities, he was the forger[a] of a letter to the human race, which was said to have been written by Jesus Christ, and to have been brought from heaven by the archangel Michael.[b] As to Clement, his character and sentiments were maliciously misrepresented, since it appears, by the best and most authentic accounts, that he was much better acquainted with the true principles and doctrines of Christianity than Boniface himself; and hence he is considered by many as a confessor and sufferer for the truth in this barbarous age.[c] Be that as it will, both Adalbert and Clement were condemned, at the instigation of Boniface, by the pontiff Zachary, in a council assembled at Rome, in 748,[d] and were committed to prison, where, in all probability, they concluded their days.

III. Religious discord ran still higher in Spain, France, and Germany, toward the conclusion of this century; and the most unhappy tumults and commotions were occasioned by a question proposed to Felix bishop of Urgel, by Elipand, archbishop of Toledo, who desired to know in what sense Christ was the son of God. The answer given to this question, was, that Christ, considered in his divine nature, was truly and essentially the Son of God; but that, considered as a man, he was only so, nominally and by adoption. This doctrine was spread abroad by the two prelates; Elipand propagated it in the different provinces of Spain, and Felix throughout Septimania, while the pontiff Adrian, and the greatest part of the Latin doctors, looked upon this opinion as a renovation of the Nestorian heresy, by its representing Christ as divided into two distinct persons. In consequence of this, Felix was successively condemned by the councils of Narbonne, Ratisbon, Frankfort on the Maine, and Rome, and was finally obliged, by the council of Aix-la-Chapelle, to retract his error, and to change his opinion.[e] The change he made was, however, rather nominal than real, the common shift of temporising divines; for he still retained his doctrine, and died in the firm belief of it at Lyons, to which city he had been banished by Charlemagne.[f] Elipand, on the contrary, lived secure in Spain under the dominion of the Saracens, far removed from the thunder of synods and councils, and out of the reach of that coercive power in religious matters, whose utmost efforts can go no farther than to make the erroneous, hypocrites or martyrs. Many are of opinion, that the disciples of Felix, who were called Adoptians, departed much less from the doctrine generally received among Christians, than is commonly imagined; and that what chiefly distinguished their tenets were the terms they used, and their manner of expression, rather than a real diversity of sentiments.[g] But, as this sect and their chief thought proper to make use of singular and sometimes of contradictory expressions, this furnished such as accused them of Nestorianism, with plausible reasons to support their charge.

[a] See the Histoire Literaire de la France, tom. iv. p. 82.

[b] There is an edition of this letter published by the learned Baluze in the Capitularia Regum Francorum, tom. ii. p. 1396.

[c] We find an enumeration of the erroneous opinions of Clement in the letters of Boniface, Epistol. cxxxv. p. 189. See also Usserii Sylloge Epistolarum Hibernicarum, p. 12. Nouveau Dictionnaire Histor. et Critique, tom. i. p. 133. ☞ The zealous Boniface was too ignorant to be a proper judge of heresy, as appears by his condemning Vigilius for believing that there were *antipodes*. The great heresy of Clement seems to have been his preferring the decisions of Scripture to the decrees of councils, and the opinions of the fathers, which he took the liberty to reject when they were not conformable to the word of God.

☞ [d] This is the true date of the council assembled by Zachary for the condemnation of Adalbert and Clement, and not the year 745, as Fleury and Mabillon have pretended; in which error they are followed by Mr. Bower, in his History of the Popes. The truth is, that the letter of Boniface, in consequence of which this council was assembled, must have been written in 748, since he declares in that letter, that he had been near thirty years legate of the holy see, into which commission he entered, as all authors agree, about the year 719.

☞ [e] The council of Narbonne, which condemned Felix, was holden in 788, that of Ratisbon in 792, that of Frankfort in 794, that of Rome in 799.

[f] The authors, who have written of the sect of Felix, are mentioned by Fabricius, Biblioth. Lat. medii Ævi, tom. ii. p. 482. Add to these Petrus de Marca, in his Marca Hispanica, lib. iii. cap. xii. p. 368.—Jo. de Ferreras, Historia de Espana, tom. ii.—Mabillon, Præf. ad. Sæc. iv. Actor SS. Ord. Benedicti, part ii. There are also very particular accounts given of Felix by Dom. Colonia, in his Histoire Literaire de la Ville de Lyon, tom. ii. and by the Benedictine monks in the Histoire Literaire de la France, tom. iv.

[g] Jo. G. Dorscheus, Collat. ad Concilium Francofurt. p. 101.—Werenfels, de Logomachiis Eruditorum, p. 459.—Basnagius, Præf. ad Etherium in Canisii Lection. antiquis, tom. ii. part i. p. 284.—G. Calixtus, Singul. Diss.

THE NINTH CENTURY.

PART I.

THE EXTERNAL HISTORY OF THE CHURCH.

CHAPTER I.

Concerning the prosperous Events which happened to the Church during this Century.

I. The reign of Charlemagne had been singularly auspicious to the Christian cause; the life of that great prince was principally employed in the most zealous efforts to propagate and establish the religion of Jesus among the Huns, Saxons, Friselanders, and other unenlightened nations; but his piety was mixed with violence, his spiritual conquests were generally made by the force of arms, and this impure mixture tarnishes the lustre of his noblest exploits. His son Louis, undeservedly surnamed the Debonnaire, or the Meek, inherited the defects of his father without his virtues, and was his equal in violence and cruelty, but greatly his inferior in all worthy and valuable accomplishments. Under his reign a very favourable opportunity was offered of propagating the Gospel among the northern nations, and particularly among the inhabitants of Sweden and Denmark. A petty king of Jutland, named Harald Klack, being driven from his kingdom and country, in 826, by Regner Lodbrock, threw himself at the emperor's feet, and implored his succours against the usurper. Louis granted his request, and promised the exiled prince his protection and assistance, on condition, however, that he would embrace Christianity, and admit the ministers of that religion to preach in his dominions. Harald submitted to these conditions, was baptized with his brother at Mentz, in 826, and returned into his country attended by two eminent divines, Ansgar or Anschaire, and Authbert; the former a monk of Corbey in Westphalia, and the latter belonging to a monastery of the same name in France. These venerable missionaries preached the Gospel with remarkable success, during the course of two years, to the inhabitants of Cimbria and Jutland.

II. After the death of his learned and pious companion Authbert, the zealous and indefatigable Ansgar made a voyage into Sweden, in 828, where his ministerial labours were also crowned with distinguished success. Returning into Germany, in 831, he was loaded by Louis with ecclesiastical honours, being created archbishop of the new church at Hamburg, and also of the whole north, to which dignity, in 844, the superintendence of the church at Bremen was added. The profits attached to this high and honourable charge were very inconsiderable, while the perils and labours, in which it involved the pious prelate, were truly formidable. Accordingly, he travelled frequently among the Danes, Cimbrians, and Swedes, in order to promote the cause of Christ, to form new churches, and to confirm and establish those which he had already incorporated; in all which arduous enterprises he passed his life in the most imminent dangers, until, in 865, he concluded his glorious course.[a]

III. About the middle of this century the Mœsians,[b] Bulgarians, and Gazarians, and after them the Bohemians and Moravians, were converted to Christianity by Methodius and Cyril, two Greek monks, whom the empress Theodora had sent to dispel the darkness of those idolatrous nations.[c] The zeal of Charlemagne, and of his pious missionaries, had been formerly exerted in the same cause, and among the same people,[d] but with so little success, that any faint notions which they had received of the Christian doctrine were entirely effaced.—The instructions of the Grecian doctors had a much better, and also a more permanent effect; but, as they recommended to their new disciples the forms of worship, and the various rites and ceremonies used among the Greeks,[e] this was the occasion of much religious animosity and contention in after-times, when the lordly pontiffs exerted all their vehemence, and employed all the means which they could devise, though with imperfect success, for reducing these nations under the discipline and jurisdiction of the Latin church.

IV. Under the reign of Basilius, the Macedonian, who ascended the imperial throne of the Greeks in 867, the Sclavonians, Arentani, and certain communities of Dalmatia, sent a solemn embassy to Constantinople to declare their resolution of submitting to the jurisdiction of the Grecian empire, and of embracing, at the same time, the Christian religion. This proposal was received with admiration and joy; and it was also answered by a suitable ardour and zeal for the conversion of a people that seemed so ingenuously disposed to embrace the truth: accordingly, a competent number of Grecian doctors were sent among them to instruct them in the knowledge of the Gospel, and to admit them by baptism into the Christian church.[f] The warlike nation of the Russians were

[a] The writers to whom we are indebted for accounts of this pious and illustrious prelate, the founder of the Cimbrian, Danish, and Swedish churches, are mentioned by Fabricius in his Biblioth. Latin. medii Ævi, tom. i. p. 292, as also in his Lux Evangelii Orbi Terrarum exoriens, p. 425. Add to these the Benedictine monks, in their Histoire Lit. de la France, tom. v. p. 277.—Acta Sanctor. Mens. Februar. tom. i. p. 391.—Erici Pontoppidani Annales Eccles. Danicæ Diplomat. tom. i. p. 18.—Molleri Cimbria Literata, tom. iii. These writers give us also circumstantial accounts of Ebbo, Withmar, Rembert, and others, who were either the fellow-labourers or successors of Ansgar.

[b] We have translated thus the term *Mysi*, which is an error in the original. Dr. Mosheim, like many others, has confounded the Mysians with the inhabitants of Mœsia, by giving to the latter, who were Europeans, the title of the former, who dwelt in Asia.

[c] Jo. George Stredowsky, Sacra Moraviæ Historia, lib. ii. cap. ii. p. 94, compared with Pet. Kohlii Introduct. in Historiam et Rem liter. Slavorum, p. 124.

[d] Stredowsky, lib. i. cap. ix. p. 55.

[e] L'Enfant, Histoire de la Guerre des Hussites, liv. i.

[f] We are indebted for this account of the conversion of the Sclavonians

converted under the same emperor, but not in the same manner, or from the same noble and rational motives. Having entered into a treaty of peace with that prince, they were engaged by various presents and promises to embrace the Gospel, in consequence of which they received not only the Christian ministers that were appointed to instruct them, but also an archbishop, whom the Grecian patriarch Ignatius had sent among them, to perfect their conversion and establish their church.[a] Such were the beginnings of Christianity among the bold and warlike Russians, who were inhabitants of the Ukraine, and who, before their conversion, had fitted out a formidable fleet, and, setting sail from Kiow for Constantinople, had spread terror and dismay through the whole empire.[b]

V. It is proper to observe, with respect to the various conversions which we have now been relating, that they were undertaken upon much better principles, and executed in a more pious and rational manner, than those of the preceding ages. The ministers, who were now sent to instruct and convert the barbarous nations, did not, like many of their predecessors, employ the terror of penal laws, to affright men into the profession of Christianity; nor, in establishing churches upon the ruins of idolatry, were they principally attentive to promote the grandeur and extend the authority of the Roman pontiffs; their views were more noble, and their conduct more suitable to the genius of the religion they professed. They had chiefly in view the happiness of mankind, endeavoured to promote the gospel of truth and peace by rational persuasion, and seconded their arguments by the victorious power of exemplary lives. It must, however, be confessed, that the doctrine they taught was far from being comformable to the pure and excellent rules of faith and practice laid down by our divine Saviour and his holy apostles; for their religious system was corrupted by a variety of superstitious rites, and a multitude of absurd inventions. It is farther certain, that there remained among these converted nations too many traces of the idolatrous religion of their ancestors, notwithstanding the zealous labours of their Christian guides: and it appears also, that these pious missionaries were content with introducing an external profession of the true religion among their new proselytes. It would be, however, unjust to accuse them on this account of negligence or corruption in the discharge of their ministry, since, in order to gain over these fierce and savage nations to the church, it may have been absolutely necessary to indulge them in some of their infirmities and prejudices, and to connive at many things, which pious missionaries could not approve, and which, in other circumstances, they would have been careful to correct.

CHAPTER II.

Concerning the Calamitous Events that happened to the Church during this Century.

I. THE Saracens had now extended their usurpations with amazing success. Masters of Asia, a few provinces excepted, they pushed their conquests to the extremities of India, and obliged a great part of Africa to receive their yoke; nor were their enterprises in the west without effect, since Spain and Sardinia submitted to their arms, and fell under their dominion. But their conquests did not end here; for, in 827, by the treason of Euphemius, they made themselves masters of the rich and fertile island of Sicily; and, toward the conclusion of this century, an army of those barbarians, proceeding from Asia, seized several cities of Calabria, and spread the terror of their victorious arms even to the very walls of Rome, while Crete, Corsica, and other islands, were either joined to their possessions, or ravaged by their incursions. It is easy to comprehend that this overgrown prosperity of a nation accustomed to bloodshed and rapine, and which also beheld the Christians with the utmost aversion, must have been every where detrimental to the progress of the Gospel, and to the tranquillity of the church. In the east, more especially, a prodigious number of Christian families embraced the religion of their conquerors, that they might live in the peaceful enjoyment of their possessions. Many, indeed, refused this base and criminal compliance, and with a pious magnanimity adhered to their principles in the face of persecution: but such were gradually reduced to a miserable condition, and were not only robbed of the best part of their wealth, and deprived of their worldly advantages, but, what was still more deplorable, they fell by degrees into such incredible ignorance and stupidity, that, in process of time, there were scarcely any remains of Christianity to be found among them, beside the mere name and a few external rites and ceremonies. The Saracens who had fixed themselves in Europe, particularly those who were settled in Spain, were of a much milder disposition, and seemed to have put off the greatest part of their native ferocity; so that the Christians, generally speaking, lived peaceably under their dominion, and were permitted to observe the laws, and to enjoy the privileges of their holy profession. It must, however, be confessed, that this mild and tolerating conduct of the Saracens was not without some few exceptions of cruelty.[c]

II. The European Christians had the most cruel sufferings to undergo from another quarter,—even from the insatiable fury of a swarm of barbarians that issued out from the northern provinces. The Normans, under which general term are comprehended the Danes, Norwegians,

to the treatise *de administrando Imperio*, composed by the learned emperor Constantine Porphyrogeneta, and published by Bandurius in his Imper. Orient. tom. i. Constantine gives the same account of this event in the life of his grandfather Basilius, the Macedonian, sect. 54, published in the Corpus Scriptorum Byzantinorum, tom. xvi.

[a] Constantinus Porph. in Vita Basilii Macedonis, sect. 96. p. 157. Corp. Byzant. See also the Narratio de Ruthenorum Conversione, published both in Greek and in Latin by Bandurius, in his Imper. Orient.

[b] The earned Lequien, in his Oriens Christianus, tom. i. p. 1257, gives a very inaccurate account of those Russians who were converted to Christianity under the reign of Basilius the Macedonian; and in this he does no more than adopt the errors of many who wrote before him on the same subject. Nor is he consistent with himself; for in one place he affirms, that the people here spoken of were the Russians who lived in the neighbourhood of the Bulgarians, while in another he maintains, that by these Russians we are to understand the Gazarians. The only reason he alleges to support the latter opinion is, that, among the Christian doctors sent to instruct the Russians, mention is made of Cyril, who converted the Gazari to Christianity. This reason shows, that the learned writer had a most imperfect knowledge both of these Russians and the Gazari. He is also guilty of other mistakes upon the same subject. There is a much better explanation of this matter given by the very learned Theoph. Sigifred Bayer, Dissert. de Russorum primâ Expeditione Constantinopolitanâ, which is published in the sixth volume of the Commentaria Acad. Scientiar. Petropolitanæ.

[c] See, for example, the account that is given of Eulogius, who suffered martyrdom at Cordova, in the Acta Sanctorum ad d. xi. Martii, tom. ii. p. 88; as also of Roderic and Solomon, two Spanish martyrs of this century Ibid. ad d. xiii. Martii, p. 328.

and Swedes, whose habitations lay along the coasts of the Baltic sea, were a people accustomed to carnage and rapine. Their petty kings and chiefs who subsisted by piracy and plunder, had already, during the reign of Charlemagne, infested with their fleets the coasts of the German ocean, but were restrained by the opposition they met with from the vigilance and activity of that warlike prince. In this century, however, they became more bold and enterprising, made frequent irruptions into Germany, Britain, Friseland, and Gaul, and carried along with them, wherever they went, fire and sword, desolation and horror. The impetuous fury of these savage barbarians not only spread desolation through the Spanish provinces,[a] but even penetrated into the very heart of Italy; for, in 857, they ravaged and plundered the city of Luna in the most cruel manner; and, about three years after, Pisa, and several other towns of Italy, met with the same fate.[b] The ancient histories of the Franks abound with the most dismal accounts of their horrid exploits.

III. The first views of these savage invaders extended no farther than plunder; but, charmed at length with the beauty and fertility of the provinces which they were so cruelly depopulating, they began to form settlements in them; nor were the European princes in a condition to oppose their usurpations. On the contrary, Charles the Bald was obliged, in 850, to resign a considerable part of his dominions to the powerful banditti;[c] and a few years after, under the reign of Charles the Gross, emperor and king of France, the famous Norman chief Godofred entered with an army into Friseland, and obstinately refused to sheathe his sword before he was master of the whole province.[d] Such, however, of the Normans as settled among the Christians, contracted a more gentle turn of mind, and gradually departed from their primitive brutality. Their marriages with the Christians contributed, no doubt, to civilize them; and engaged them to abandon the superstition of their ancestors with more facility, and to embrace the Gospel with more readiness than they would have otherwise done. Thus the proud conqueror of Friseland solemnly embraced the Christian religion after he had received in marriage, from Charles the Gross, Gisela, the daughter of Lothaire the younger.

[a] Jo. de Ferreras, Historia de Espana, vol. ii. Piracy was esteemed among the northern nations a very honorable and noble profession; and hence the sons of kings, and the young nobility, were trained up to this species of robbery, and made it their principal business to perfect themselves in it. Nor will this appear very surprising to such as consider the religion of these nations, and the barbarism of the times. See Jo. Lud. Holberg, Historia Danorum et Norvegorum Navalis, in Scriptis Societatis Scientiar. Hafniensis, tom. iii. p. 349, in which there are a multitude of curious and interesting relations concerning the ancient piracies, drawn from the Danish and Norwegian annals.

[b] See the Scriptores Rerum Italicarum, published by Muratori.

[c] Annales incerti Auctoris, in Pithæi Scriptoribus Francicis, p. 46.

[d] Reginonis Prumiensis Annal. lib. ii.

PART II.

THE INTERNAL HISTORY OF THE CHURCH.

CHAPTER I.

Concerning the State of Letters and Philosophy during this Century.

I. The Grecian empire, in this century, was in circumstances seemingly calculated to extinguish all taste for letters and philosophy, and all zeal for the cultivation of the sciences. The liberality, however, of the emperors, some of whom were men of learning and taste, and the wise precautions taken by the patriarchs of Constantinople, among whom Photius deserves the first rank in point of erudition, contributed to attach a certain number of learned men to that imperial city, and thus prevented the total decline of letters. Accordingly, we find in Constantinople, at this time, several persons who excelled in eloquence and poetry; some who displayed, in their writings against the Latins, a considerable knowledge of the art of reasoning, and a high degree of dexterity in the management of controversy; and others who composed the history of their own times with accuracy and elegance. The controversy with the Latins, when it grew more keen and animated, contributed, in a particular manner, to excite the literary emulation of the disputants; rendered them studious to acquire new ideas, and a rich and copious elocution, adorned with the graces of elegance and wit; and thus roused and invigorated talents that were ready to perish in indolence and sloth.

II. We learn from Zonaras, that the study of philosophy lay for a long time neglected in this age; but it was revived, with a zeal for the sciences in general, under the emperor Theophilus, and his son Michael III. This revival of letters may principally be ascribed[a] to the encouragement and protection which the learned received from Bardas, who had been declared Cæsar, himself an illiterate man, but a warm friend of the celebrated Photius, the great patron of science, by whose counsel he was, undoubtedly, directed in this matter. At the head of all the learned men, to whom Bardas committed the culture of the sciences, he placed Leo, surnamed the Wise, a man of the most profound and uncommon erudition, and who afterwards was consecrated bishop of Thessalonica. Photius explained the Categories of Aristotle, while Michael Psellus gave a brief exposition of the better works of that great philosopher.

III. The Arabians, who, instead of cultivating the arts and sciences, had thought of nothing hitherto, but of extending their territories, were now excited to literary pursuits by Almamoun, otherwise called Abu Giafar Abdallah, whose zeal for the advancement of letters was great, and whose munificence toward men of learning and genius was truly royal. Under the auspicious protection of this celebrated khalif of Syria and Egypt, the Arabians made a rapid and astonishing progress in various kinds of learning. This excellent prince began to reign about the time of the death of Charlemagne, and died in 833. He erected the famous schools of Bagdad, Cufa, and Basra, and established seminaries of learning in several other cities; he drew to his court men of eminent parts by his extraordinary liberality, set up noble libraries in various places, caused translations to be made of the best Grecian productions into the Arabic language at a vast expense, and employed every method of promoting the cause of learning, that became a great and generous prince, whose zeal for the sciences was attended with knowledge.[b] It was under the reign of this celebrated khalif, that the Arabians began to take pleasure in the Grecian learning, and to propagate it, by degrees, not only in Syria and Africa, but also in Spain and Italy; and from this period they give us a long catalogue of celebrated philosophers, physicians, astronomers, and mathematicians, who were ornaments to their nation through several succeeding ages;[c] and in this certainly they do not boast without reason, though we are not to consider as literally true, all the wonderful and pompous things which the more modern writers of the Saracen history tell us of these illustrious philosophers.

After this period the European Christians profited much by the Arabian learning, and were highly indebted to the Saracens for improvement in the various sciences; for the mathematics, astronomy, physic, and philosophy, that were taught in Europe from the tenth century, were, for the most part, drawn from the Arabian schools that were established in Spain and Italy, or from the writings of the Arabian sages. Hence the Saracens may, in one respect, be justly considered as the restorers of learning in Europe.

IV. In that part of Europe which was subject to the dominion of the Franks, Charlemagne laboured with incredible zeal and ardour for the advancement of useful learning, and animated his subjects to the culture of the sciences in all their various branches: so that, had his successors been disposed to follow his example, and capable of acting upon the noble plan which he formed, the empire, in a little time, would have been entirely delivered from barbarism and ignorance. It is true, this great prince left in his family a certain spirit of emulation, which animated his immediate successors to imitate, in some measure, his zeal for the prosperity of the republic of letters. Louis the Debonnaire both formed and executed several designs that were extremely conducive to the progress of the arts and sciences;[d] and his zeal, in this respect, was surpassed by the ardour with which his son, Charles the Bald, exerted himself in the propagation of letters, and in exciting the emulation of the learned by the most alluring marks of his protection and favour. This great patron of the sciences drew the *literati* to his court from all parts, took a particular delight in their conversation, multiplied and embellished the seminaries of learning, and protected, in a more especial manner, the Aulic school, of which mention

[a] Zonar. Annal. tom. ii. lib. xvi.

[b] Abulpharajius, Historia Dynastiar. p. 246.—Georg. Elmacin. Histor. Saracen. lib. ii. p. 139.—Herbelot, Biblioth. Orient. article Mamun, p. 545.

[c] See the treatise of Leo Africanus, de Medicis et Philosophis Arabibus, published by Fabricius in his Bibliotheca Græca, tom. xii. p. 259.

[d] See the Histoire Literaire de la France, tom. iv. p. 582.

has already been made, and which was first erected in the seventh century, for the education of the royal family and the first nobility.[a] His brother Lothaire endeavoured to revive in Italy the drooping sciences, and to rescue them from that state of languor and decay into which the corruption and indolence of the clergy had permitted them to fall. For this purpose he erected schools in the eight principal cities of Italy, in 823,[b] but with little success, since that country appears to have been entirely destitute of men of learning and genius during the ninth century.[c]

In England learning had a better fate under the auspicious protection of king Alfred, who acquired an immortal name, not only by the admirable progress he made in all kinds of elegant and useful knowledge,[d] but also by the care he took to multiply men of letters and genius in his dominions, and to restore to the sciences, sacred and profane, the credit and lustre which they so eminently deserve.[e]

V. But the infelicity of the times rendered the effects of all this zeal and all these projects for the advancement of learning much less considerable than might have otherwise been expected. The protectors and patrons of the learned were themselves learned; their authority was respectable, and their munificence was boundless; and yet the progress of science toward perfection was but slow, because the interruptions arising from the troubled state of Europe were frequent. The discords that arose between Louis and his sons, which were succeeded by a rupture between the latter, retarded considerably the progress of letters in the empire; and the incursions and victories of the Normans, which afflicted Europe during the whole course of this century, were so inimical to the culture of the arts and sciences, that, in most of the regions of this part of the world, and even in France, there remained but a small number who truly deserved the title of learned men.[f] The wretched and incoherent fragments of erudition that yet remained among the clergy were confined to the monasteries, and to the episcopal schools; but the zeal of the monkish and priestly orders for the improvement of the mind, and the culture of the sciences, diminished in proportion as their revenues increased, so that their indolence and ignorance grew with their possessions.

VI. It must, however, be confessed, that several examples of learned men, whose zeal for science was kindled by the encouragement and munificence of Charlemagne, shone forth with a distinguished lustre through the darkness of this barbarous age. Among these, the first rank is due to Rabanus Maurus, whose fame was great through all Germany and France, and to whom the youth resorted, in prodigious numbers, from all parts, to receive his instructions in the liberal arts and sciences. The writers of history, whose works have deservedly preserved their names from oblivion, are Eginhard, Freculph, Thegan, Haymo, Anastasius, Ado, and others of less note. Florus, Walafridus Strabo, Bertharius, and Rabanus, excelled in poetry. Smaragdus and Bertharius were eminent for their skill in grammar and languages, as was also the celebrated Rabanus already mentioned, who acquired a very high degree of reputation by a learned and subtle treatise concerning the causes and the rise of languages. The Greek and Hebrew erudition was cultivated with considerable success by William, Servatus Lupus, Scotus, and others. Eginhard, Agobard, Hincmar, and Servatus Lupus, were famed for the eloquence which appeared both in their discourses and in their writings.[g]

VII. The philosophy and logic that were taught in the European schools during this century, scarcely deserved such honourable titles, and were little better than an empty jargon. There were, however, to be found in various countries, particularly among the Irish, men of acute parts and extensive knowledge, who were perfectly well entitled to the appellation of philosophers. Of these, the chief was Johannes Scotus Erigena,[h] a native of Ireland, the friend and companion of Charles the Bald, who delighted so much in his conversation as to honour him with a place at his table. Scotus was endowed with an excellent and truly superior genius, and was considerably versed both in Greek and Latin erudition. He explained to his disciples the philosophy of Aristotle, for which he was singularly well qualified by his thorough knowledge of the Greek language; but, as his genius was too bold and aspiring to confine itself to the authority and decisions of the Stagirite, he pushed his philosophical researches yet farther, dared to think for himself, and ventured to pursue truth without any other guide than his own reason. We have yet extant of his composition, five Books concerning the Division of Nature; an intricate and subtle production, in which the causes and principles of all things are investigated with a considerable degree of sagacity, and in which also the precepts of Christianity are allegorically explained, yet in such a manner as to show, that their ultimate end is the union of the soul with the Supreme Being. He was the first who blended the scholastic theology with the mystic, and formed both into one system. It has also been imagined, that he was far from rejecting the opinions of those who consider the union of God and nature, as similar to the union that subsists between the soul and the body,—a notion much the same with that of many ancient philosophers, who looked upon

[a] Herman. Conringii Antiquit. Academicæ, p. 320.—Cæs. Eg. du Boulay, Hist Acad. Paris. tom. i. p. 178.—Launoy, de Scholis Caroli M. cap. xi, xii. p. 47.—Histoire Liter. de la France, tom. v. p. 483.

[b] See the edict for that purpose among the Capitularia, published by Muratori in the first volume of his compilation de Rebus Italicis.

[c] See Muratori's Antiq. Ital. medii Ævi, tom. iii. p. 829.

[d] See Ant. Wood. Hist. et Antiquit. Academ. Oxoniens. lib. i. p. 13.—Boulay, Hist. Acad. Paris. tom. i. p. 211.—General Dictionary, at the article Alfred. (This prince, among other pious and learned labours, translated the Pastoral of Gregory I., Boetius de Consolatione, and Bede's Ecclesiastical History.)

☞ [e] This excellent prince not only encouraged by his protection and liberality such of his own subjects as made any progress in the liberal arts and sciences, but invited over from foreign countries men of distinguished talents, whom he fixed in a seminary at Oxford, and, in consequence, may be looked upon as the founder of that noble university.—Johannes Scotus Erigena, who had been in the service of Charles the Bald, and Grimbald, a monk of St. Bertin in France, were the most famous of those learned men who came from abroad: Asserius, Werefrid, Plegmund, Dunwuf, Wulfsig, and the abbot of St. Neot's, deserve the first rank among the English literati who adorned the age of Alfred. See Collier's Ecclesiastical History, vol. i. book iii. and Rapin's History of England.

[f] Servati Lupi Op. Epist. xxxiv. p. 69.—Conringii Antiq. Acad. p. 322.—Histoire Liter. de la France, tom. iv. p. 251.

[g] Such as are desirous of a more circumstantial account of these writers, and of their various productions, may consult the Histoire Literaire de la France, tom. iv. p. 251 to 271; or the more ample account given of them by the celebrated Le Bœuf, in his Etat des Sciences en France depuis Charlemagne, jusqu'au Roi Robert, which is published in his Recueil de divers Ecrits pour servir d'Eclaircissement à l'Histoire de France, tom. ii.

☞ [h] Erigena signifies properly a native of Ireland, as Erin was the ancient name of that kingdom.

the Deity as the soul of the world. But it may, perhaps, be alleged, and not without reason, that what Scotus said upon this subject amounted to no more than what the *Realists*,[a] as they are called, maintained afterwards, though it must be allowed that he has expressed himself in a very perplexed and obscure manner.[b] This celebrated philosopher formed no particular sect, at least as far as we know; and this will be considered, by those who are acquainted with the spirit of the times in which he lived, as a proof that his immense learning was accompanied with meekness and modesty.

About this time a certain person named Macarius, a native of Ireland, propagated in France that enormous error, which was afterwards adopted and professed by Averroes, that one individual intelligence, one soul, performed the spiritual and rational functions in all the human race. This error was confuted by Ratram, a famous monk of Corbey.[c] Before these writers flourished Dungal, a native of Ireland also, who left his country, and retired into a French monastery, where he lived during the reigns of Charlemagne and his son Louis, and taught philosophy and astronomy with the greatest reputation.[d] Heric, a monk of Auxerre, made likewise an eminent figure among the learned of this age; he was a man of uncommon sagacity, was endowed with a great and aspiring genius, and is said, in many things, to have anticipated the famous Des-Cartes in the manner of investigating truth.[e]

CHAPTER II.

Concerning the Doctors and Ministers of the Church, and its Form of Government during this Century.

I. THE impiety and licentiousness of the greatest part of the clergy arose, at this time, to an enormous height, and stand upon record, in the unanimous complaints of the most candid and impartial writers of this century.[f] In the east, tumult, discord, conspiracies, and treason, reigned uncontrolled, and all things were carried by violence and force. These abuses appeared in many things, but particularly in the election of the patriarchs of Constantinople. The favour of the court was now the only step to that high and important office; and, as the patriarch's continuance in that eminent post depended upon such an uncertain and precarious foundation, nothing was more usual than to see a prelate pulled down from his episcopal throne by an imperial decree. In the western provinces, the bishops were voluptuous and effeminate in a very high degree. They passed their lives amidst the splendour of courts and the pleasures of a luxurious indolence, which corrupted their taste, extinguished their zeal, and rendered them incapable of performing the solemn duties of their functions;[g] while the inferior clergy were sunk in licentiousness, minded nothing but sensual gratifications, and infected with the most heinous vices the flock, whom it was the very business of their ministry to preserve, or to deliver from the contagion of iniquity. Besides, the ignorance of the sacred order was, in many places, so deplorable, that few of them could either read or write; and still fewer were capable of expressing their wretched notions with any degree of method or perspicuity. Hence it happened, that, when letters were to be penned, or any matter of consequence was to be committed to writing, they commonly had recourse to some person who was supposed to be endowed with superior abilities, as appears in the case of Servatus Lupus.[h]

II. Many circumstances concurred, particularly in the European nations, to produce and augment this corruption and licentiousness, so shameful in an order of men, who were set apart to exhibit examples of piety to the rest of the world. Among these we may reckon, as the chief sources of the evil under consideration, the calamities of the times, the bloody and perpetual wars that were carried on between Louis the Debonnaire and his family, the incursions and conquests of the barbarous nations, the gross and incredible ignorance of the nobility, and the riches that flowed in upon the churches and religious seminaries from all quarters. Many other causes also contributed to dishonour the church, by introducing into it a corrupt ministry. A nobleman, who, through want of talents, of activity, or courage, was rendered incapable of appearing with dignity in the cabinet, or with honour in the field, immediately turned his views toward the church, aimed at a distinguished place among its chiefs and rulers, and became, in consequence, a contagious example of stupidity and vice to the inferior clergy.[i] The patrons of churches, in whom resided the right of election, unwilling to submit their disorderly conduct to the keen censure of zealous and upright pastors, industriously looked for the most abject, ignorant, and worthless ecclesiastics, to whom they committed the care of souls.[k] But one of the circumstances, which contributed in a particular manner to render, at least, the higher clergy wicked and depraved, and to take off their minds from the duties of their station, was the obligation of performing certain services to their sovereigns, in consequence of the possessions

☞ [a] The Realists, who followed the doctrine of Aristotle with respect to universal ideas, were so called in opposition to the Nominalists, who embraced the hypothesis of Zeno and the Stoics upon that perplexed and intricate subject. Aristotle held, against Plato, that previous to, and independent of, matter, there were no universal ideas or essences; and that the ideas, or exemplars, which the latter supposed to have existed in the divine mind, and to have been the *models* of all created things, had been eternally impressed upon matter, and were coëval with, and inherent in, their objects. Zeno and his followers, departing both from the Platonic and Aristotelian systems, maintained that these pretended universals had neither form nor essence, and were no more than mere terms and nominal representations of their particular objects. The doctrine of Aristotle prevailed until the eleventh century, when Roscellinus embraced the Stoical system, and founded the sect of the Nominalists, whose sentiments were propagated with great success by the famous Abelard. These two sects differed considerably among themselves, and explained, or rather obscured, their respective tenets in a variety of ways.

[b] The work here alluded to was published by Mr. Thomas Gale, in 1681. The learned Heuman has made several extracts from it, and has given also an ample account of Scotus, in his Acts of the Philosophers, written in German, tom. iii. p. 858.

[c] Mabillon, Præf. part ii. Actor. SS. Ord. Benedicti, sect. 156. p. 53

[d] Histoire Literaire de la France, tom. iv. p. 493.

[e] Le Bœuf, Memoires pour l'Histoire d'Auxerre, tom. ii. p. 481.—Acta Sanctorum, tom. iv. M. Junii ad d. xxiv. p. 829, et ad d. xxxi. Jul. p. 249; for this philosopher has obtained a place among the saintly order.

[f] See Agobardus, de Privilegiis et Jure Sacerdotii, sect. 13.

[g] The reader will be convinced of this by consulting Agobard, *passim*, and by looking over the laws enacted in the Latin councils for restraining the disorders of the clergy. See also Servatus Lupus, Epist. xxxv. p. 73, 281, and Steph. Baluze, in Adnot. p. 378.

[h] See the works of Servatus Lupus, Epist. xcviii. xcix. p. 126, 142, 148; as also his Life. See also Rodolphi Bituricensis Capitula ad Clerum suum, in Baluzii Miscellaneis, tom. vi. p. 139, 148.

[i] Hincmarus, in Opere Posteriore contra Godeschalcum, cap. xxxvi. tom. i. op. p. 318.—Servatus Lupus, Epist. lxxix. p. 120.

[k] Agobardus, de Privilegiis et Jure Sacerdotii, cap. xi. p. 341. tom. i. op.

they derived from the royal bounty. The bishops and heads of monasteries held many lands and castles by a feudal tenure; and, being thereby bound to furnish their princes with a certain number of soldiers in time of war, were obliged also to take the field themselves at the head of these troops,[a] and thus to act in a sphere that was utterly inconsistent with the nature and duties of their sacred character. Beside all this, it often happened that rapacious princes, in order to satisfy the craving wants of their soldiers and domestics, boldly invaded the possessions of the church, which they distributed among their armies; in consequence of which the priests and monks, in order to avoid perishing through hunger, abandoned themselves to the practice of violence, fraud, and all sorts of crimes, considering these acts as the only remaining means by which they could procure a subsistence.[b]

III. The Roman pontiffs were raised to that high dignity by the suffrages of the sacerdotal order, accompanied by the voice of the people; but, after their election, the approbation of the emperor was necessary, in order to their consecration.[c] An edict, indeed, is yet extant, supposed to have been published, in 817, by Louis the Debonnaire, in which he abolishes this imperial right, and grants to the Romans, not only the power of electing their pontiff, but also the privilege of installing and consecrating him when elected, without waiting for the consent of the emperor.[d] But this grant will not deceive those who inquire into the affair with any degree of attention and diligence, since several learned men have proved it spurious by the most irresistible arguments.[e] It must, however, be confessed, that, after the time of Charles the Bald, a new scene of things arose; and the important change above mentioned was really introduced. That prince, having obtained the imperial dignity by the good offices of the bishop of Rome, returned this eminent service by delivering the succeeding pontiffs from the obligation of waiting for the consent of the emperors, in order to their being installed in their office; and thus we find, that from the time of Eugenius III., who was raised to the pontificate in 884, the election of the pope was carried on without the least regard to law, order, and decency, and was generally attended with civil tumults and dissensions, until the reign of Otho the Great, who put a stop to these disorderly proceedings.

IV. Among the pontiffs of this century, there were very few who distinguished themselves by their learning, prudence, and virtue, or who were studious of those particular qualities which are essential to the character of a Christian bishop. On the contrary, the greatest part of them are only known by the flagitious actions that have transmitted their names with infamy to our times; and all seem to have vied with each other in their ambitious efforts to extend their authority, and render their dominion unlimited and universal. It is here that we may place, with propriety, an event which is said to have interrupted the much-vaunted succession of regular bishops in the see of Rome, from the first foundation of that church to the present times. Between the pontificate of Leo IV., who died in 855, and that of Benedict III., a certain woman, who artfully disguised her sex for a considerable time, is said, by learning, genius, and dexterity, to have made good her way to the papal chair, and to have governed the church with the title and dignity of pontiff about two years. This extraordinary person is yet known by the title of Pope Joan. During the five succeeding centuries this event was generally believed, and a vast number of writers bore testimony to its truth; nor, before the reformation undertaken by Luther, was it considered by any, either as incredible in itself, or as disgraceful to the church.[f] But, in the last century, the elevation, and indeed the existence of this female pontiff, became the subject of a keen and learned controversy; and several men of distinguished abilities, both among the Roman catholics and protestants, employed all the force of their genius and erudition to destroy the credit of this story, by invalidating, on the one hand, the weight of the testimonies on which it was founded, and by showing, on the other, that it was inconsistent with the most accurate chronological computations.[g] Between the contending parties, some of the wisest and most learned writers have judiciously steered a middle course; they grant that many fictitious and fabulous circumstances have been interwoven with this story; but they deny that it is entirely destitute of foundation, or that the controversy is yet ended, in a satisfactory manner, in favour of those who dispute the truth; and, indeed, upon a deliberate and impartial view of this whole matter, it will appear more than probable, that some unusual event must have happened at Rome, from which this story derived its origin, because it is not at all credible, from any principles of moral evidence, that an event should be universally believed and related in the same manner by a multitude of historians, during five centuries immediately succeeding its supposed date, if that event had been absolutely destitute of all foundation. But what it was that gave rise to this story is yet to be discovered, and is likely to remain uncertain.[h]

[a] Steph. Baluzii Appendix Actor. ad Servatum, p. 508.—Muratori Antiq. Ital. medii Ævi, tom. ii. p. 446.—Mabillon, Annal. Benedict. tom. vi. p. 587.—Du-Fresne, ad Joinvillii Hist. Ludovici S. p. 75, 76.

[b] Agobardus, de Dispens. Rerum Ecclesiast. sect. iv.—Flodoardus, Histor. Eccles. Rhemensis, lib. iii. cap. ix.—Servatus Lupus, Epist. xlv. p. 87, 437, &c.—Muratori, tom. vi. Antiq. Ital. p. 302.—Lud. Thomassin, Disciplina Ecclesiæ vet. et novæ circa Beneficia, par. ii. lib. iii. cap. xi. These corrupt measures prevailed also among the Greeks and Lombards, as may be seen in the Oriens Christianus of Lequien, tom. i. p. 142.

[c] See De Bunau, Histor. Imper. German. tom. iii.

[d] Harduini Concilia, tom. iv. p. 1236.—Le Cointe, An. Eccl. Francor. tom. vii. ad An. 817. sect. 6.—Baluzii Capit. Regum Fran. t. i. p. 591.

[e] Muratori, Droits de l'Empire sur l'Etat Ecclesiast. p. 54, and Antiq. Ital. tom. iii. p. 29, 30, in which that learned man conjectures, that this edict was forged in the eleventh century. Bunau, Hist. Imper. German. tom. iii. p. 34. The partisans, however, of the papal authority, such as Fontanini and others, plead strenuously, though ineffectually, for the authenticity of the edict in question.

[f] The arguments of those who maintained the truth of this extraordinary event are collected in one striking point of view, with great learning and industry, by Fred. Spanheim, in his Exercitatio de Papâ Fœminâ, tom. ii. op. p. 577. This dissertation was translated into French by the celebrated L'Enfant, who digested it into a better method, and enriched it with several additions.

[g] The arguments of those who reject the story of Pope Joan as a fable, have been collected by David Blondel, and after him with still more art and erudition by Bayle, in the third volume of his Dictionary, at the article *Papesse*. Add to these Jo. Georg. Eccard. (Histor. Franciæ Oriental. tom. ii. lib. xxx. sect. 119. p. 436,) who has adopted and appropriated the sentiments of the great Leibnitz, upon the matter in question. See also Lequien's Oriens Christian. tom. ii. p. 777, and Heuman's Syllogæ Dissert. Sacr. tom. i. part ii. p. 352. The very learned Jo. Christoph. Wagenselius has given a just and accurate view of the arguments on both sides, which may be seen in the Amœnitates Literariæ of Schelhornius, part i. p. 146; and the same has been done by Basnage in his Histoire de l'Eglise, tom. i. p. 408. A list of the other writers, who have employed their labours upon this intricate question, may be seen in Casp. Sagittarius' Introd. in Hist. Eccles. tom. i. cap. xxv. p. 676, and in the Biblioth. Bremens. tom. viii. part v. p. 935.

[h] Such is the opinion of Paul Sarpi, in his Lettere Italiane, Lett.

V. The enormous vices, that must have covered so many pontiffs with infamy in the judgment of the wise, formed not the least obstacle to their ambition in these miserable times, nor hindered them from extending their influence, and augmenting their authority, both in church and state. It does not, indeed, appear from any authentic records, that their possessions increased in proportion to the progress of their authority, or that any new grants of land were added to what they had already obtained from the liberality of the kings of France. The donations, which Louis the Debonnaire is reported to have made to them, are mere inventions, equally destitute of truth and probability;[a] and nothing is more groundless than the accounts of those writers who affirm that Charles the Bald divested himself, in 875, of his right to the city of Rome and its territory, in favour of the pontiffs, whom he at the same time enriched with a variety of noble and costly presents, in return for the good services of John VIII., by whose assistance he had been raised to the empire. Be that as it may, it is certain, that the authority and affluence of the bishops of Rome increased greatly from the time of Louis, but more especially from the accession of Charles the Bald to the imperial throne, as all the historical records of that period abundantly testify.[b]

VI. After the death of Louis II. a fierce and dreadful war broke out between the posterity of Charlemagne, among which there were several competitors for the empire. This furnished the Italian princes and pope John VIII. with an opportunity of assuming the right of nominating to the imperial throne, and of excluding from all concern in this election the nations who had formerly the right of suffrage; and, as the occasion was favourable, it was seized with avidity, and improved with the utmost dexterity and zeal. Their favour and interest were earnestly solicited by Charles the Bald, whose entreaties were rendered effectual by rich presents, prodigious sums of money, and most pompous promises, in consequence of which he was proclaimed, in 876, by the pope and the Italian princes assembled at Pavia, king of Italy and emperor of the Romans. Carloman and Charles the Gross, who succeeded him in the kingdom of Italy, and in the Roman empire, were also elected by the Roman pontiff and the princes of Italy. After the reigns of those potentates, the empire was torn in pieces: the most deplorable tumults and commotions arose in Italy, France, and Germany, which were governed or rather subdued and usurped by various chiefs; and, in this confused scene, the highest bidder was, by the aid of the greedy pontiffs, generally raised to the government of Italy, and to the imperial throne.[c]

VII. Thus the power and influence of the pontiffs, in civil affairs, rose in a short time to an enormous height, through the favour and protection of the princes, in whose cause they had employed the influence which superstition had given them over the minds of the people. The increase of their authority, in religious matters, was not less rapid or less considerable; and it arose from the same causes. The wisest and most impartial among the Roman catholic writers, not only acknowledge, but have even taken pains to demonstrate, that, from the time of Louis the Debonnaire, the ancient rules of ecclesiastical government were gradually changed in Europe by the counsels and instigation of the court of Rome, and new laws substituted in their place. The European princes suffered themselves to be divested of the supreme authority in religious matters, which they had derived from Charlemagne; the episcopal power was greatly diminished, and even the authority of both provincial and general councils began to decline. The Roman pontiffs, elate with their overgrown prosperity, and the daily accessions that were made to their authority, were eagerly bent upon persuading all, and had, indeed, the good fortune to persuade many, that the bishop of Rome was constituted, by Jesus Christ, supreme legislator and judge of the church universal; and that, therefore, the bishops derived all their authority from the pope, nor could the councils determine any thing without his permission and consent.[d] This opinion, which was inculcated with the utmost zeal and ardour, was opposed by such as were acquainted with the ancient ecclesiastical constitutions, and the government of the church in the earlier ages; but it was opposed in vain.

VIII. In order to gain credit to this new ecclesiastical system, so different from the ancient rules of church government, and to support the haughty pretensions of the pontiffs to supremacy and independence, it was necessary to produce the authority of ancient deeds, to stop the mouths of such as were disposed to set bounds to their usurpations. The bishops of Rome were aware of this; and as those means were deemed the most lawful that tended best to the accomplishment of their purposes, they employed some of their most ingenious and zealous partisans in forging conventions, acts of councils, epistles, and the like records, by which it might appear, that, in the first ages of the church, the Roman pontiffs were clothed with the same spiritual majesty and supreme authority which they now assumed.[e] Among these fictitious sup-

lxxxii. p. 452; of L'Enfant, Biblioth. Germanique, tom. x. p. 27; of Theod. Hasæus, Biblioth. Bremens. tom. viii. part v. p. 935; and of the celebrated Pfaff, Instit. Histor. Eccles. p. 402; to whom we might add Wernsdorf, Boecler, Holberg, and many others, were such an enumeration necessary. Without assuming the character of a judge in this intricate controversy, concerning which so many decisions have been confidently pronounced, I shall only take the liberty to observe, that the matter in debate is yet dubious, and has not, on either side, been represented in such a light as to bring conviction.

[a] See above, sect. 3.

[b] Bunau, Histor. Imperii Rom. German. tom. ii. p. 482.—Jo. George Eccard, Histor. Franciæ Orient. tom. ii. lib. xxxi. p. 606.

[c] This matter is amply illustrated by Sigonius, in his famous book de Regno Italiæ, and by the other writers of German and Italian history.

[d] See the excellent work of an anonymous and unknown author, who signs himself D. B. and whose book is entitled Histoire du Droit Ecclesiastique public François, published first at London, in 1737, and lately republished in a more splendid edition. The author of this performance shows, in a judicious and concise manner, the various steps by which the papal authority rose to such a monstrous height. His account of the ninth century may be seen in the first volume of his work, at the 160th page.

[e] There is just reason to imagine, that these decretals, and various other acts, such as the grants of Charlemagne and his son Louis, were forged with the knowledge and consent of the Roman pontiffs, since it is utterly incredible that these pontiffs should, for many ages, have constantly appealed, in support of their pretended rights and privileges, to acts and records that were only the fictions of private persons, and should with such weak arms have stood out against kings, princes, councils, and bishops, who were unwilling to receive their yoke. Acts of a private nature would have been useless here, and public deeds were necessary to accomplish the views of papal ambition. Such forgeries were in this century deemed lawful, on account of their supposed tendency to promote the glory of God, and to advance the prosperity of the church: and, therefore, it is not surprising, that the *good* pontiffs should feel no remorse in imposing upon the world frauds and forgeries, that were designed to enrich the patrimony of St. Peter, and to aggrandise his successors in the apostolic see.

ports of the papal dignity, the famous *Decretal Epistles*, as they are called, said to have been written by the pontiffs of the primitive time, deserve chiefly to be stigmatized. They were the productions of an obscure writer, who fraudulently prefixed to them the name of Isidore, bishop of Seville,[a] to make the world believe that they had been collected by this illustrious and learned prelate. Some of them had appeared in the eighth century,[b] but they were now entirely drawn from their obscurity, and produced, with an air of ostentation and triumph, to demonstrate the supremacy of the Roman pontiffs.[c] The decisions of a certain Roman council, which is said to have been holden during the pontificate of Sylvester, were likewise alleged in behalf of the same cause; but this council had not been heard of before the present century, and the accounts now given of it proceeded from the same source with the decretals, and were equally authentic. Be that as it may, the decrees of this pretended council contributed much to enrich and aggrandize the Roman pontiffs, and exalt them above all human authority and jurisdiction.[d]

IX. There were, however, among the Latin bishops, some men of prudence and sagacity, who saw through these impious frauds, and perceived the chains that were forging both for them and for the church. The French bishops distinguished themselves, in a particular and glorious manner, by the zeal and vehemence with which they opposed the spurious decretals, and other fictitious monuments and records, and protested against their being received among the laws of the church. But the obstinacy of the pontiffs, and particularly of Nicolas I., conquered this opposition, and reduced it to silence. And as the empire, in the periods that succeeded this contest, fell back into the grossest ignorance and darkness, there scarcely remained any who were capable of detecting these odious impositions, or disposed to support the expiring liberty of the church. The history of the following ages shows, in a multitude of deplorable examples, the disorders and calamities that sprang from the ambition of the aspiring pontiffs; it represents these despotic lords of the church, labouring, by the aid of their impious frauds, to overturn its ancient government, to undermine the authority of its bishops, to engross its riches and revenues into their own hands; and, what is still more horrible, it represents them aiming perfidious blows at the thrones of princes, and endeavouring to lessen their power, and to set bounds to their dominion. All this is unanimously acknowledged by such as have looked, with attention and impartiality, into the history of the times of which we now write, and is ingenuously confessed by men of learning and probity, who are well affected to the Romish church and its sovereign pontiff.[e]

X. The monastic life was now universally in the highest esteem; and nothing could equal the veneration that was paid to such as devoted themselves to the sacred gloom and indolence of a convent. The Greeks and Orientals had been long accustomed to regard the monkish orders and discipline with the greatest admiration; but it was only from the beginning of the eighth century, that this holy passion was indulged among the Latins to such an extravagant length. In the present age it went beyond all bounds: kings, dukes, and counts, forgot their true dignity, even the zealous discharge of the duties of their high station, and affected that contempt of the world and its grandeur, which they took for magnanimity, though it was really the result of a narrow and superstitious spirit. They abandoned their thrones, their honours, and their treasures, and shut themselves up in monasteries, with a view of devoting themselves entirely to God. Several examples of this fanatical extravagance were exhibited in Italy, France, Germany, and Spain, both in this and in the preceding century; and if the allurements of worldly pleasures and honours had too much power over the minds of many, to permit their separating themselves from human society during their lives, such endeavoured to make amends for this in their last hours; for, when they perceived death approaching, they demanded the monastic habit, and actually put it on before their departure, that they might be regarded as of the fraternity, and be in consequence entitled to the fervent prayers and other spiritual succours of their ghostly brethren.

But nothing affords such a striking and remarkable proof of the excessive and fanatical veneration that was paid to the monastic order, as the conduct of several kings and emperors, who drew numbers of monks and abbots from their cloisters, and placed them in stations entirely foreign to their vows and their character, even amidst the splendour of a court, and at the head of affairs. The transition, indeed, was violent, from the obscurity of a convent, and the study of a liturgy, to sit at the helm of an empire, and manage the political interests of nations.[*] But such was the case; and pious princes alleged, as a reason for this singular choice, that the government of a state could never be better placed than in the hands of such holy men, who had subdued all irregular appetites and passions, and were so divested of the lusts of pleasure and ambition, as to be incapable of any unworthy designs, or any low, sordid, or selfish views. Hence we find, in the history of these times, frequent examples of monks and abbots performing the functions of ambassadors, envoys, and ministers of state, and displaying their talents with various success in these high and eminent stations.

XI. The morals, however, of the monks, were far from being so pure as to justify the reason alleged for their promotion. Their patrons and protectors, who loaded them with honours and preferment, were sensible of the irregular and licentious lives, that many of them led, and used

[a] It is certain that the forger of the decretals was extemely desirous of persuading the world that they were collected by Isidore, the celebrated bishop of Seville, who lived in the sixth century. See Fabricii Biblioth. Latin. medii Ævi, tom. v. p. 561. It was a custom among the bishops to add, from a principle of humility, the epithet *peccator*, i. e. *sinner*, to their titles; and, accordingly, this forger has added the word *peccator* after the name of Isidore: but this some ignorant transcribers have absurdly changed into the word *mercator*; and hence it happens that one Isidorus Mercator passes for the fraudulent collector, or forger of the decretals.

[b] See Calmet, Histoire de Lorraine, tom. i. p. 528.—B. Just. Hen. Bohmer, Præf. ad novam Edit. Juris Canon. tom. i. p. x. xix. Not.

[c] Beside the authors of the Centuriæ Magdeburgenses and other writers, the learned Blondel has demonstrated, in an ample and satisfactory manner, the spuriousness of the decretals, in his Pseudo-Isidorus et Turrianus vapulantes; and in our time the imposition is acknowledged even by the Roman catholics, at least by such of them as possess some degree of judgment and impartiality. See Buddeus' Isagoge in Theologiam, tom. ii. p. 726; as also Petr. Constantius' Prolegom. ad Epistolas Pontificum, tom. i. p. 30; and a dissertation of Fleury, prefixed to the sixteenth volume of his Ecclesiastical History.

[d] See J. Launoy, de cura Ecclesiæ erga pauperes et miseros, cap. i. Observat. i. p. 576. tom. ii. part ii. op.

[e] See the above-mentioned author's treatise, entitled Regia Potestas in Causis Matrimonial. tom. i. part ii. op. p. 764; as also Petr. Constantius, Præf. ad Epist. Romanor. Pontif. tom. i. p. 127.

their utmost efforts to correct their vices, and to reform their manners. Louis the Debonnaire distinguished his zeal in the execution of this virtuous and noble design; and, to render it more effectual, he employed the pious labours of Benedict, abbot of Aniane, in reforming the monasteries, first in Aquitaine, and afterwards throughout the whole kingdom of France, and in restoring, by new and salutary laws, the monastic discipline, which had been so neglected as to fall into decay. This worthy ecclesiastic presided, in 817, in the council of Aix-la-Chapelle, where several wise measures were taken for removing the disorders that reigned in the cloisters; and, in consequence of the unlimited authority he had received from the emperor, he subjected all the monks, without exception, to the rule of the famous Benedict, abbot of Mont-Cassin, annulled the variety of rites and customs that had prevailed in the different monasteries, prescribed to them all one uniform method of living, and thus united, as it were, into one general body or society, the various orders which had hitherto been connected by no common bond.[a] This admirable discipline, which acquired to Benedict of Aniane the highest reputation, and occasioned him to be revered as the second father of the western monks, flourished during a certain time, but afterwards declined through various causes, until the conclusion of this century, when, under the calamities that oppressed both the church and the empire, it almost entirely disappeared.

XII. The same emperor, who had appeared with such zeal, both in protecting and reforming the monks, gave also distinguished marks of his favour to the order of canons, which Chrodegangus had introduced in several places during the last century. He distributed them through all the provinces of the empire, and instituted also an order of canonesses, the first female convent known in the Christian world.[b] For each of these orders the zealous emperor had a rule drawn up, in 817, in the council of Aix-la-Chapelle, substituting it for that which had been appointed by Chrodegangus; and this new rule was observed in most of the monasteries and convents of the canons and canonesses in the west until the twelfth century, although it was disapproved by the court of Rome.[c] The author of the rule, framed for the canons, was undoubtedly Amalarius, a presbyter of Metz; but it is not so certain whether that which was drawn up for the canonesses, was composed by the same hand.[d] Be that as it may, the canonical order grew into high repute; and from this time a great number of convents were erected for its members in all the western provinces, and were richly endowed by the liberality of pious and opulent Christians. But this institution degenerated in a short time, like all others, from its primitive purity, and ceased to answer the laudable intention and design of its worthy founders.[e]

XIII. Of the theological writers who flourished among the Greeks, the following are the most remarkable:

Photius, patriarch of Constantinople, a man of most profound and universal erudition, whose Bibliotheca,[f] Epistles, and other writings, are yet valuable on many accounts.

Nicephorus, also a patriarch of the above-mentioned city, who, among other productions, published a warm defence of the worship of images against the enemies of that idolatrous service.[g]

Theodorus Studites, who acquired a name chiefly by his warm opposition to the Iconoclasts, and by the zeal with which he wrote in favour of image worship.[h]

The same cause has principally contributed to transmit to after ages the names of Theodorus Graptus, Methodius, who obtained the title of Confessor for his adherence to image worship in the very face of persecution, Theodorus Abucara,[i] Petrus Siculus, Nicetas David, and others, who would probably have been long since buried in oblivion, had not the various contests between the Greek and Latin churches, and the divisions of the former among themselves upon the question concerning images, excited the vehemence of these inconsiderable writers, and furnished them with an occasion of making some noise in the world.

Moses Barcepha, a Syrian bishop, far surpassed all whom we have now been mentioning, and deserved the shining reputation which he has obtained in the republic of letters, as what we have yet extant of his works discover marks of true genius, and an uncommon acquaintance with the art of writing.[k]

XIV. Rabanus Maurus, archbishop of Metz, is deservedly placed at the head of the Latin writers of this age; the force of his genius, the extent of his knowledge, and the multitude of productions that flowed from his pen, entitle him to this distinguished rank, and render improper all comparison between him and his contemporaries. He may be called the great light of Germany and France, since it was from the prodigious fund of knowledge he possessed, that those nations derived principally their religious instruction. His writings were every where in the hands of the learned,[l] and were holden in such veneration, that, during four centuries, the most eminent of the Latin divines appealed to them as authority in religious matters, and

[a] Jo. Mabillon, Acta Sanctor. Ord. Benedict. Sæc. IV. par. i. Præf. p. xxvii. and Præf. ad Sæc. V. p. xxv. et ejusdem Annales Ordin. S. Benedict. tom. ii. p. 430.—Calmet, Hist. de Lorraine, tom. i. p. 596. For a particular account of Benedict of Aniane, and his illustrious virtues, see the Acta Sanctor. tom. ii. Febr. 606; and the Histoire Lit. de la France, tom. iv. p. 447.

[b] See Mabillon, Annal. Ordin. S. Benedicti, tom. ii. p. 428.

[c] This rule was condemned in a council held at Rome, A. D. 1059, under the pontiff Nicolas II. The pretexts used by the pontiff and the assembled prelates, to justify their disapprobation of this rule, were, that it permitted the canons to enjoy the possessions they had before their vows, and allowed to each of them too large a portion of bread and wine; but the true reason was, that this order had been instituted by an emperor without either the consent or knowlege of the Roman pontiff. For an account of the rule and discipline of these canons, see Fleury's Hist. Eccles. tom. x. p. 163, 164, &c. Brussels edition in 12mo.

[d] Lud. Thomassin, Disciplin. Eccles. Vet. et Novæ, part i. lib. iii. cap. xlii, xliii.—Muratori, Antiq. Ital. medii Ævi, tom. v. p. 186, 540. No accounts of the canons are less worthy of credit, than those which are given by writers, who have been themselves members of that order, such as Raymond Chapponel's Histoire des Chanoines, published at Paris in 1699; for these writers, from fond prejudices in favour of their institution, and an ambitious desire of enhancing its merit, and rendering it respectable, derive the origin of the canonical order from Christ and his apostles, or trace it up, at least, to the first ages of the Christian church.

[e] Calmet, Hist. de Lorraine, tom. i. p. 591.—Hist. Lit. de la France, tom. iv. p. 536.

[f] See Camusat, Histoire des Journaux, tom. i. p. 87.

[g] Acta Sanctor. tom. ii. Martii ad d. xiii. p. 293.—Oudinus, Scriptor. Eccles. tom. ii. p. 2.

[h] Theodore Studites was one of the most voluminous writers of this century, and would certainly have been known as a man of genius and learning in after ages, even if the controversy concerning images had never existed. There are of his writings, yet extant, 265 letters, several treatises against the Iconoclasts, 124 epigrams in iambics, and a large manuscript, which contains a course of catechetical instruction concerning the duties of the monastic life.

[i] See Bayle's Dictionary, vol. i.

[k] Assemani Biblioth. Orient. Vatican. tom. ii. p. 127.

[l] See, for a particular account of the life and writings of Rabanu

adopted almost universally the sentiments they contained. After this illustrious prelate, the writers who are most worthy of mention are,

Agobard, archbishop of Lyons, a man of wisdom and prudence, and far from being destitute of literary merit; but whose reputation has deservedly suffered by his vindicating, and even fomenting the rebellion of Lothaire and Pepin against Louis the Debonnaire, their father and their sovereign.[a]

Hilduin, abbot of St. Denis, who acquired no small reputation by a work entitled Areopagitica.[b]

Eginhard, abbot of Selingestadt, the celebrated author of the Life of Charlemagne, remarkable for the beauty of his diction, the perspicuity and elegance of his style, and a variety of other literary accomplishments.[c]

Claudius, bishop of Turin, whose exposition of several books of Scripture,[d] as also his Chronology, gained him an eminent and lasting reputation.[e]

Freculph, bishop of Lisieux, whose Chronicle, which is no more than a heavy compilation, is yet extant.

Servatus Lupus, of whose composition we have several epistles and treatises: and who, though a copious and subtle writer, is yet defective in point of elegance and erudition.[f]

Drepanius Florus, who left behind him several poems, an exposition of certain books of Scripture, and other performances less worthy of attention.[g]

Christian Druthmar, the author of a Commentary upon St. Matthew's Gospel.[h]

Godeschalc, a monk of Orbais, who rendered his name immortal by the controversy which he commenced concerning predestination and free grace.

Paschasius Radbert,[i] a name famous in the contests concerning the real presence of Christ's body in the eucharist; and who, to pass in silence his other writings, composed a book upon this very subject, which furnished abundant matter of dispute throughout this century.

Bertram, or Ratram, a monk of Corby, who deserves the first rank among the writers that refuted the doctrine of Radbert; and whose book concerning the sacrament of the Lord's supper, composed by the order of Charles the Bald, gave occasion to many contests among learned divines.[k]

Haymo, bishop of Halberstadt, the laborious author of several treatises upon various subjects, and who is more to be esteemed for his industry and diligence, than for his genius and learning.[l]

Walafridus Strabo, who acquired no mean reputation by his Poems, his Lives of the Saints, and his explications of many of the more difficult passages of Scripture.[m]

Hincmar, archbishop of Rheims, a man of an imperious and turbulent spirit, but who deserves a distinguished place among the Latin writers of this century, since his works discover an aspiring genius, and an ardent zeal in the pursuit of truth, and tend, in a singular manner, to throw light both upon the civil and ecclesiastical history of the age in which he lived.[n]

Johannes Scotus Erigena, the friend and companion of Charles the Bald, an eminent philosopher, and a learned divine, whose erudition was accompanied with uncommon marks of sagacity and genius, and whose various performances, as well as his translations from the Greek, gained him a shining and lasting reputation.[o]

It is sufficient barely to name Remigius Bertharius, Ado, Aimoin, Heric, Regino, abbot of Prum, and others, of whom the most common writers of ecclesiastical history give ample accounts.

CHAPTER III.

Concerning the Doctrine of the Christian Church during this Century.

I. THE zeal of Charlemagne for the interests of Christianity, and his liberality to the learned, encouraged many to apply themselves diligently to the study of the Scriptures, and to the pursuit of religious truth: and, as long as this eminent set of divines remained, the western provinces were happily preserved from many errors, and from a variety of superstitious practices. Thus we find among the writers of this age several men of eminent talents, whose productions show that the lustre of true erudition and theology was not yet totally eclipsed. But these illustrious luminaries of the church disappeared one after another; and barbarism and ignorance, encouraged by their departure, resumed their ancient seats, and brought, in their train, a prodigious multitude of devout follies, odious superstitions, and abominable errors. Nor did any encourage and propagate with more zeal and ardour, these superstitious innovations, than the sacerdotal orders, the spiritual guides of a deluded people; and if we inquire how it came to pass, that the clergy were so zealous in such an inglorious cause, we shall find that this zeal was in some the effect of ignorance, and, in others, the fruit of avarice and ambition, since much was to be gained, both in point of authority and opulence, from the progress of superstition. Among the Greeks and orientals, Christianity was almost in the same declining and deplorable state, though there arose, from time to time, in the eastern provinces, men of superior abilities, who endeavoured to support the cause of true religion, and to raise it from the pressures under which it laboured.

Maurus, the Histoire Literaire de la France, tom. v. p. 151; as also the Acta Sanctor. tom. i. Febr. p. 500.

[a] See Colonia, Hist. Liter. de la ville de Lyon, tom. ii. p. 93.—General Dictionary, at the article Agobard.—Hist. Lit. de la France, tom. iv. p. 567. [Agobard opposed with great zeal both the worship and the use of images, in his famous book, de Picturis et Imaginibus, a work which has greatly embarrassed the doctors of the Romish church.]

[b] Hist. Lit. de la France, tom. iv. p. 607.

[c] Hist. Lit. de la France, tom. iv. p. 550. See also the Life of Charlemagne, the best edition of which is that published by Schminkius, at Utrecht, in 1711.

☞ [d] This prelate, who was famous for his knowledge of the holy Scriptures, composed 111 books of commentaries upon Genesis, 4 upon Exodus, and several upon Leviticus. He wrote also a commentary upon the Gospel of St. Matthew, in which there are many excellent things, and an exposition of all the Epistles of St. Paul. His commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians is printed, but all the rest are in manuscript.

[e] See Simon, Critique de la Biblioth. Eccles. de M. Du-Pin, t. i. p. 284.

[f] Histoire Lit. de la France, tom. v. p. 255.

[g] Colonia, Histoire Liter. de Lyon, tom. ii. p. 135.—Hist. Lit. de la France, tom. v. p. 213.

[h] Hist. Lit. de la France, tom. v. p. 84.

[i] For an account of Radbert, see the work last quoted, tom. v. p. 287.

[k] We shall have occasion to speak more particularly of Bertram, and his book, in the following chapter.

[l] It is proper to observe, that a great part of the writings that are attributed to Haymo, bishop of Halberstadt, were composed by Remi, or Remigius, of Auxerre. See Casimir Oudinus, Comment. de Scriptor. Eccles. tom. ii. p. 330.—Histoire Literaire de la France, tom. v. p. 111. tom. vi. p. 106.—Le Bœuf, Recueil de Diss. sur l'Histoire de la France, tom. i. p. 278.

[m] See the Histoire de la France, tom. v. p. 544.

[n] The same work, tom. v. p. 416.

[o] See Herm. Conringius, Antiq. Academicæ, p. 309, and the Hist. Lit. de la France, tom. v. p. 416.

II. The causes of this unhappy revolution, that covered the Christian church with superstition and darkness, will appear evident to such as are at all acquainted with the history of these times. The Oriental doctors, miserably divided among themselves, and involved in the bitterest contentions and quarrels with the western churches, lost all notion of the true spirit and genius of Christianity, and, corrupted and biassed by the prejudices and passions that are generally excited and nourished by ill-managed controversy, became incapable of promoting the true and essential interests of religion. Intent also upon defending the excellence and divine authority of their doctrine and discipline against the Latin doctors, and in maintaining among themselves the worship of images, which began to be warmly opposed, they advanced, in the course of these disputes, many things that were highly erroneous; and, as one error follows another, their number increased from day to day. The savage and unnatural lives of the monks and hermits, whose number was prodigious, and whose authority was considerable, who haunted the woods and deserts, the gloomy scenes of their extravagant devotion, —contributed much, among other causes, to the decay of solid and rational piety. Add to all this, the irruptions of the barbarous nations into the west, the atrocious exploits of usurping princes, the drooping and neglected condition of the various branches of learning, the ambitious phrensy of the Roman pontiffs, (who were incessantly gaping after new accessions of authority and dominion,) the frauds and tricks of the monastic orders carried on under the specious mask of religion; and then we shall see the true causes that founded the empire of superstition and error, upon the ruin of virtue, piety, and reason.

III. The ignorance and corruption that dishonoured the Christian church, in this century, were great beyond measure; and if there were no other examples of their enormity upon record, than the single instance of the stupid veneration that was paid to the bones and carcasses of departed saints, this would be sufficient to convince us of the deplorable progress of superstition. This idolatrous devotion was now considered as the most sacred and momentous branch of religion; nor did any dare to entertain the smallest hopes of finding the Deity propitious, before they had assured themselves of the protection and intercession of some one or other of the saintly order. Hence it was that every church, and indeed every private Christian, had their particular patron among the saints, from an apprehension that their spiritual interests would be but indifferently managed by those, who were already employed about the souls of others; for they judged, in this respect, of the saints, as they did of mortals, whose capacity is too limited to comprehend a vast variety of objects. This notion rendered it necessary to multiply prodigiously the number of saints, and to create daily new patrons for the deluded people; and this was done with the utmost zeal. The priests and monks set their invention at work, and peopled, at discretion, the invisible world with imaginary protectors. They dispelled the thick darkness which covered the pretended spiritual exploits of many holy men; and invented both names and histories of saints[a] that never existed, that they might not be at a loss to furnish the credulous and wretched multitude with objects proper to perpetuate their superstition, and to nourish their confidence. Many chose their own guides, and committed their spiritual interests either to phantoms of their own creation, or to distracted fanatics, whom they esteemed as saints, for no other reason than their having lived like madmen.

IV. The ecclesiastical councils found it necessary, at length, to set limits to the licentious superstition of those ignorant wretches, who, with a view to have still more friends at court, (for such were their gross notions of things,) were daily adding new saints to the list of their celestial mediators. They, accordingly, declared by a solemn decree, that no departed Christian should be considered as a member of the saintly order before the bishop in a provincial council, and in the presence of the people, had pronounced him worthy of that distinguished honour.[b] This remedy, feeble and illusory as it was, contributed, in some measure, to restrain the fanatical temerity of the saint makers: but, in its consequences, it was the occasion of a new accession of power to the Roman pontiff. Even so early as this century, many were of opinion, that it was proper and expedient, though not absolutely necessary, that the decisions of bishops and councils should be confirmed by the consent and authority of the pope, whom they considered as the supreme and universal bishop; and this will not appear surprising to any who reflect upon the enormous strides which the bishops of Rome made toward unbounded dominion in this barbarous and superstitious age, whose corruption and darkness were peculiarly favourable to their ambitious pretensions. It is true, we have no example of any person solemnly sainted by the bishop of Rome alone, before the tenth century,[c] when Udalric, bishop of Augsburg, received this dignity in a formal manner from John XV. It is, however, certain, that before that time the pontiffs were consulted in matters of that nature, and their judgment respected in the choice of those who were to be honoured with saintship;[d] and it was by such steps as these, that the church of Rome engrossed to itself the creation of these tutelary divinities, which at length was distinguished by the title of *canonization*.

V. This preposterous multiplication of saints was a new source of abuses and frauds. It was thought necessary to write the lives of these celestial patrons, in order to procure for them the veneration and confidence of a deluded multitude; and here lying wonders were invented, and all the resources of forgery and fable exhausted, to celebrate exploits which had never been performed, and to perpetuate the memory of holy persons who had never existed. We have yet extant a prodigious quantity of these trifling legends, the greatest part of which were, undoubtedly

[a] See Dr. Middleton's Letter from Rome, in which we find the names of St. Baccho, St. Viar, St. Amphibolus, Euodia, &c.]

[b] Mabillon, Act. Sanctor. Ord. Benedicti, Sæc. V. Præf. p. 44.—Launoy, de Lazari, Magdalenæ, et Marthæ in Provinciam Appulsu, cap. i. sect. xii.—Franc. Pagi, Breviarum Pontif. Roman. tom. ii. p. 259, tom. iii. p. 30.

[c] See Dan. Papebrochius, de solennium Canonizationum Initiis et Progress. in Propylæo Actor. SS. mens. Maii, p. 171; and the other authors who have written upon this subject, of which there is an ample list in the Bibliographia Antiquar. of Fabricius, cap. vii. sect. 25.

[d] See the candid and impartial account that is given of this matter by the late pope Benedict XIV. in his laborious work, de Servorum Dei Beatificatione et Beatorum Canonizatione, lib. i. cap. 7. p. 59, tom. i. op. It is to be wished, that historians of the church of Rome would learn to imitate the prudence, moderation, and equity of that illustrious pontiff.

forged after the time of Charlemagne, by the monastic writers, who had both the inclination and leisure to edify the church by these *pious* frauds. The same impostors, who peopled the celestial regions with fictitious saints, employed also their fruitful inventions in embellishing, with false miracles and various other impertinent forgeries, the histories of those who had been really martyrs or confessors in the cause of Christ; these fictions, however, did not pass without animadversion, but were severely censured by some of the most eminent writers of the times.[a] Various were the motives that engaged different persons to propagate these impositions, and countenance their authors. Some were incited to this by the seductions of a false devotion, which reigned in this perverse and ignorant age, and made them imagine, that departed saints were highly delighted with the applause and veneration of mortals, and never failed to crown, with peculiar marks of their favour and protection, such as were zealous in honouring their memories, and in celebrating their exploits. The prospect of gain, and the ambitious desire of being reverenced by the multitude, engaged others to multiply the number, and to maintain the credit of the legends, or saintly registers. The churches, that were dedicated to the saints, were perpetually crowded with supplicants, who flocked to them with rich presents, in order to obtain succour under the afflictions they suffered, or deliverance from the dangers which they had reason to apprehend; and it was regarded also as a very great honour to be the more immediate ministers of these mediators, who, as it is likewise proper to observe, were esteemed and frequented in proportion to their antiquity, and to the number and importance of the pretended miracles that had rendered their lives illustrious. The latter circumstance offered a strong temptation to such as were employed by the various churches in writing the lives of their tutelar saints, to supply by invention the defects of truth, and to embellish their legends with fictitious prodigies; indeed, they were not only tempted to this imposture, but were even obliged to make use of it in order to swell the fame of their respective patrons.[b]

VI. But even all this was insufficient to satisfy the demands of superstition, nourished by the stratagems of a corrupt and designing priesthood, and fomented by the zeal of the more ignorant and stupid sons of the church. It was not enough to reverence departed saints, and to confide in their intercession and succours; it was not enough to clothe them with an imaginary power of healing diseases, working miracles, and delivering from all sorts of calamities and dangers; their bones, their clothes, the apparel and furniture they had possessed during their lives, the very ground which they had touched, or in which their putrefied carcasses were laid, were treated with a stupid veneration, and supposed to retain the power of healing all disorders both of body and mind, and of defending such as possessed them against all the assaults and devices of Satan. The consequence of this absurd notion was, that every one was eager to provide himself with these salutary remedies; for which purpose great numbers undertook fatiguing and perilous voyages, and subjected themselves to all sorts of hardships, while others made use of this delusion to accumulate riches, and to impose upon the miserable multitude by the most impious and shocking inventions. As the demand for relics was prodigious and universal, the clergy employed all their dexterity to satisfy these demands, and were far from being scrupulous in the methods they used for that end. The bodies of the saints were sought by fasting and prayer, instituted by the priest in order to obtain a divine answer and an infallible direction, and this pretended direction never failed to accomplish their desires; the holy body was always found, in consequence, as they impiously gave out, of the suggestion and inspiration of God himself. Each discovery of this kind was attended with excessive demonstrations of joy, and animated the zeal of these devout seekers to enrich the church still more and more with this new kind of treasure. Many travelled with this view into the eastern provinces, and frequented the places which Christ and his disciples had honoured with their presence, that, with the bones and other secret remains of the first heralds of the Gospel, they might comfort dejected minds, calm trembling consciences, save sinking states, and defend their inhabitants from all sorts of calamities. Nor did these pious pilgrims return home with empty hands; for the craft, dexterity, and knavery of the Greeks, found a rich prey in the stupid credulity of the Latin relic-hunters, and made profitable commerce of this new devotion. The latter paid considerable sums for legs and arms, skulls and jawbones, (several of which were pagan, and some not human,) and other things that were supposed to have belonged to the primitive worthies of the Christian church; and thus the Latin churches came to the possession of those celebrated relics of St. Mark, St. James, St. Bartholomew, Cyprian, Panteleon, and others, which they show at this day with so much ostentation. But there were many who, unable to procure for themselves these spiritual treasures by voyages and prayers, had recourse to violence and theft; for all sorts of means, and all sorts of attempts in a cause of this nature, were considered, when successful, as pious and acceptable to the Supreme Being.[c]

VII. The study of the Scriptures languished much among the Greeks in this century. Photius, who composed a book of Questions,[d] relating to various passages of Scripture, an exposition of the Epistles of St. Paul, and other productions of the same nature,[e] was one of the few who employed their talents in the illustration of the sacred writings. He was a man of great sagacity and

[a] See Servatus Lupus' Vita Maximini, p. 275, and the candid and learned observations upon this subject that are to be found in various places of the works of the celebrated Launoy: *e. g.* in his Dispunctio Epistolæ Petri de Marca, de Tempore quo in Gallia Christi Fides recepta, cap. xiv. p. 110, in his Dissertationes de primis Christianæ Relig. in Gallia Initiis, diss. ii. 142, 144, 145, 147, 168, 169, 181.—De Lazari, Magdal. et Marthæ, in Galliam Appulsu, p. 340.—De duobus Dionysiis, p. 527, 529, 530. tom. ii. part i. op.—See also Martenne, Thesaurus Anecdotor. tom. i. p. 151.—Histoire de la France, tom. iv. p. 273.

[b] Of all the lives of the saints written in this century, those which were drawn up by the monks of Great Britain, and of Bretagne in France, seem to be the most liable to suspicion. See Mabillon, Præf. ad Sæc. I. Benedictin.

[c] See Muratori, (Antiq. Ital. tom. v.) who gives examples of the truth of this assertion.

☞ [d] This work, which is entitled Amphilochia, from its having been addressed to Amphilochius, bishop of Cyzicum, consists of 308 questions, and answers to them; a sixth part of which, at least, are to be found in the Epistles of Photius, published in 1651 by bishop Montague. The greater part of these questions relate to different texts of the Old and New Testament; but these are interspersed with others of a philosophical and literary kind. The work is still extant in manuscript in the Vatican, Barberinian, and Bavarian libraries.

☞ [e] Such as a *catena* (a *chain*) of commentaries on the book of Psalms, compiled from the writings of Athanasius, Basil, Chrysostom, &c., and a commentary upon the Prophets, both of which are yet extant

genius, who preferred the dictates of reason to the decisions of authority; notwithstanding all which, he cannot be recommended as a model to other commentators. The other Greek writers, who attempted to explain the Scriptures, did little more than compile and accumulate various passages from the commentators of the preceding ages; and this method was the origin of those *Catenæ*, or chains of commentaries, so much in vogue among the Greeks during this century, of which a considerable number have come down to our times, and which consisted entirely in a collection of the explications of Scripture that were scattered up and down in the ancient authors. The greatest part of the theological writers, finding themselves incapable of more arduous undertakings, confined their labours to this compilatory practice, to the great detriment of sacred criticism.

VIII. The Latin commentators were greatly superior in number to those among the Greeks, in consequence of the zeal and munificence of Charlemagne, who, both by his liberality and by his example, had excited and encouraged the doctors of the preceding age to the study of the Scriptures. Of these expositors there are two, at least, who are worthy of esteem,—Christian Druthmar, whose Commentary on St. Matthew has reached our times;[a] and the abbot Bertharius, whose Two Books concerning Fundamentals are also said to be yet extant. The rest seem to have been unequal to the important office of sacred critics, and may be divided into two classes, which we have already had occasion to mention in the course of this history; the class of those who merely collected and reduced into a mass the opinions and explications of the ancients, and that of a fantastic set of expositors, who were always hunting after mysteries in the plainest expressions, and labouring to deduce a variety of abstruse and hidden significations from every passage of Scripture, all which they did, for the most part, in a very clumsy and uncouth manner. At the head of the first class was Rabanus Maurus, who acknowledges that he borrowed from the ancient doctors the materials of which he made use in illustrating the Gospel of St. Matthew and the Epistles of St. Paul. To this class also belonged Walafrid Strabo, who borrowed his explications chiefly from Rabanus; Claudius of Turin, who trod in the footsteps of Augustin and Origen; Hincmar, whose Exposition of the four Books of Kings, compiled from the fathers, we still possess; Remigius of Auxerre, who derived from the same source his illustrations of the Psalms and other books of sacred writ; Sedulius, who explained in the same manner the Epistles of St. Paul; Florus, Haymo bishop of Halberstadt, and others, whom, for the sake of brevity, we pass in silence.

IX. Rabanus Maurus, whom we introduced above at the head of the compilers from the fathers, deserves also an eminent place among the allegorical commentators, on account of his diffuse and tedious work, entitled Scripture Allegories. To this class also belong Smaragdus, Haymo, Scotus, Paschasius Radbert, and many others, whom it is not necessary to particularize. The fundamental and general principle, in which all the writers of this class agree, is, that, beside the literal signification of each passage in Scripture, there are hidden and deep senses which escape the vulgar eye; but they are not agreed about the number of these mysterious significations. Some attribute to every phrase three senses, others four, and some five; and the number is carried to seven by Angelome, a monk of Lisieux, an acute, though fantastic writer, who is far from deserving the meanest rank among the expositors of this century.[b]

X. The teachers of theology were still more contemptible than the commentators; and the Greeks, as well as the Latins, were extremely negligent both in unfolding the nature, and proving the truth of the doctrines of Christianity. Their method of inculcating divine truth was dry and unsatisfactory, and more adapted to fill the memory with sentences, than to enlighten the understanding, or to improve the judgment. The Greeks, for the most part, followed implicitly Damascenus, while the Latins submitted their hoodwinked intellects to the authority of Augustine. Authority became the test of truth, and supplied in arrogance what it wanted in argument. That magisterial decisions were employed in the place of reason, appears manifestly from the *Collectaneum de tribus Quæstionibus* of Servatus Lupus; and also from a treatise of Remigius, concerning the necessity of holding fast the truths of the Gospel, and of maintaining inviolable the sacred authority of the holy and orthodox fathers. If any deigned to appeal to the authority of the Scriptures in defence of their systems, they either explained them in an allegorical manner, or understood them in the sense that had been given to them by the decrees of councils, or in the writings of the fathers; from which senses they thought it both unlawful and impious to depart. The Irish doctors alone, and particularly Johannes Scotus, had the courage to spurn the ignominious fetters of authority, and to explain the sublime doctrines of Christianity in a manner conformable to the dictates of reason, and the principles of true philosophy. But this noble attempt drew upon them the malignant fury of a superstitious age, and exposed them to the hatred of the Latin theologians, who would not permit either reason or philosophy to interfere in religious matters.[c]

XI. The important science of morals suffered, like all others, in the hands of ignorant and unskilful writers. The labours of some were wholly employed in collecting from the fathers an indigested heap of maxims and sentences concerning religious and moral duties; and such, among others, was the work of Alvarus, entitled *Scintillæ Patrum*. Others wrote of virtue and vice, in a more systematic manner; such as Halitgarius, Rabanus Maurus, and Jonas, bishop of Orleans; but the representations they gave of one and the other were very different from those which we find in the Gospel. Some deviated into that most absurd and delusive method of instructing the ignorant in the will of God by a fantastic combination of figures and allegories; and several of the Greeks began

in manuscript, the former in the Bibliotheca Segueriana or Coisliniana, and the latter in the Vatican library.

[a] See R. Simon, Histoire critique des principaux Commentateurs du Nouv. Testament. chap. xxv. p. 348; as also his Critique de la Bibliotheque Ecclesiastique de M. Du-Pin, tom. i. p. 293.

[b] See the preface to his Commentary on the Book of Kings, in the Bibliotheca Patrum, Maxima, tom. xv. p. 308. The commentary of Angelome upon the book of Genesis was published by Bernard Pezius, in his Thesaurus Anecdotorum, tom. i. part i.; but, indeed, the loss would not have been great, if it had never seen the light.

[c] For an account of the persecution and hatred that Johannes Scotus suffered in the cause of reason and liberty, see Du Boulay, Hist. Academ. Paris. tom. i. p. 182; as also Mabillon, Acta Sanctor. Ord. Bened. Sæc. V. p. 392.

to turn their studies towards the solution of cases of conscience,[a] in order to remove the difficulties that arose in scrupulous and timorous minds. We pass in silence the writers of homilies and books of penance, of which a considerable number appeared in this century.

XII. The doctrine of the mystics, whose origin is falsely attributed to Dionysius the Areopagite, and whose precepts were designed to elevate the soul above all sensible and terrestrial objects, and to unite it to the Deity in an ineffable manner, had been now for a long time in vogue among the Greeks, and more especially among the monastic orders; and to augment the credit of this fanatical sect, and multiply its followers, Michael Syncellus and Methodius composed the most pompous and eloquent panegyrics upon the memory of Dionysius, in which his virtues were celebrated with the utmost exaggeration. The Latins were not yet bewitched with the specious appearance, and the illusory charms of the mystic devotion, which was equally adapted to affect persons of a lively fancy and those of a more gloomy turn of mind. They lived in a happy ignorance of this contagious doctrine, when the Grecian emperor Michael Balbus sent to Louis the Debonnaire, in 824, a copy of the pretended works[b] of Dionysius the Areopagite, which fatal present immediately kindled the holy flame of mysticism in the western provinces, and filled the Latins with the most enthusiastic admiration of this new religion. The translation of these spurious works into Latin by the express order of the emperor,[c] who could not be easy while his subjects were deprived of such a valuable treasure, contributed much to the progress of mysticism. By the order of the same emperor, Hilduin, abbot of St. Denys, composed an account of the life, actions, and writings of Dionysius, under the title of Areopagitica, in which work, among other impudent fictions, usual in those times of superstition and imposture, he maintained, in order to exalt the honour of his nation, that Dionysius the Areopagite, and Dionysius the bishop of Paris, were one and the same person.[d] This fable, which was invented with unparalleled assurance, was received with the most perfect and unthinking credulity, and made such a deep and permanent impression upon the minds of the French, that the repeated demonstrations of its falsehood have not yet been sufficient entirely to ruin its credit. As the first translation of the works of Dionysius that had been executed by order of Louis, was probably in a barbarous and obscure style, a new and more elegant one was given by the famous Johannes Scotus Erigena, at the request of Charles the Bald, the publication of which increased considerably the partisans of the mystic theology among the French, Italians, and Germans. Scotus himself was so enchanted with this new doctrine, that he incorporated it into his philosophical system, and upon all occasions either accommodated his philosophy to it, or explained it according to the principles of his philosophy.

XIII. The defence of Christianity, against the Jews and Pagans, was greatly neglected in this century, in which the intestine disputes and dissensions that divided the church, gave sufficient employment to such as had an inclination to controversy, or a talent of managing it with dexterity and knowledge. Agobard, however, as also Amulo and Rabanus Maurus, chastised the insolence and malignity of the Jews, and exposed their various absurdities and errors, while the emperor Leo, Theodorus Abucara, and other writers, whose performances are lost, employed their polemic labours against the progress of the Saracens, and refuted their impious and extravagant system. But it may be observed in general of those who wrote against the Saracens, that they reported many things, both concerning Mohammed and his religion, which were far from being true; and if, as there is too much reason to imagine, they did this designedly, knowing the falsehood, or at least the uncertainty of their allegations against these infidels, we must look upon their writings rather as intended to deter the Christians from apostacy, than to give a rational refutation of the Saracen doctrine.

XIV. The contests of the Christians among themselves were carried on with greater eagerness and animosity than the disputes in which they were engaged with the common enemies of their faith; and these contests were daily productive of new calamities and disorders, which dishonoured their profession, and threw a heavy, though undeserved reproach, upon the cause of true religion. After the banishment of Irene, the controversy concerning images broke out anew among the Greeks, and was carried on by the contending parties, during the half of this century, with various and uncertain success. The emperor Nicephorus, though he did not abrogate the decrees of the council of Nice, or order the images to be taken out of the churches, deprived the patrons of image-worship of all power to molest or injure their adversaries, and seems upon the whole to have been an enemy to that idolatrous service. But his successor Michael Curopalates, surnamed Rhangebe, acted in a very different manner. Feeble and timorous, and dreading the rage of the priests and monks who maintained the cause of images, he favoured that cause during his short reign, and persecuted its adversaries with the greatest bitterness and cruelty. The scene changed again, upon the accession of Leo the Armenian to the empire, who abolished the decrees of the Nicene council relating to the use and worship of images, in a council assembled at Constantinople, in 814;[e]

[a] See Nicephori Chartophylac. Epistolæ Duæ, in the Bibliotheca Magna Patrum, tom. iii. p. 413.

[b] Usserii Sylloge Ep. Hibernicar. p. 54, 55. ☞ The spuriousness of these works is now admitted by the most learned and impartial of the Roman catholic writers, as they contain accounts of many events that happened several ages after the time of Dionysius, and were not all mentioned until after the fifth century. See Fleury, Hist. Eccles. liv. 54. tom. vi. p. 528. edit. Bruxelles.

[c] That these books were translated by the order of Louis, appears manifestly from the Epistle to that emperor, which Hilduin prefixed to his Areopagitica, and in which we find the following passage: "de notitiâ librorum, quos (Dionysius) patrio sermone conscripsit, et quibus petentibus illos composuit, lectio nobis per Dei gratiam et vestram ordinationem, cujus dispensatione interpretatos, scrinia nostra eos petentibus reserat, satisfacit." From this passage, it is evident that they are in an error who affirm that the Latin translation of the works of Dionysius was not executed before the time of Charles the Bald. And they err also, who, with Mabillon, (Annal. Benedict. tom. ii. lib. xxix. sect. 59. p. 488.) and the authors of the Hist. Lit. de la France, (tom. v. p. 425.) inform us, that Michael Balbus sent these works already translated into Latin to the emperor Louis. It is amazing how men of learning could fall into the latter error, after reading the following passage in the Epistle above quoted: "Authenticos namque eosdem (Dionysii) libros Græcâ linguâ conscriptos, cum œconomus ecclesiæ Constantinopolitanæ et ceteri missi Michaelis legatione—functi sunt—pro munere magno suscepimus."

[d] Launoy, Diss. de Discrimine Dionysii Areopag. et Parisiensis, cap. iv. p. 38. tom. ii. p. i. op.; as also the writings of this great man concerning both those divines.

☞ [e] Fleury and some other writers place the meeting of this council in 815.

without however enacting any penal laws against their idolatrous worshippers. This moderation, far from satisfying the patriarch Nicephorus, and the other partisans of image-worship, only served to encourage their obstinacy, and to increase their insolence; upon which the emperor removed the haughty prelate from his office, and chastised the fury of several of his adherents with a deserved punishment. His successor Michael, surnamed Balbus, or the Stammerer, was obliged to observe the same conduct, and to depart from the clemency and indulgence which, in the beginning of his reign, he had discovered toward the worshippers of images, whose idolatry, however, he was far from approving. The monks more especially provoked his indignation by their fanatical rage, and forced him to treat them with particular severity. But the zeal of his son and successor Theophilus, in discouraging this new idolatry, was still more vehement; for he opposed the adorers of images with great violence, and went so far as to put to death some of the more obstinate ringleaders of that impetuous faction.

XV. On the death of Theophilus, which happened in 842, the regency was entrusted to the empress Theodora during her son's minority. This superstitious princess, fatigued with the importunate solicitations of the monks, deluded by their forged miracles, and not a little influenced also by their insolent threats, assembled, in the year above mentioned, a council at Constantinople, in which the decrees of the second Nicene council were reinstated in their lost authority, and the Greeks were indulged in their corrupt propensity to image-worship by a law which encouraged that wretched idolatry;[a] so that, after a controversy, which had been carried on during the space of a hundred and ten years, the cause of idolatry triumphed over the dictates of reason and Christianity; the whole east, the Armenians excepted, bowed down before the victorious images; nor did any of the succeeding emperors attempt to cure the Greeks of this superstitious phrensy, or restrain them in the performance of this puerile worship. The council that was holden at Constantinople under Photius, in 879, and which is reckoned by the Greeks the eighth general council, gave a farther degree of force and vigour to idolatry, by maintaining the sanctity of images, and approving, confirming, and renewing the Nicene decrees. The superstitious Greeks, who were blind-led by the monks in the most ignominious manner, esteemed this council as a most signal blessing derived to them from the immediate interposition of Heaven, and accordingly instituted, in commemoration thereof, an anniversary festival, which was called the Feast of Orthodoxy.[b]

XVI. The triumph of images, notwithstanding the zealous efforts of the Roman pontiffs in their favour, was obtained with much more difficulty among the Latins, than it had been among the Greeks; for the former yet maintained the inalienable privilege of judging for themselves in religious matters, and were far from being disposed to submit their reason implicitly to the decisions of the pontiff, or to regard any thing as infallible and true, which had authority for its only foundation. The greater part of the European Christians, as we have seen already, steered a middle course between the idolaters and the Iconoclasts, between those who were zealous for the worship of images on the one hand, and those who were averse to all use of them on the other. They were of opinion, that images might be suffered as the means of aiding the memory of the faithful, and of calling to their remembrance the pious exploits and the virtuous actions of the persons they represented; but they detested all thoughts of paying them the least marks of religious homage or adoration. Michael Balbus, when he sent, in 824, a solemn embassy to Louis the Debonnaire, to renew and confirm the treaties of peace and friendship which had been concluded between his predecessors in the empire and Charlemagne, charged his ministers, in a particular manner, to bring over the king of the Franks[c] to the party of the Iconoclasts, that they might gradually suppress, by their united influence, the worship of images, and thus restore concord and tranquillity to the church. Louis, on this occasion, assembled a council at Paris, in 824,[d] in order to examine the proposal of the Grecian emperor; in which it was resolved to adhere to the decrees of the council of Frankfort, which allowed the *use* of images in the churches, but severely prohibited the treating of them with the smallest marks of religious *worship*. But in process of time the European Christians departed gradually from the observance of this injunction, and fell imperceptibly into a blind submission to the decisions of the pope, whose influence and authority daily became more formidable; so that, toward the conclusion of this century, the Gallican clergy began to pay a certain kind of religious homage to the saintly images, in which their example was followed by the Germans and other nations.[e]

XVII. Notwithstanding this apostacy, the Iconoclasts were not destitute of adherents among the Latins. Of these, the most eminent was Claudius, bishop of Turin, by birth a Spaniard, and also a disciple of Felix, bishop of Urgel. This zealous prelate, as soon as he had obtained the episcopal dignity through the favour of Louis the Debonnaire, began to exercise the duties of his function, in 823, by ordering all images, and even the cross, to be cast out of the churches, and committed to the flames. The year following he composed a treatise, in which he not only defended these vehement proceedings, and declared against the use, as well as the worship, of images, but also broached several other opinions, that were quite contrary to the notions of the multitude, and to the prejudices of the times. He denied, among other things, in opposition to the Greeks, that the cross was to be honoured with any kind of worship; he treated relics with the

[a] See Fred. Spanheim, Historia Imaginum, sect. viii. p. 845, tom. ii. op.—L'Enfant, Preservatif contre la Reunion avec le Siege de Rome, tom. iii. lett. xiv. p. 147; lett. xviii, xix. p. 509.

[b] See Gretser's Observat. in Codinum de Officiis Aulæ et Eccles. Constantinopolitanæ, lib. iii. cap. viii.; as also the Ceremoniale Byzantinum, published by Reisk, lib. i. c. xxviii. p. 92.

[c] So Michael and his son Theophilus style Louis in their letter to him, refusing him the title of emperor, to which, however, he had an undoubted right, in consequence of the treaties which they now desired to renew.

[d] Fleury, Le Sueur, and other historians, unanimously place this council in 825. It may be proper to observe, that the proceedings of this council evidently show, that the decisions of the Roman pontiff were by no means looked upon at this time either as obligatory, or infallible; for, when the letter of pope Adrian, in favour of images, was read in the council, it was almost unanimously rejected, as containing absurd and erroneous opinions. The decrees of the second council of Nice, relating to image-worship, were also censured by the Gallican bishops; and the authority of that council, though received by several popes as an œcumenical one, absolutely rejected; and what is remarkable is, that the pope did not, on this account, declare the Gallican bishops heretics, or exclude them from the communion of the apostolic see. See Fleury, liv. xlvii.

[e] Mabillon, Annal. Benedictin. tom. ii. p. 488, et Act. Sanctorum Ord. Bened. sæc. IV.—Le Cointe, Annal. Eccles. Francor. t. iv. ad Ann. 824.

utmost contempt, as absolutely destitute of the virtues that were attributed to them, and censured with great freedom and severity those pilgrimages to the holy land, and those journeys to the tombs of the saints, which, in this century, were looked upon as extremely salutary, and particularly meritorious. This noble stand in the defence of true religion, drew upon Claudius a multitude of adversaries; the sons of superstition rushed upon him from all quarters; Theodemir, Dungallus, Jonas of Orleans, and Walafrid Strabo,[a] combined to overwhelm him with their voluminous answers. But the learned and venerable prelate maintained his ground,[b] and supported his cause with such dexterity and force, that it remained triumphant, and gained new credit; and hence it happened, that the city of Turin and the adjacent country were, for a long time after the death of Claudius, much less infected with superstition than the other parts of Europe.

XVIII. The controversy that had been carried on in the preceding century concerning the *procession* (if we may be allowed to use that term) of the Holy Ghost from the Father and the Son, and also concerning the words *filio-que*, foisted by the Latins into the creed of Constantinople, broke out now with redoubled vehemence, and from a private dispute became a flaming contest between the Greek and Latin churches. The monks of Jerusalem distinguished themselves in this controversy, and complained particularly of the interpolation of the words *filioque*, i. e. *and from the son*, in the above-mentioned symbol; nor did they stop here, but despatched to Charlemagne, in 809, a certain ecclesiastic of their order, whose name was John, to obtain satisfaction in this matter.[c] The affair was debated in due form, in a council assembled in that year at Aix-la-Chapelle, and also at Rome, in the presence of pope Leo III. to whom the emperor had sent ambassadors for that purpose. Leo adopted the doctrine which represented the Holy Ghost as proceeding from the Father and the Son, but he condemned the addition that had been made to the symbol,[d] and declared it as his opinion, that *filio-que*, being evidently an interpolation, ought to be omitted in reading the symbol, and at length stricken out of it entirely, not every where at once, but in such a prudent manner as to prevent disturbance. His successors were of the same opinion; the word, however, being once admitted, not only kept its place in opposition to the Roman pontiffs, but was by degrees added to the symbol in all the Latin churches.[e]

XIX. To these disputes of ancient origin were added controversies entirely new, and particularly that famous one concerning the manner in which the body and blood of Christ were present in the eucharist. It had been hitherto the unanimous opinion of the church that the body and blood of Christ were administered to those who received the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, and that they were consequently present at that holy institution, but the sentiments of Christians concerning the nature and manner of this presence were various and contradictory, nor had any council determined with precision that important point, or prescribed the manner in which this pretended presence was to be understood. Both reason and folly were hitherto left free in this matter; nor had any imperious mode of faith suspended the exercise of the one, or restrained the extravagance of the other. But, in this century, Paschasius Radbert, a monk, and afterwards abbot of Corbey, pretended to explain with precision, and to determine with certainty, the doctrine of the church on this head; for which purpose he composed, in 831, a treatise concerning the sacrament of the body and blood of Christ.[f] A second edition of this treatise, revised with care, and considerably augmented, was presented, in 845, to Charles the Bald; and it principally gave occasion to the warm and important controversy that ensued. The doctrine of Paschasius amounted, in general, to the two following propositions: first, that, after the consecration of the bread and wine in the Lord's Supper, nothing remained of these symbols but the outward figure, under which the body and blood of Christ were really and locally present; and, secondly, that the body of Christ thus present in the eucharist was the same body that was born of the Virgin, that suffered upon the cross, and was raised from the dead. This new doctrine, and more especially the second proposition now mentioned, excited, as might well be expected, the astonishment of many. Accordingly it was opposed by Rabanus Maurus, Heribald, and others, though they did not all refute it in the same method, or on the same principles. Charles the Bald, on this occasion, ordered the famous Ratram and Johannes Scotus to draw up a clear and rational explication of that important doctrine which Radbert seemed to have so egregiously corrupted.[g] These learned divines executed with zeal and diligence the orders of the emperor. The treatise of Scotus perished in the ruins of time; but that of Ratram is still extant,[h] which furnished ample matter of dispute, both in the last and present century.[i]

XX. It is remarkable that in this controversy each of the contending parties were almost as much divided among themselves as they were at variance with their adversaries. Radbert, who began the dispute, contradicts himself in many places, departs from his own principles, and maintains, in one part of his book, conclusions that he had disavowed in another. His principal adversary Bertram, or Ratram, seems in some respects liable to the same charge; he appears to follow in general the doctrine of

☞ [a] In order to do justice to the adversaries of Claudius here mentioned, it is necessary to observe, that they only maintained the innocence and usefulness of images, without pretending to represent them as objects of religious worship.

[b] Mabillon, Annal. Benedictin. tom. ii. p. 488.—Præf. ad sæc. IV. Actor. SS. Ord. Benedict. p. 8.—Histoire Liter. de la France, tom. iv. p. 491, and tom. v. p. 27, 64.—Basnage, Histoire des Eglises Reformées, tom. i.

[c] See Steph. Baluzii Miscellanea, tom. vii. p. 14.

☞ [d] This addition of *filio-que* to the symbol of Nice and Constantinople, was made in the fifth and sixth centuries by the churches of Spain; and their example was followed by most of the Gallican churches, where the symbol was read and sung with this addition.

[e] See Le Cointe, Annal. Eccles. Francor. tom. iv. ad a. 809.—Longueval, Histoire de l'Eglise Gallicane, tom. v. p. 151.

[f] See Mabillon, Annales Benedict. ii. p. 539. An accurate edition of Radbert's book was published by Martenne, in the sixth volume of his Ampliss. Collect. veter. Scriptor. p. 378. The life and actions of this wrong-headed divine are treated of at large by Mabillon, in his Acta Sanctor. Ord. Benedict. Sæc. IV. part II. 126, and by the Jesuits, in the Acta SS. Antwerp. ad d. xxvi. Aprilis.

[g] For an account of Ratram, or Bertram, and his famous book which made so much noise in the world, see the Biblioth. Lat. of Fabricius, tom. i. p. 1661.

☞ [h] A new English translation of the book of Bertram, (who was a priest and a monk of Corbey) concerning the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ in the Sacrament, was published at Dublin in 1752: to which is prefixed a very learned and judicious historical dissertation respecting this famous author and his works, in which both are ably defended against the calumnies and fictions of the Roman catholic writers.

[i] There is an account, but a partial one, of this controversy in Mabillon's Præf. ad Sæc. IV. part ii. Benedict. p. viii. which the curious reader will therefore do well to compare with Basnage's Hist. de l'Eglise, t. i. 909.

those, who deny that the body and blood of Christ are *really* present in the holy sacrament, and to affirm on the contrary that they are only represented by the bread and wine as their signs or symbols. There are, however, several passages in his book which seem inconsistent with this just and rational notion of the eucharist, or at least are susceptible of different interpretations, and have therefore given rise to various disputes. Johannes Scotus, whose philosophical genius rendered him more accurate, and shed through his writings that logical precision so much wanted, and so highly desirable in polemical productions, was the only disputant in this contest who expressed his sentiments with perspicuity, method, and consistency, and declared plainly that the bread and wine were the signs and symbols of the absent body and blood of Christ. All the other theologians of his time fluctuate and waver in their opinions, express themselves with ambiguity, and embrace and reject the same tenets at different times, as if they had no fixed or permanent principles on this subject. Hence it evidently appears, that there was not yet in the Latin church any fixed or universally received opinion concerning the manner in which the body and blood of Christ are present in the eucharist.

XXI. The disputants in this controversy charged each other reciprocally with the most odious doctrines, which each party drew by way of consequences from the tenets they opposed,—a method of proceeding as unjust, as it is common in all kinds of debate. Hence arose the imaginary heresy, that, on the triumphant progress of the doctrine of transubstantiation in the eleventh century, was branded with the title of *Stercoranism*, and of which the true origin was as follows: They who, embracing the opinion of Paschasius Radbert, believed that the bread and wine in the sacrament were substantially changed after the consecration, and preserved only their external figure, drew a most unjust conclusion from the opinion of their adversaries, who maintained, on the contrary, that the bread and wine preserved their substance, and that Christ's body and blood were only figuratively, and not really, present in the eucharist. They alleged that the doctrine of the latter implied, that the body of Christ was digested in the stomach, and was thrown out with the other excrements. But this consequence was quickly retorted upon those that imagined it; for they who denied the conversion of the bread and wine into the real body and blood of Christ, charged the same enormous consequence upon their antagonists who believed this transmutation; and the charge certainly was much more applicable to the latter than to the former. The truth is, that it was neither truly applicable to the one nor to the other; and their mutual reproaches, most wretchedly founded, show rather a spirit of invective, than a zeal for the truth. The charge of Stercoranism is but a malignant invention; it can never, without the most absurd impudence, be brought against those who deny the transmutation of the bread into the body of Christ; it may indeed be charged upon such as allow this transmutation, though it be a consequence that none of them, except those whose intellects were unsound, perhaps ever avowed.[a]

XXII. While this controversy was at its greatest height, another of a quite different kind, and of much greater importance, arose, whose unhappy consequences are yet felt in the reformed churches. The subject of this new contest was the doctrine of predestination and divine grace, and its rise is universally attributed to Godeschalcus, an illustrious Saxon, who had entered involuntarily into the monastic order in the convent of Fulda, whence he removed to the monastery of Orbais, in the diocese of Soissons, where he prosecuted his theological studies, not only with great assiduity, but also with an insatiable desire of sounding the deepest mysteries, and of being 'wise above what is written.' This eminent ecclesiastic, upon his return from Rome in 847, took up his lodging for some time with count Eberald, one of the principal noblemen at the court of the emperor Lothaire, where he discoursed largely of the intricate doctrine of predestination in the presence of Nothingus, bishop of Verona, and maintained that God, from all eternity, had preordained some to everlasting life, and others to everlasting punishment and misery. Rabanus Maurus, who was by no means his friend, being informed of the propagation of this doctrine, opposed him with great vigour. To render his opposition more successful, he began by representing Godeschalcus as a corrupter of the true religion, and a forger of monstrous heresies, in some letters addressed to count Eberald and to the bishop of Verona; and when the accused monk came from Italy into Germany to justify himself against these clamours, and for that purpose appeared at Mentz, of which Rabanus his accuser was archbishop, he was condemned in a council assembled by the latter in that city, in 848, and sent thence to Hincmar, archbishop of Rheims, in whose diocese he had received the order of priesthood. Hincmar, who was devoted to the interests of Rabanus, assembled a council at Quiercy in 849, in which Godeschalcus was condemned a second time, and was also treated in a manner equally repugnant to the principles of religion and the dictates of humanity. Because he was firm in maintaining his doctrine, which he affirmed, and indeed with truth, to be the doctrine of St. Augustine, the imperious Hincmar degraded him from the priesthood, and was so barbarous as to order him to be scourged with the utmost severity, until the force of his pain overpowering his constancy, obliged him, according to the commands of his reverend executioners, to burn with his own hands that justification of his opinions which he had presented to the council of Mentz. After these barbarous proceedings, the unfortunate monk was cast into prison in the monastery of Hautvilliers, where he ended his misery and his days in 868, or the following year, maintaining with his last breath the doctrine for which he had suffered.

XXIII. While Godeschalcus lay in prison, his doctrine gained him followers; his sufferings excited compassion; and both together produced a considerable schism in the Latin church. Ratram, monk of Corbey, Prudentius, bishop of Troyes, Loup, or Lupus, abbot of Ferrieres, Florus, deacon of Lyons, Remi, archbishop of the same city, with his whole church, and many other ecclesiastics, whom it would be tedious to mention, pleaded with the utmost zeal and vehemence, both in their writings and in their discourse, the cause of this unhappy monk, and of

[a] For an account of the Stercoranists, see Mabillon, Præf. ad Sæc. IV. Benedict. part ii. p. 21.—J. Basnage, Histoire de l'Eglise, tom. i. p. 926, and a Treatise of the learned Dr. Pfaff, published at Tubingen in 1750.

his condemned opinions. Some, indeed, confined themselves principally to the defence of his person and conduct, while others went farther, and employed all their zeal, and all their labour, in the vindication of his doctrine. On the opposite side of the question were Hincmar, his unrighteous judge, Amalarius, the celebrated Johannes Scotus, and others, who all maintained, that Godeschalcus and his opinions had received the treatment they deserved. As the spirit of controversy ran high between these contending parties, and grew more vehement from day to day, Charles the Bald summoned a new council, or synod, which met at Quiercy in 853, in which, by the credit and influence of Hincmar, the decrees of the former council were confirmed, and in consequence Godeschalcus was again condemned. But the decrees of this council were declared null; and decisions of a different kind, by which he and his doctrine were vindicated and defended, were enacted in a council assembled at Valence in Dauphiné, in 855. This council was composed of the clergy of Lyons, Vienne, and Arles, with Remi, archbishop of Lyons, at their head; and its decrees were confirmed, in 859, by the council of Langres, in which the same clergy were assembled, and in 860, by the council of Tousi, in which the bishops of fourteen provinces supported the cause of the persecuted monk, whose death allayed the heat of this intricate controversy.[a]

XXIV. If we attend to the merits of this cause, we shall find that the debate still subsists in all its force, and that the doctrine of Godeschalcus has in our days both able defenders and powerful adversaries. He undoubtedly maintained a two-fold predestination, one to everlasting life, and the other to eternal death. He held also, "that God did not desire or will the salvation of all mankind, but that of the elect only; and that Christ did not suffer death for the whole human race, but for those persons only whom God has predestinated to eternal salvation." These decisions, which carry a severe and rigorous aspect, are softly and favourably interpreted by the followers of Godeschalcus. They deny, for example, that their leader represents God as predestinating, to a necessary course of iniquity, those whom he has previously predestinated to eternal misery; and, according to them, the doctrine of Godeschalcus amounts to no more than this: "That God has, from all eternity, doomed to everlasting misery such as he foresaw would go on impenitent in a sinful course, and has decreed their ruin in consequence of their sins freely committed and eternally foreseen: that the salutary effects of the mercy of God, and the sufferings of Christ, extend indeed only to the elect, and are made good to them alone; though this mercy and these sufferings, considered in themselves, belong equally to all mankind." But this contradictory jargon did not satisfy the adversaries of the predestinarian monk; they maintained, on the contrary, that, under ambiguous terms and perplexed sentences, Godeschalcus had concealed the most enormous errors, propagating it assiduously as an article of faith, "That God had not only by an original decree predestinated one part of mankind to eternal damnation, but had also pushed them on by an irresistible necessity, by a prepollent force, to those crimes and transgressions which were proper to render that damnation just."[b] Without determining any thing upon such an intricate and incomprehensible subject, with respect to which silence is the truest wisdom, we shall only observe, that the private quarrels, and mutual hatred, that prevailed between Rabanus Maurus and Godeschalcus, were the real source of the predestinarian controversy, and of all the calamities in which it involved the unfortunate monk.[c]

XXV. Another, though less important, controversy, arose about this time, concerning the concluding words of a very ancient hymn, which runs thus; *te, trina Deitas unaque, poscimus*, which may be thus translated, 'O God, who art three, and at the same time but one, we beseech thee,' &c. Hincmar wisely prohibited the singing of these words in the churches that were under his jurisdiction, from a persuasion that they tended to introduce into the minds of the multitude notions inconsistent with the unity and simplicity of the Supreme Being, and might lead them to imagine that there were three Gods. But the Benedictine monks refused to obey this mandate, and Bertram, who was one of the most eminent of that order, wrote a copious work to prove the expression *trina Deitas*, or threefold Deity, orthodox, from the authority of fathers, esteemed the only criterion of truth in those miserable times. Godeschalcus, who now lay in prison, heard of this dispute, entered warmly into it, and in a laboured dissertation supported the cause of his Benedictine brethren; on which account Hincmar accused him of tritheism, and drew up a treatise to prove the charge, and to refute that impious and enormous heresy. This controversy, however, was but of a short duration; and the exceptionable passage of the hymn in question maintained its credit, notwithstanding all the efforts of Hincmar, and continued, as before, to be sung in the churches.[d]

XXVI. A vain curiosity, and not any design of promoting useful knowledge and true piety, was the main

---

[a] Beside the common writers, who speak of this controversy, the curious reader will do well to consult the more learned and impartial accounts he will find of it in Boulay's Hist. Acad. Paris, tom. i. p. 178.—Mabillon's Præf. ad Sæc. IV. Benedict. part ii. p. xlvii.—Hist. Literaire de la France, tom. v. p. 352.—Usserii Historia Godeschalci.—Gerard. Joh. Vossii Historia Pelagiana, lib. vii. cap. iv.—Fabricii Biblioth. Latin. medii Ævi, tom. iii. p. 210.

[b] The cause of Godeschalcus has been very learnedly defended by the celebrated Maguin, who published also a valuable edition of all the treatises that were composed on both sides of this intricate controversy. This interesting collection, which was printed at Paris in 1650, bears the following title: "veterum Auctorum qui Nono Sæculo de Prædestinatione et Gratiâ scripserunt, Opera et Fragmenta, cum Historiâ et geminâ Præfatione." Cardinal Norris maintained also the cause of the predestinarian monk with more brevity, but less moderation than Maguin. This brief vindication may be seen in the Synopsis Historiæ Godeschalcanæ, which is inserted in the 4th volume of the works of that cardinal, p. 677. All the Benedictines, Jansenists, and Augustin monks maintain, almost without exception, that Godeschalcus was most unjustly persecuted and oppressed by Rabanus Maurus. The Jesuits are of a different opinion; they assert in general, and Louis Cellot, one of their order, has in a more particular manner laboured to demonstrate, in his Historia Godeschalci Prædestinationis, published at Paris in 1655, that the monk in question was justly condemned, and deservedly punished.

[c] The parents of Godeschalcus consecrated him to God, by devoting him from his infancy, as was the custom of the times, to the monastic life in the monastery of Fulda. The young monk, however, having arrived at a certain age, seemed much disposed to abandon his retreat, to shake off his religious fetters, and to return into society; but he was prevented from the execution of this purpose by Rabanus Maurus, who kept him against his will in his monastic bonds. Hence a violent contest arose between these ecclesiastics, in which Louis the Debonnaire was obliged to interpose; and hence proceeded the furious disputes concerning predestination and grace. See Centuriæ Magdeb. Cent. ix. c. 10.—Mabillon, Annal. Bened. tom. ii. ad annum 829, p. 523.

[d] An account of this controversy is given by the writers of the life, actions, and doctrines of Godeschalcus.

source of the greatest part of the controversies that were carried on in this century; and it was more especially this idle curiosity, carried to an indecent and most extravagant length, that gave rise to the controversy concerning the manner in which Christ was born of the Virgin, which began in Germany, and made its way from that country into France. Certain Germans maintained, that Jesus proceeded from his mother's womb in a manner quite different from those general and uniform laws of nature that regulate the birth of the human species; which opinion was no sooner known in France, than it was warmly opposed by the famous Ratram, who wrote a book expressly to prove that Christ entered into the world in the very same way with other mortals, and that his Virgin mother bore him, as other women bring forth their offspring. Paschasius Radbert, who was constantly employed, either in inventing or patronising the most extravagant fancies, adopted the opinion of the German doctors, and composed an elaborate treatise to prove that Christ was born, without his mother's womb being opened, in the same manner as he came into the chamber where his disciples were assembled after his resurrection, though the door was shut. He also charged those who held the opinion of Ratram with denying the virginity of Mary. This fruitless dispute was soon hushed, and gave place to controversies of superior moment.[a]

XXVII. Of all the controversies that divided Christians in this century, the most interesting, though at the same time the most lamentable, was that which occasioned the fatal schism between the Greek and Latin churches. A vindictive and jealous spirit of animosity and contention had long prevailed between the bishops of Rome and Constantinople, and had sometimes broken out into acts of violence and rage. The ambition and fury of these contending prelates became still more keen and vehement about the time of Leo the Isaurian, when the bishops of Constantinople, seconded by the power and authority of the emperors, withdrew from the jurisdiction of the Roman pontiffs many provinces, over which they had hitherto exercised a spiritual dominion.[b] In this century the contest rose to an enormous height, and broke forth into a most dreadful flame, in 858,[c] when the learned Photius was chosen the patriarch of Constantinople, by the emperor Michael, in the place of Ignatius, whom that prince had driven from his see and sent into exile. This violent proceeding, though it was vindicated and even applauded by a council assembled at Constantinople in 861, was far from being attended with a general approbation. Ignatius appealed from this council to pope Nicolas I., who espoused his interests, and, in a council assembled at Rome in 862, excommunicated Photius as unlawfully elected, and his abettors for having been concerned in such an unrighteous cause. The new patriarch, however, was so far from being terrified or dejected by this excommunication, that he returned the compliment to the pope, and, in a council assembled at Constantinople, in 866, he declared Nicolas unworthy of the place he held in the church, and also of being admitted to the communion of Christians.

XXVIII. The Roman pontiff alleged a specious pretext for his acting with such violence, and exciting such unhappy commotions in the church. This pretence was the innocence of Ignatius, whom, upon an accusation of treason, whether true or false, the emperor had degraded from his patriarchal dignity. This, however, was not the true reason; ambition and interest were the real though secret springs that directed the motions of Nicolas, who would have borne with patience, and viewed with indifference, the unjust sufferings of Ignatius, if he could have recovered from the Greeks the provinces of Illyricum, Macedonia, Epirus, Achaia, Thessaly, and Sicily, which the emperor and Photius had removed from the jurisdiction of the Roman pontiff. Before he engaged in the cause of Ignatius, he sent a solemn embassy to Constantinople, to demand the restitution of the provinces; but his demand was rejected with contempt. Hence, under pretence of avenging the injuries committed against Ignatius, he indulged without restraint his own private resentment, and thus covered with the mask of justice the fury of disappointed ambition and avarice.

XXIX. While affairs were in this troubled state, and the flame of controversy was growing more violent from day to day, Basilius the Macedonian, who by the murder of his predecessor, had paved his way to the imperial throne, calmed at once these tumults, and restored peace to the church, by recalling Ignatius from exile, to the high station from which he had been degraded, and by confining Photius in a monastery. This act of authority was solemnly approved and confirmed by a council assembled at Constantinople, in 869, in which the legates of pope Adrian II. had great influence, and were treated with the highest marks of distinction.[d] The Latins acknowledge this assembly as the eighth œcumenical council; and in it the religious contests between them and the Greeks were concluded, or at least hushed and suspended. But the controversy concerning the authority of the pontiffs, the limits of their just power, and particularly their jurisdiction in Bulgaria, still subsisted; nor could all the efforts of papal ambition engage either Ignatius or the emperor to give up Bulgaria, or any other province, to the see of Rome.

XXX. The contest that had arisen between the Greeks and Latins concerning the elevation of Photius, was of such a nature as to admit an easy and effectual remedy. But the haughty and ambitious spirit of this learned and ingenious patriarch fed the flame of discord instead of extinguishing it, and unhappily prolonged the troubles and divisions of the Christian church. In the year 866, he added to the see of Constantinople the province of Bulgaria, with which Nicolas had formed the design of augmenting his spiritual dominion. While the pope was most bitterly provoked at missing his aim, Photius went yet farther, and entered into measures every way unworthy of his character and station: for he not only sent a circular letter to the oriental patriarchs to engage them to espouse his private cause, as the public and momentous cause of the church, but drew up a most violent charge of heresy against the Roman bishops, who had been sent among

[a] See the Spicilegium veterum Scriptorum, published by M. d'Acheri, tom. i. p. 396.—Mabillon, Præf. ad Sæc. IV. Benedict. part ii. p. 51.

[b] See Giannone, Historia di Napoli, tom. i.—Petr. de Marca, de Concordia Sacerdotii et Imperii, lib. i. cap. i. p. 6.—Lequien, Oriens Christianus, tom. i. p. 96.

☞ [c] In the original, we find the date of 852; but, as this is probably an error of the press, the translator has taken the liberty to correct it in the text.

[d] The writers on both sides of this controversy are enumerated by Fabricius, in his Biblioth. Græca, vol. iv. c. xxxviii. p. 372.

the newly-converted Bulgarians, and against the church of Rome in general. The articles of corrupt doctrine, or heresy, which this imperious and exasperated prelate brought against the votaries of the Romish system, were as follow: first, that they fasted on the Sabbath, or seventh day of the week: secondly, that in the first week of Lent they permitted the use of milk and cheese: thirdly, that they prohibited their priests from marrying, and separated from their wives such as had been married when they entered into orders:[a] fourthly, that they represented the bishops alone as authorized to anoint with the holy chrism baptized persons, and, in consequence, obliged those who had been anointed by presbyters, to receive that unction a second time from the hand of a bishop: lastly, that they had adulterated the symbol or creed of Constantinople, by adding to it the words *filio-que*, i. e. *and from the son*, and were therefore of opinion that the Holy Spirit did not proceed from the Father only, but also from the Son.[b] Nicolas I. finding the Roman church thus attacked, sent the articles of this accusation to Hincmar and the other Gallican bishops in 867, desiring them to assemble their respective suffragans in order to examine and answer the reproach of Photius. In pursuance of this exhortation of the pontiff, Odo, Æneas, and Ado, bishops of Beauvais, Paris, and Vienne, as also the celebrated Ratram, stepped forth gallantly into the field of controversy against the Greeks, answered one by one the accusations of Photius, and employed the whole force of their erudition and zeal in maintaining the cause of the Latin church.[c]

XXXI. On the death of Ignatius, which happened in 878, the emperor took Photius into favour, and placed him again at the head of the Greek church. This restoration of the degraded patriarch was agreed to by the Roman pontiff John VIII. on condition, however, that Photius would permit the Bulgarians to come under the jurisdiction of the see of Rome. The latter promised to satisfy in this the demands of the pontiff, to which the emperor also seemed to consent;[d] and hence it was that John VIII. sent legates to the council holden in 879 at Constantinople, by whom he declared his approbation of the acts of that assembly, and acknowledged Photius as his brother in Christ. The promises, however, of the emperor and the patriarch were far from being accomplished; for after this council the former, most probably by the advice, or at least with the consent of the latter, refused to transfer the province of Bulgaria to the Roman pontiff; and it must be confessed that this refusal was founded upon most weighty and important reasons. The pope was highly irritated at this disappointment, and sent Marinus to Constantinople in the character of legate, to declare that he had changed his mind with reference to Photius, and that he entirely approved the sentence of excommunication that had been formerly given against him. The legate, upon delivering this disagreeable message, was cast into prison by the emperor, but was afterwards liberated; and, being raised to the pontificate upon the death of John VIII., recalled the remembrance of this injurious treatment, and levelled a new sentence of condemnation against Photius.

XXXII. This sentence was treated with contempt by the haughty patriarch; but, about six years after this period, he experienced anew the fragility of sublunary grandeur and elevation, by a fall which concluded his prosperous days; for, in 886, Leo, surnamed the Philosopher, the son and successor of Basilius, deposed him from the patriarchal see, and confined him in an Armenian monastery, where he died in 891. The death of Photius, who was the only author of the schisms that divided the Greeks and Latins, might have been an occasion of removing these unhappy contests, and of restoring peace and concord in the church, if the Roman pontiffs had not been regardless of the demands of equity as well as of the duty of Christian moderation. But these imperious lords of the church indulged their vindictive zeal beyond all measure, and would be satisfied with nothing of less moment than the degradation of all the priests and bishops, who had been ordained by Photius. The Greeks, on the other hand, were shocked at the arrogance of these unjust pretensions, and would not submit to them on any conditions. Hence a spirit of resentment and irritation renewed the rage of dispute, which had been happily declining; religious as well as civil contests were again set on foot; new controversies were added to the old, until the fatal schism took place, which produced a lasting and total separation between the Greek and Latin churches.

CHAPTER IV.

Concerning the Rites and Ceremonies used in the Church during this Century.

I. THAT religious rites and ceremonies were progressively multiplied, evidently appears from the labours of those writers who began in this century to explain to the ignorant multitude their origin, their nature, and the purposes they served; for the multiplicity alone of these religious rites could render the explication of them necessary. Johannes Scotus, Angelome, Remi or Remigius, bishop of Auxerre, and Walafrid Strabo, were the principal authors who distinguished themselves in this species of sacred literature, to whom we may add Amalarius, many of whose explanations were, however, refuted by Agobard and Florus. Their works are generally entitled *De Officiis Divinis;* for in the style of this age religious ceremonies were called by that name. The labours of these pious and learned men in illustrating the ritual were undoubtedly undertaken with good intentions; but their utility may be well called into question; and it would be bold to affirm that they were not as prejudicial to the church in some respects, as they might be advantageous to it in others. Their books afforded, indeed, a certain sort of spiritual nourishment to the minds of Christians in their attendance upon public worship; but this nourishment was both coarse and unwholesome. The reasons alleged for the

[a] Photius attributes, to this forced and unnatural celibacy of the clergy, that multitude of children whose fathers were unknown. Remarkable to this purpose is the following passage from a book of Alvaro Pelagio, bishop of Sylva in Portugal, *de Planctu Ecclesiæ:* "It is to be wished," says he, "that the clergy had never vowed chastity, especially the clergy of Spain, where the sons of the laity are not much more numerous than the sons of the clergy."

[b] See the letter of Photius in the collection published by bishop Montague, N. ii. p. 47. Other writers mention ten heads of accusation brought against Photius; but such do not distinguish between the first and second controversy that arose between the Greeks and Latins, and they add to the articles, with which this patriarch was charged, those that were drawn up in the time of Michael Cerularius. Certain it is, that in the epistle of Photius, which relates only to the first controversy, and is the only criterion by which we ought to judge of it, there are no more heads of accusation than the five which we have enumerated in the text.

[c] Mabillon, Præf. ad Sæc. IV. Bened. part ii. p. 55.

[d] Mich. le Quien, Oriens Christianus, tom. i. p. 103.

ceremonies in vogue at this time in the church, and the purposes they were supposed to answer, were, for the most part, not only far-fetched, childish, and ridiculous, but also bore the strongest marks of forgery and fiction. It is also farther observable, that these illustrations not only encouraged, but augmented prodigiously, to the detriment of real piety, the veneration and zeal of the multitude for external rites and ceremonies; for who would dare to refuse their admiration and reverence to institutions, which they were taught to consider as full of the most mysterious wisdom, and founded upon the most pious and affecting reasons?

II. It would be endless to enter into an exact enumeration of the various rites and ceremonies, which were now introduced, for the first time, and of which some were adopted by the whole body of Christians, and others only by certain churches. We shall therefore dismiss this matter with the general account which follows, and point out in the notes the sources from which the curious reader may derive a more particular knowledge of the absurdities of this superstitious age. The carcases of the saints transported from foreign countries, or discovered at home by the industry and diligence of pious or designing priests, not only obliged the rulers of the church to augment the number of festivals or holidays already established, but also to diversify the ceremonies in such a manner, that each saint might have his peculiar worship; and, as the authority and credit of the clergy depended much upon the high notion which was generally entertained of the virtue and merit of the saints whom they had canonised, and presented to the multitude as objects of religious veneration, it was necessary to amuse and surprise the people by a variety of pompous and striking ceremonies, by images and the like inventions, in order to keep up and nourish their stupid admiration for the saintly tribe. Hence arose the splendour and magnificence that were lavished upon the churches in this century, and the prodigious number of costly pictures and images with which they were adorned; hence the stately altars, which were enriched with the noblest inventions of painting and sculpture, and illuminated with innumerable tapers at noon-day; hence the multitude of processions, the gorgeous and splendid garments of the priests, and the masses that were celebrated in honour of the saints.[a] Among other novelties, the feast of All-Saints was added, in this century, by Gregory IV. to the Latin calendar;[b] and the festival of St. Michael, which had been long kept with the greatest marks of devotion and respect by the Orientals and Italians, began now to be observed more zealously and universally among the Latin Christians.[c]

III. Nor was it only in the solemn acts of religious worship that superstition reigned with unlimited sway; its influence extended even to the affairs of private life, and was observable in the civil transactions of men, particularly among the Latin Christians, who retained with more obstinacy than the Greeks a multitude of customs, which derived their origin from the sacred rites of paganism. The barbarous nations, which were converted to Christianity, could not support the thoughts of abandoning altogether the laws and manners of their ancestors, however inconsistent they might be with the indispensable demands of the Gospel: on the contrary, they persuaded the Christians among whom they lived to imitate their extravagant superstition in this respect; and this was the true and original source of the barbarous institutions that prevailed among the Latins, during this and the following century; such as the various methods by which it was usual for persons accused to prove their innocence in doubtful cases, either by the trial of cold water, by single combat, by the fire ordeal, or by the cross.[d] It is no longer a question

[a] See the work of J. Fecht, de Missis in Honorem Sanctorum.

[b] See Mabillon, de Re Diplomaticâ, p. 537.

[c] The holidays or festivals of the saints were yet but few in number among the Latins, as appears from a poem of Florus, published by Martenne in the fifth volume of his Thesaurus Anecdotorum.

[d] All these were presumptuous attempts to force the divine providence to declare itself miraculously in favour of the truth. In the trial of cold water, the person accused had the right foot and left hand bound together, and was, in this posture, thrown naked into the water. If he sunk, he was acquitted; but, if he floated upon the surface, this was considered as an evidence of guilt. The most respectable authors, ancient and modern, attribute the invention of this superstitious trial to pope Eugenius II., and it is somewhat surprising that Mr. Bower has taken no notice of it in his history of that pontiff. Baluze has inserted, in the second volume of his Capitularia, the solemn forms of prayer and protestation, which Eugenius had caused to be drawn up as an introduction to this superstitious practice; and both Fleury and Spanheim look upon that pontiff as its inventor. On the other hand, father Le Brun, a priest of the oratory, maintains in his Histoire Critique des Pratiques Superstitieuses, tom. ii., that this custom was much more ancient than Eugenius, and his reasons are not unworthy of attention. Be that as it may, this custom was condemned and abrogated at the request or rather by the authority of Louis the Debonnaire, about the year 829. It was, however, revived afterwards, and was practised in the tenth, eleventh, and twelfth centuries, as we shall see in the progress of this history. For an account of this mode of trial, Dr. Mosheim refers us, in a note, to Mabillon's Analecta veteris Ævi, tom. i. p. 47, and Roye's work de Missis Dominicis, p. 152.

The trial by duel, or single combat, was introduced toward the conclusion of the fifth century by Gondebald, king of the Burgundians, when the abuse of oaths had occasioned the most horrible perjuries, and opened the door to all sorts of injustice. The duel was then added to the oath by Gondebald; the successful combatant was supposed to be in the right, and this barbarous test of truth and justice was, in spite of humanity and common sense, adopted by the Lombards, French, and Germans, and borrowed from them by other nations. It was first prohibited in 855, in the third council of Valence.

The fire ordeal was practised in various ways. The accused either held a burning ball of iron in his hand, or was obliged to walk barefooted upon heated ploughshares, whose number was increased in proportion to the number or enormity of the crimes imputed to him: and sometimes a glove of red-hot iron was used on this occasion, as we see in the tenth book of the history of Denmark, by Saxo the Grammarian. If in these trials the person impeached remained unhurt, and discovered no signs of pain, he was discharged as innocent; otherwise he was punished as guilty. The first account we have of Christians appealing to this kind of trial as a proof of their innocence, is that of Simplicius, bishop of Autun, who lived in the fourth century. This prelate, as the story goes, before his promotion to the episcopal order, had entered into the matrimonial state; and his fond wife, unwilling to quit him after his advancement, continued to sleep in the same chamber with her spouse. The sanctity of Simplicius suffered, at least in the voice of fame, by the constancy of his wife's affection; and it was rumoured that the holy man, though a bishop, persisted, in opposition to the ecclesiastical canons, to taste the sweets of matrimony; upon which the dame, in the presence of a great concourse of people, took up a considerable quantity of burning coals, which she held in her clothes, and applied to her breasts, without the least hurt to her person or damage to her garments, as the legend says, and her example being followed by her husband with like success, the silly multitude admired the miracle, and proclaimed the innocence of the loving pair. Bricius, or St. Brice, (whom Mr. Collier, in his Ecclesiastical History of England, represents by mistake as the first Christian who endeavoured to clear himself in this way,) played a trick of much the same nature in the fifth century.

The trial by the cross was made by obliging the contending parties to stretch out their arms, and he that continued the longest in this posture gained his cause.

Jo. Loccenii Antiquit. Sueo-Gothicæ, lib. ii. cap. vii. viii. p. 144. This barbarous method of deciding controversies by duel was practised even by the clergy. See Just. Hen. Böhmeri Jus Eccles. Prot. t. v. p. 88. Petr. Lambecius, Res Hamburg. lib. ii. p. 39.—Usserii Sylloge Epistol. Hibernic. p. 81.—Johnson, Leges Eccles. Britanniæ.—Michel de la Roche, Memoires Liter. de la Grande Bretagne, tom. viii. p. 391.

See Agobardus, contra Judicium Dei, tom. i. op. et contra Legem Gundobaldi, cap. ix. p. 114.—Hier. Bignonius, ad Formulas Marculphi, cap. xii.—Baluzius, ad Agobardum, p. 104.

in our days, from what source these methods of deciding dubious cases and accusations derived their origin; all agree that they were mere delusions, drawn from the barbarous rites of paganism,[a] and not only opposite to the precepts of the Gospel, but absolutely destructive of the spirit of true religion. The pontiffs, however, and the inferior clergy, encouraged these odious superstitions, and went so far as to accompany the practice of them with the celebration of the Lord's Supper and other rites, in order to give them a Christian aspect, and to recommend them to the veneration and confidence of the multitude.

CHAPTER V.

Concerning the Divisions and Heresies that troubled the Church during this Century.

I. THE sects, that had sprung up in the earlier ages of the church, subsisted still, with little change in their situations or circumstances. Such of them as were considerably numerous, fixed their settlements beyond the limits both of the Greek and Latin empires, and thus out of the reach of their enemies. The Nestorians more especially, and the Monophysites, secure under the protection of the Arabians, were extremely industrious in maintaining their credit, and also discovered a warm and active zeal in the propagation of Christianity among those who were yet unacquainted with that divine religion. Some learned men are of opinion, that it was only in this century that the Abyssinians or Ethiopians embraced the sentiments of the Monophysites, in consequence of the exhortations addressed to them by the doctors of that sect who resided in Egypt. But this is undoubtedly an erroneous account of the matter; for it is certain, that the Abyssinians, who were accustomed to receive their spiritual guides from the bishop of Alexandria, commenced Monophysites in the seventh century, if not sooner; for in that period the Arabians made themselves masters of Egypt, oppressed the Greeks, and granted to the Monophysites such a powerful protection, as enabled them to reduce under their jurisdiction almost all the churches that had been established in Egypt.[b]

II. The Greeks, during the greatest part of this century, were engaged in a most bitter controversy, or, to speak more properly, in a bloody and barbarous war with the Paulicians, a sect that may be considered as a branch of the Manichæans, and which resided principally in Armenia. This pernicious sect is said to have been formed by two brothers, Paul and John, sons of Callinices, and inhabitants of Samosata, from the former of whom it derived its name; though others are of opinion that the Paulicians were so called from another Paul, an Armenian by birth, who lived under the reign of Justinian II.[c] Be that as it may, a certain zealot called Constantine, revived, in the seventh century, under the government of Constans, this drooping faction, which had suffered deeply from the violence of its adversaries, and was ready to expire under the severity of the imperial edicts, and of those penal laws which were executed against its adherents with the utmost rigour. Constans, Justinian II., and Leo the Isaurian, exerted their zeal against the Paulicians with a peculiar degree of bitterness and fury, left no method of oppression unemployed, and neglected no means of accomplishing their ruin; but their efforts were ineffectual, nor could all their power, or all their barbarity, exhaust the patience or conquer the obstinacy of that inflexible people, who, with a fortitude worthy of a better cause, seemed to despise the calamities to which their erroneous doctrine exposed them. The face of things changed, however, to their advantage toward the commencement of this century; and their affairs wore a more prosperous aspect under the protection of the emperor Nicephorus, who favoured them in a particular manner, and restored to them their civil privileges, as well as their religious liberty.[d]

III. Their tranquillity, however, was but of short duration; it was a transient scene that was soon to be succeeded by yet more dreadful sufferings than they had hitherto experienced. The cruel rage of persecution, which had for some years been suspended, broke forth with redoubled violence under the reigns of Michael Curopalates, and Leo the Armenian, who caused the strictest search to be made after the Paulicians, in all the provinces of the Grecian empire, and inflicted capital punishment upon such of them as refused to return to the bosom of the church. This rigorous decree turned the afflictions of the Paulicians, who dwelt in Armenia, into vengeance, and drove them into the most desperate measures. They massacred Thomas, bishop of New Cæsarea, and also the magistrates and judges whom the emperors had established in Armenia; and, after avenging themselves thus cruelly, they took refuge in the countries that were governed by the Saracens, and thence infested the neighbouring states of Greece with perpetual incursions.[e] After these reciprocal acts of cruelty and vengeance, the Paulicians, as it would seem, enjoyed an interval of tranquillity, and returned to their habitations in the Grecian provinces.

IV. But the most dreadful scene of persecution that was exhibited against these wretched heretics, arose from the furious and inconsiderate zeal of the empress Theodora. This impetuous woman, who was regent of the empire during the minority of her son, issued out a decree, which placed the Paulicians in the perplexing alternative either of abandoning their principles, or of perishing by fire and sword. The decree was severe; but the cruelty with which it was put in execution by those who were sent into Armenia for that purpose, was horrible beyond expression; for these ministers of wrath, after confiscating the goods of above a hundred thousand of that miserable people, put their possessors to death in the most barbarous manner, and made them expire slowly in a variety of the most exquisite tortures. Such as escaped destruction fled for protection and refuge to the Saracens, who received

[a] Strabo tells us, in the fifth book of his Geography, that, while the sacred rites of the goddess Ferona were celebrated in a grove not far from mount Soracte, several persons, transported with the imaginary presence of this pretended divinity, fell into fits of enthusiasm, and walked bare-footed over heaps of burning coals without receiving the least damage. The historian adds, that a spectacle so extraordinary drew a prodigious concourse of people to this annual solemnity. Pliny relates something of the same nature concerning the Hirpii. See his Nat. Hist. book vii. chap. ii.

[b] Nouveaux Memoires de la Compagnie de Jesus dans le Levant, tom. iv. p. 283, 284.—Le Grand, Dissert. iv.—Lobo, Voyage Historique de l'Abyssinie, tom. ii. p. 18.

[c] Photius, lib. i. contra Manichæos, p. 74, in B. Wolfii Anecdotis Græcis, tom. i.

[d] See Georg. Cedrenus, Compend. Historiar. tom. ii.

[e] Photius, lib. i. contra Manichæos, p. 125.—Petri Siculi Historia Manichæorum, p. 71.

them with compassion and humanity, and permitted them to build a city for their residence, which was called Tibrica. Upon this they entered into a league with the Saracens; and, choosing for their chief an officer of the greatest resolution and valour, whose name was Carbeas, they declared against the Greeks a war which was carried on with the utmost vehemence and fury. This war continued during the whole century; the victory seemed often doubtful, but the slaughter was terrible, and the numbers that perished on both sides prodigious. Many of the Grecian provinces felt, in a more particular manner, the dire effects of this cruel contest, and exhibited the most affecting scenes of desolation and misery.[a] During these commotions, some Paulicians, toward the conclusion of the century, spread abroad among the Bulgarians their pestilential doctrines, which were received with docility, and took root speedily, as might naturally be expected, among a barbarous people, recently converted to the Christian faith.[b]

V. The Greeks treated the Paulicians, of whom we have now been speaking, as Manichæans; though, if we may credit the testimony of Photius, the Paulicians expressed the utmost abhorrence of Manes and his doctrine.[c] Most evident it is, that they were not altogether Manichæans, though they embraced some opinions that resembled certain tenets of that abominable sect. They had not, like the Manichæans, an ecclesiastical government administered by bishops, priests, and deacons: they had no sacred order of men distinguished by their manner of life, their habit, or any other circumstance, from the rest of the assembly; nor had councils, synods, or the like institutions, any place in their religious polity. They had certain doctors whom they called *Synecdemi*, i. e. companions in the journey of life, and also *Notarii*. Among these, there reigned a perfect equality; and they had no peculiar rights or privileges, nor any external mark of dignity to distinguish them from the people.[d] The only singularity that attended their promotion to the doctorial rank was, that they changed their lay-names for Scripture ones, as if there had been something peculiarly venerable in the names of the holy men, whose lives and actions are recorded in the sacred writings. They received all the books of the New Testament, except the two Epistles of St. Peter, which they rejected for reasons unknown to us; and their copies of the Gospel were exactly the same with those used by all other Christians, without the least interpolation of the sacred text; in which respect also they differed considerably from the Manichæans.[e] They moreover recommended to the people without exception, with the most affecting and ardent zeal, the constant and assiduous perusal of the Scriptures, and expressed the utmost indignation against the Greeks, who allowed to priests alone an access to these sacred fountains of divine knowledge.[f]—In explaining, however, the doctrines of the Gospel, they often departed from the literal sense and the natural signification of the words, and interpreted them in a forced and allegorical manner, when they opposed their favourite opinions and tenets;[g] and such more especially were the delusive and erroneous explications, which they gave of what is said concerning the institutions of baptism and the Lord's Supper, and the divine authority of the Old Testament, all which they obstinately rejected. Beside the books of the New Testament, they treated with particular veneration certain epistles of Sergius, the most eminent and illustrious doctor of their sect.

VI. The Greek writers, instead of giving a complete view of the Paulician system, which was undoubtedly composed of a great variety of tenets, content themselves with mentioning six monstrous errors, which, in their estimation, rendered the Paulicians unworthy of enjoying either the comforts of this world, or the happiness of the next. These errors are as follow: 1. "They denied that this inferior and visible world was the production of the Supreme Being, and they distinguished the creator of this world, and of human bodies, from the most high God, who dwells in the heavens." It was principally on account of this odious doctrine, which was, however, adopted by all the Gnostic sects, that the Paulicians were deemed Manichæans by the Greeks. But what their sentiments were concerning the creator of this world, and whether they considered him as a being distinct from the evil principle, are matters that no writer has hitherto explained in a satisfactory manner. We learn only from Photius, that, according to the Paulician doctrine, the evil principle was engendered by darkness and fire; whence it plainly follows that he was neither self-originated, nor eternal.[h] 2. "They treated contemptuously the Virgin Mary;" that is to say, according to the manner of speaking usual among the Greeks, they refused to adore and worship her. They maintained, indeed, that Christ was the son of Mary, and was born of her (although they

[a] Georg. Cedrenus, Compend. Hist. p. 541, edit. Paris.—Zonoras, Annal. lib. xvi. The principal authors who have given accounts of the Paulicians are Photius, lib. i. contra Manichæos, and Petrus Siculus, whose history of the Manichæans Matth. Raderus published in Greek and Latin in 1604. By the account of Petrus Siculus that is given by himself, we learn that, in 870, under the reign of Basilius the Macedonian, he was sent ambassador to the Paulicians at Tibrica, to treat with them for the exchange of prisoners, and lived among them during the space of nine months; this is sufficient to give us a high idea of the power and prosperity of the Paulicians at that time. It is from this eminent writer that Cedrenus seems to have taken what he has advanced in his Compend. Hist. p. 431. What we learn concerning the Paulicians from more modern writers, (such as Bayle, in his Dictionary, and B. Jo. Christ. Wolfius, in his Manichæismus ante Manichæos, p. 247,) seems to be derived from Bossuet's Histoire des Variations des Eglises Protestantes, tom. ii. p. 129. But this authority is highly exceptionable; for Bossuet did not consult the true sources of knowledge upon this point; and, what is still worse, the spirit of party seems to have led him into *voluntary* errors.

[b] It is not improbable that there are yet, in Thrace and Bulgaria, Paulicians, or Paulians as they are called by some. It appears at least certain, that in the seventeenth century some of that sect still subsisted, and dwelt at Nicopolis, as we learn from the testomony of Urb. Cerri, who tells us, in his Etat present de l'Eglise Romaine, that Peter Deodati archbishop of Sophia, caused them to abandon their errors, and to return to the catholic faith; but whether the latter part of the account be true or false, is more than we shall pretend to determine.

[c] Photius, lib. i. contra Manichæos, p. 17, 56, 65. Petr. Siculus, Hist. Manich. p. 43.

[d] Photius, l. c. p. 31, 32.—Petr. Sicul. p. 44.—Cedrenus, l. c. p. 431.

[e] Photius, p. 11.—Petr. Sicul. p. 19.

[f] Photius, p. 101.—Petr. Sicul. p. 57.

[g] Photius, p. 12.

[h] Photius, lib. ii. contra Manichæos, p. 147. It is evident, beyond all contradiction, that the Paulicians, in imitation of the Oriental philosophers from whom the Gnostics and Manichæans derived their origin, considered eternal matter as the seat and source of all evil: but they believed, at the same time, like many of the Gnostics, that this matter, endued from all eternity with life and motion, had produced an active principle, which was the fountain of vice, misery, and disorder. This principle, according to them, is the author of all material substances, while God is the Creator and Father of spirits. These tenets resemble, no doubt, the Manichæan doctrine; yet they differ from it in several points. The Paulicians seemed to have emanated from one of the old Gnostic sects, and to have been very numerous and diversified; and, though persecuted and oppressed from age to age in the most rigorous manner by many emperors, they could never be entirely suppressed, or extirpated.

maintained, as appears from the express testimony of their adversaries, that the divine Saviour brought with him from heaven his human nature, and that Mary, after the birth of Christ, had other children by Joseph;) they only fell into the sentiments of the Valentinians, and held, that Christ passed through the womb of the Virgin, as the pure stream of limpid water passes through a conduit, and that Mary did not preserve her virginity to the end of her days; all which assertions the Greeks rejected with the utmost antipathy and abhorrence. 3. "They refused to celebrate the holy institution of the Lord's Supper;" for, as they imagined many precepts and injunctions of the Gospel to be of a merely figurative and parabolical nature, so they understood, by the bread and wine which Christ is said to have administered to his disciples at his last supper, the divine discourses and exhortations of the Saviour, which are a spiritual food and nourishment to the soul, and fill it with repose, satisfaction, and delight.[a] 4. "They loaded the cross of Christ with contempt and reproach;" by which we are only to understand, that they refused to follow the absurd and superstitious practice of the Greeks, who paid to the pretended wood of the cross a certain sort of religious homage. As the Paulicians believed that Christ was clothed with an ethereal, impassible, and celestial body, they could by no means grant that he was *really* nailed to the cross, or that he expired, in effect, upon that ignominious tree: and hence naturally arose that treatment of the cross, of which the Greeks accused them. 5. "They rejected, after the example of the greatest part of the Gnostics, the books of the Old Testament, and looked upon the writers of that sacred history as inspired by the Creator of this world, and not by the Supreme God." 6. "They entirely excluded presbyters and lay-elders from the administration of the church." By this, however, no more can be meant, than that they refused to call their doctors by the name of *presbyters*, a name which had its origin among the Jews, and was peculiar to that odious people, who persecuted Jesus Christ, and attempted, as the Paulicians speak, to put him to death.[b]

[a] The Greeks do not charge the Paulicians with any error concerning baptism; it is, however, certain, that the accounts of that sacred institution, which are given in Scripture, were allegorically explained by this extravagant sect; and Photius, in his first book against the Manichæans, expressly asserts that the Paulicians treated baptism as a mere allegorical ceremony, and by the baptismal water understood the Gospel.

[b] These six famous errors of the Paulicians I have taken from the Manichæan history of Petrus Siculus, with whom Photius and Cedrenus agree, although their accounts of these opinions be less perspicuous and distinct. The explanatory remarks that I have added, are the result of my own reflections upon the Paulician system, and the doctrine of the Greeks.

THE TENTH CENTURY.

PART I.

THE EXTERNAL HISTORY OF THE CHURCH.

CHAPTER I.

Concerning the prosperous Events which happened to the Church during this Century.

I. The deplorable state of Christianity in this century, arising partly from that astonishing ignorance that gave a loose rein both to superstition and immorality, and partly from an unhappy concurrence of causes of another kind, is unanimously lamented by the various writers, who have transmitted to us the history of these miserable times. Yet, amidst all this darkness, some gleams of light were perceived from time to time, and several occurrences happened, which deserve a place in the prosperous annals of the church. The Nestorians in Chaldæa extended their spiritual conquests beyond mount Imaus, and introduced the Christian religion into Tartary, (properly so called,) whose inhabitants had hitherto lived in their natural state of ignorance and ferocity, uncivilized and savage. The same successful missionaries spread, by degrees, the knowledge of the Gospel among that most powerful nation of the Turks, or Tartars, which went by the name of Karit, and bordered on Kathay, or the northern part of China.[a] The laborious industry of this sect, and their zeal for the propagation of the Christian faith, deserve, no doubt, the highest encomiums; it must, however, be acknowledged, that the doctrine and worship, which they introduced among these barbarians, were far from being, in all respects, conformable to the true spirit and genius of the Christian religion.

II. The Prince of that country, whom the Nestorians converted to the Christian faith, assumed, if we may give credit to the vulgar tradition, the name of John after his baptism, to which he added the surname of Presbyter, from a principle of modesty. Hence it was, as some learned men imagine, that the successors of this monarch retained these names until the time of Genghiz-Khan, who flourished in the fourteenth[b] century, and were each of them called Prester John.[c] But all this has a very fabulous air; at least it is advanced without any solid proof; it even appears evident, on the contrary, that the famous Prester John, who made so much noise in the world, did not begin to reign in that part of Asia before the conclusion of the eleventh century. It is, however, certain, beyond all contradiction, that the monarchs of the nation called Karit, (which makes a large part of the empire of the Mogul, and is by some denominated a tribe of the Turks, and, by others, of the Tartars,) embraced Christianity in this century; and that a considerable part of Tartary, or Asiatic Scythia, lived under the spiritual jurisdiction of bishops who were sent among them by the Nestorian pontiff.[d]

III. If we turn our eyes to the western world, we shall find the Gospel making its way with more or less rapidity among the most rude and uncivilized nations. The famous arch-pirate Rollo, son of a Norwegian Count, being banished from his native land,[e] had, in the preceding century, put himself at the head of a resolute band of Normans, and seized one of the maritime provinces of France, whence he infested the neighbouring country with perpetual incursions and depredations. In 912, this valiant chief, with his whole army, embraced the Christian faith, on the following occasion. Charles the Simple, who wanted both resolution and power to drive this warlike and intrepid invader out of his dominions, was obliged to have recourse to negotiation. He accordingly offered to make over to Rollo a considerable part of his territories, on condition that the latter would consent to a peace, espouse his daughter Gisela,[f] and embrace Christianity. These terms were accepted by Rollo without the least hesitation; and his army, following the example of their leader, professed a religion of which they were totally ignorant.[g] These Norman pirates, as appears from many authentic records, were absolutely without religion of any kind, and therefore were not restrained, by the power of prejudice, from embracing a religion which presented to them the most advantageous prospects. They knew no distinction between interest and duty, and they estimated truth and virtue only by the profits with which they were attended. It was from this Rollo, who received at his baptism the name of Robert, that the famous line of Norman dukes derived its origin; for the province of Bretagne, and a part of Neustria, which Charles the Simple conveyed to his son-in-law by a solemn grant, were from this time known by the name of Normandy,[h] which they derived from their new possessors.

IV. The Christian religion was introduced into Poland, by the zealous efforts of female piety. Dambrowska, daughter of Boleslaus, duke of Bohemia, persuaded,

---

[a] Assemani Bibliotheca Oriental. Vatic. tom. iii. part ii. p. 482.—Herbelot, Bibliotheque Orientale, p. 256.

[b] Dr. Mosheim, and his translator, ought to have said the thirteenth century. Edit.

[c] See Assemani Biblioth. tom. iii. part ii. p. 282.

[d] The late learned Sigefred Bayer, in his Preface to the Museum Sinicum, p. 145, informed us of his design to give the world an accurate account of the Nestorian churches established in Tartary and China, drawn from some curious ancient records and monuments, that have not been as yet made public. His work was to have been entitled Historia Ecclesiarum Sinicarum, et Septentrionalis Asiæ; but death prevented the execution of this interesting plan, and also of several others, which this great man had formed, and which would undoubtedly have thrown a new light upon the history of the Asiatic Christians.

[e] Holbergi Historia Danorum Navalis in Scriptis Societat. Scient. Hafniens. part iii. p. 357.

[f] Other writers more politely represent the offer of Gisela as one of the methods that Charles employed to obtain a peace with Rollo.

[g] Boulay, Hist. Acad. Paris. tom. i. p. 296.—Daniel, Hist. de France, tom. ii. p. 587.

[h] It was Neustria, and not Bretagne, that received the name of Normandy, from the Normans who chose Rollo for their chief

by the force of repeated exhortations, her husband Micislaus, duke of Poland, to abandon paganism; and, in 965, he embraced the Gospel. The account of this agreeable event was no sooner brought to Rome, than the pontiff, John XIII., sent into Poland Ægidius, bishop of Tusculum, attended with a numerous train of ecclesiastics, in order to second the pious efforts of the duke and duchess, who desired, with impatience, the conversion of their subjects. The exhortations and endeavours of these devout missionaries, who were unacquainted with the language of the people they came to instruct, would have been entirely without effect, had they not been accompanied with the edicts and penal laws, the promises and threats of Micislaus, which dejected the courage, and conquered the obstinacy of the reluctant Poles. When therefore the fear of punishment, and the hope of reward, had laid the foundations of Christianity in Poland, two national archbishops and seven bishops were consecrated to the ministry, whose zeal and labours were followed with such success, that the whole body of the people abandoned, by degrees, their ancient superstitions, and made public profession of the religion of Jesus.[a] It was, indeed, no more than an external profession; for that inward change of affections and principles, which the Gospel requires, was far from being an object of attention in this barbarous age.

V. The Christian religion was established in Russia by means similar to those that had occasioned its propagation in Poland; for we must not lay any stress upon the proselytes that were made to Christianity among the Russians in the preceding century, since those conversions were neither permanent nor solid, and since it appears evidently that such of that nation, as, under the reign of Basilius the Macedonian, had embraced the doctrine of the Greek church, relapsed soon after into the superstition of their ancestors. Wlodomir, duke of Russia and Muscovy, married, in 961, Anne, sister of Basilius, the second Grecian emperor of that name; and this zealous princess, by her repeated entreaties and her pious importunity, at length persuaded her reluctant spouse to receive the Christian faith, and he was accordingly baptised, in 987, assuming on that occasion the name of Basilius. The Russians spontaneously followed the example of their prince; we have, at least, no account of any compulsion or violence being employed in their conversion;[b] and this is the true date of the entire establishment of Christianity among that people. Wlodomir and his duchess were placed in the highest order of the Russian saints, and are still worshipped at Kiow, (where they were interred,) with the greatest devotion. The Latins, however, paid no such respect to the memory of Wlodomir, whom they represented as absolutely unworthy of saintly honours.[c]

VI. The Hungarians and Avari had received some faint notions of Christianity under the reign of Charlemagne, in consequence of the measures that had been taken by that zealous prince for the propagation of the Gospel. These notions, however, were soon and easily extinguished by various circumstances, which took their rise from the death of Charlemagne: and it was not before the century of which we now write that the Christian religion obtained a fixed settlement among these warlike nations.[d] Toward the middle of this century, Bulosudes and Gyula or Gylas, two Turkish chiefs, whose governments lay upon the banks of the Danube,[e] made public profession of Christianity, and were baptised at Constantinople. The former apostatized soon after to the religion of his ancestors, while the latter not only persevered stedfastly in his new profession, but also showed the most zealous concern for the conversion of his subjects, who, in consequence of his express order, were instructed in the doctrines and precepts of the Gospel by Hierotheus, a learned prelate, by whom he had been accompanied in his journey to Constantinople. Sarolta, the daughter of Gylas, was afterwards given in marriage to Geysa, the chief of the Hungarian nation, whom she persuaded to embrace the divine religion in which she had been educated. The faith, however, of this new convert was feeble and unsteady, and he retained a strong propensity to the superstition which he had been engaged to forsake; but his apostacy was prevented by the pious remonstrances of Adalbert, archbishop of Prague, who went into Hungary towards the conclusion of this century, and by whom also Stephen, the son of Geysa, was baptised with great pomp and solemnity. It was to this young prince that the Gospel was principally indebted for its propagation and establishment among the Hungarians, whose general conversion was the fruit of his zeal for the cause of Christ; for he perfected what his father and grandfather had only begun; fixed bishops, with large revenues, in various places; erected magnificent temples for Divine worship; and, by the influence of instructions, threatenings, rewards, and punishments, brought his subjects, almost without exception, to abandon the wretched superstition of their idolatrous ancestors. These vigorous proceedings, by which Stephen introduced the religion of Jesus among the Hungarians, procured him the most distinguished honours of saintship in succeeding ages.[f]

VII. The Christian religion was in a very unsettled state among the Danes under the reign of Gormon; and, notwithstanding the protection it received from his queen,

[a] Duglossi Historia Polonica, lib. ii. p. 91, lib. iii. p. 95, 239.—Regenvolscii Historia Eccles. Slavon. lib. ii. cap. i. p. 8.—Henr. Canisii Lectiones Antiquæ, tom. iii. part i. p. 41.—Solignac, Hist. de Pologne, tom. i. p. 71.

[b] See Anton. Pagi Critica in Baron. tom. iv. ad annum 987, p. 55, et ad an. 1015, p. 110.—Car. du Fresne, Famil. Byzant. p. 143.

[c] Ditmari, Merseb. Episcopi, Chronic. lib. vii. Caronic. p. 417, tom. i. Scriptor Brunsvic. Leibnitii.

[d] Pauli Debrezeni Historia Eccles. Reformator. in Ungariâ, part i. cap. iii. p. 19.

[e] The Hungarians and Transylvanians were at this time known to the Grecians by the name of Turks.

[f] The Greeks, Germans, Bohemians, and Poles, severally claim the honour of having been the founders of the Christian religion in Hungary; and their respective pretensions have introduced not a little obscurity into this matter. The Germans allege, that the Christian religion was brought into Hungary by Gisela, sister to their emperor Henry II., who, being given in marriage to Stephen, the king of that nation, persuaded that prince to embrace the Gospel. The Bohemians tell us, on the other hand, that it was by the ministry of Adalbert, archbishop of Prague, that Stephen was converted. The Poles affirm, that Geysa, having married a Christian princess of their nation, viz. Adelheid, sister to Micislaus, duke of Poland, was induced by her remonstrances and exhortations to make profession of Christianity. In consequence of a careful examination of all these pretensions, we have followed the sentiments and decisions of the Greek writers, after having diligently compared them with the Hungarian historians; and we are encouraged in this by the authority of the learned Gabriel de Juxta Hornad, who, in his Initia Religionis Christianæ inter Hungaros Ecclesiæ orientali adserta, published in 1740, decides this question in favour of the Greeks. All other accounts of the matter are extremely imperfect, and subject to many doubts and difficulties.

who professed it publicly, it was obliged to struggle with many difficulties, and to encounter much opposition. The face of things changed, indeed, after the death of Gormon. His son Harald, surnamed Blaatand, being defeated by Otho the Great, in 949, embraced the Gospel, and was baptised, together with his consort and his son Sueno or Swein, by Adaldagus, archbishop of Hamburg, or, as others allege, by Poppon, a pious ecclesiastic, who attended the emperor in this expedition. It is probable that Harald, educated by his mother Tyra, who was a Christian, was not extremely averse to the religion of Jesus; it appears, however, certain, that his conversion was less the effect of his own choice, than of the irresistible commands of his victorious enemy; for Otho, persuaded that the Danes would never desist from their hostile incursions and rapines, while they persevered in the religion of their ancestors, which was calculated to nourish a ferocity of temper, and to animate to military exploits, made it the principal condition of the treaty of peace, which he concluded with Harald, that he and his subjects should receive the Christian faith.[a] On the conversion of this prince, Adaldagus and Poppon employed their ministerial labours among the Cimbrians and Danes, in order to engage them to imitate such an illustrious example; and their exhortations were crowned with remarkable success, to which the stupendous miracles performed by Poppon are said to have contributed in a particular manner. These miracles, indeed, were of such a kind, as manifestly shows that they derived their origin from human art, and not from a divine interposition.[b] As long as Harald lived, he used every wise and probable method of confirming his subjects in the religion they had embraced. For this purpose he established bishops in several parts of his dominions, enacted excellent laws, abrogated superstitious customs, and imposed severe restraints upon all vicious and immoral practices. But, after all these pious efforts, and salutary measures, which promised such fair prospects to the rising church, his son Sueno, or Swein, apostatized from the truth, and, during a certain time, involved the Christians in the deepest calamity and distress, and treated them with the greatest cruelty and injustice. This persecuting tyrant felt, however, in his turn, the heavy strokes of adversity, which produced a salutary change in his conduct, and happily brought him to a better mind; for, being driven from his kingdom, and obliged to seek his safety in a state of exile among the Scots, he embraced anew the religion he had abandoned, and, on his restoration to his dominions, exerted the most ardent and exemplary zeal in the cause of Christianity, which he endeavoured to promote to the utmost of his power.[c]

VIII. It was in this century, that the first dawn of the Gospel arose upon the Norwegians, as we learn from the most authentic records. The conversion of that people was attempted, in 933, by their monarch, Hagen Adelsteen, who had been educated among the English, and who employed certain ecclesiastics of that nation to instruct his subjects in the doctrines of Christianity. But his pious efforts were rendered fruitless by the brutal obstinacy with which the Norwegians persevered in their ancient prejudices; and the assiduity and zeal with which his successor Harald Graufeldt pursued the same plan of reformation, were also without effect.[d] The succeeding princes, far from being discouraged by these obstacles, persisted firmly in their worthy purpose; and Haco, among others, yielding to the entreaties of Harald, king of Denmark, to whom he was indebted for the Norwegian crown, embraced, himself, the Christian religion, and recommended it with the greatest fervour to his subjects, in an assembly of the people, holden in 945.[e] This recommendation, notwithstanding the solemnity and zeal with which it was accompanied, made little impression upon the minds of this fierce and barbarous people; nor were they entirely gained over by the zealous endeavours of Olaus to convert them to Christianity, though the pious diligence of that prince, which procured him the honour of saintship, was not altogether without effect.[f] But that which gave the finishing stroke to the conversion of the Norwegians was their subjection to Sueno, or Swein, king of Sweden, who, having defeated their monarch Olaus Tryg-gueson, became master of Norway, and obliged its inhabitants to abandon the gods of their ancestors, and to embrace universally the religion of Jesus.[g] Among the various doctors who were sent to instruct this barbarous people, the most eminent, both in merit and authority, was Guthebald, an English priest.[h] From Norway, Christianity spread its salutary light through the adjacent countries, and was preached, with success, in the Orkney islands, which were, at that time, subject to the Norwegian kings, and also in Iceland and Old Groenland; for it is evident, from many circumstances and records of undoubted authority, that the greatest part of the inhabitants of these countries received the Gospel in this century.[i]

IX. In Germany the pious exploits of Otho the Great contributed, in a signal manner, to promote the interest of

---

[a] Adami Brem. Hist. lib. ii. cap. ii. iii. p. 16, cap. xv. p. 20, in Lindenbrogii Scriptoribus rerum Septentrional.—Alb. Kranzii Wandalia, lib. iv. cap. xx.—Ludwigii Reliquiæ Manuscriptor. tom. ix. p. 10.—Pontoppidani Annales Ecclesiæ Diplomatici, tom. i. p. 59.

[b] Jo. Adolph. Cypræi Annales Episcopor. Slesvic. cap. xiii. p. 78.—Adam Bremens. lib. ii. cap. xxvi. p. 22, cap. xliv. p. 28.—Jo. Stephen. ad Saxonem Grammat. p. 207.—Molleri Introduct. ad Historiam Chersones. Cimbric. part ii. cap. iii. sect. 14.

[c] Saxon. Gramm. Histor. Dan. lib. x. p. 186.—Pontoppidan. de Gestis et Vestigiis Danorum extra Daniam, tom. ii. cap. i. sect. 1, 2.

[d] Eric. Pontoppidan. Annales Eccles. Danicæ diplomat. tom. i. p. 66.

[e] Torfæi Historia Norvegica, tom. ii. p. 183, 214.

[f] Torfæus, p. 457.

☞ [g] Dr. Mosheim attributes here to Swein the honour which is due to his predecessor Olaus Tryg-gueson; if it can be deemed an honour to have promoted a rational and divine religion by compulsion and violence, by fire and sword. Olaus, who had abjured paganism in England, during his youth, in consequence of a warm and pathetic discourse which he had heard from a British priest, returned to Norway with a firm resolution to propagate Christianity throughout his dominions. For this purpose he travelled from one province to another, attended by a chosen band of soldiers, and, sword in hand, performed the functions of missionary and apostle. His ministry, thus enforced, was followed with the desired success throughout all the provinces, except that of Drontheim, which rose in rebellion against him, and attacked Christianity with the same kind of arguments that Olaus employed in establishing it. This opposition occasioned several bloody battles, which ended, however, in the defeat of the rebels, and of the god Thor, their tutelar deity, whose statue Olaus dragged from its place, and burned publicly in the sight of his worshippers. This event dejected the courage of the inhabitants of Drontheim, who submitted to the religion and laws of their conqueror. And thus, before the reign of Sueno, at least before the defeat of Olaus by that prince, Norway was Christian. See the History of Denmark, published in French by M. Mallet, vol. i. p. 52, 53.

[h] Chron. Danicum à Ludewigio editum in Reliquiis Manuscriptorum, tom. ix. p. 11, 16, 17.

[i] On the subject of the conversion of the inhabitants of the Orkneys, see Torfæi Historia Rerum Orcadens. lib. i. p. 22, and, for an account of the Icelanders, the reader may consult Arngrim Jonas' Crymogæa, lib. i. and Arius' Multis. in Schedis Islandiæ; as also Torfæus, Histor. Norveg. tom. ii. p. 378, 379, 417; and Gabriel Liron's Singularités Historiques et Literaires, t. i. p. 138.—The same Torfæus gives a full account

Christianity, and to fix it upon solid foundations throughout the empire. This truly great prince, whose pious magnanimity clothed him with a lustre infinitely superior to that which he derived from his imperial dignity, was constantly employed in extirpating the remains of the ancient superstitions, and in supporting and confirming the infant church, which in several provinces had not yet attained any considerable degree of consistence and vigour. That there might be rulers and pastors to govern the church, and to contribute both by their doctrine and example to the reformation and improvement of an unpolished and illiterate people, he established bishops in several places, and generously erected and endowed the bishoprics of Brandenburg, Havelberg, Meissen, Magdeburg, and Naumberg; by which excellent establishments the church was furnished with eminent doctors from various parts, whose instructions were the occasion of raising up new labourers in the spiritual harvest, and of thus multiplying the ministers of Christ from time to time. It was also through the munificence of the same prince, that many convents were erected for those who, in conformity with the false piety of the times, chose to finish their Christian course in the indolent sanctity of a solitary life; and it was by his express order that schools were established in almost every city for the education of the youth. All this may serve to show us the generosity and zeal of this illustrious emperor, whose merit would have surpassed the highest encomiums, had his prudence and moderation been equal to the fervour of his piety and the uprightness of his intentions. But the superstition of his empress,[a] and the deplorable ignorance of the times, deluded this good prince into the notion, that he obliged the Deity in proportion as he loaded the clergy with riches and honours, and that nothing was more proper to draw down upon him the divine protection, than the exercise of a boundless liberality to his ministers. In consequence of this idle and extravagant fancy, Otho opened the sources of his opulence, which flowed into the church like an overgrown torrent, so that the bishops, monks, and the religious fraternities in general, wallowed in wealth and abundance. But succeeding ages perceived the unhappy effects of this excessive and ill-judged munificence, when the sacred orders employed this opulence, which they had acquired without either merit or labour, in gratifying their passions, in waging war against all who opposed their ambitious pretensions, and in purchasing the various pleasures of a luxurious and effeminate life.

X. It was no doubtful mark of the progress and strength of the Christian cause, that the European kings and princes began so early as this century to form the project of a holy war against the Mohammedans, who were masters of Palestine. They considered it as an intolerable reproach upon Christians, that the very land in which the divine author of their religion had received his birth, had exercised his ministry, and made expiation for the sins of mortals, should be abandoned to the enemies of the Christian name. They also looked upon it as highly just, and suitable to the majesty of the Christian religion, to avenge the calamities and injuries, the persecution and reproach, which its professors had suffered under the Mohammedan yoke. The bloody signal was accordingly given toward the conclusion of this century, by Sylvester II. in the first year of his pontificate; and this signal was an epistle, written in the name of the church of Jerusalem, to the church universal throughout the world,[b] in which the European powers were solemnly exhorted and entreated to succour and deliver the Christians in Palestine. The pope's exhortations, however, were without effect, except upon the inhabitants of Pisa, who are said to have obeyed the summons with the utmost alacrity, and to have prepared themselves immediately for a holy campaign.[c]

CHAPTER II.

Concerning the Calamitous Events that happened to the Church during this Century.

I. THE Christian religion suffered less in this century from the cruelty of its enemies, than from the defection of its friends. Of all the pagan monarchs, under whose government the Christians lived, none behaved to them in a hostile manner, or tormented them with the execution of compulsive edicts or penal laws, except Gormon and Swein, kings of Denmark. Notwithstanding this, their affairs were far from being either in a fixed or flourishing state; and their situation was full of uncertainty and peril, both in the eastern and western provinces. The Saracens in Asia and Africa, amidst the intestine divisions under which they groaned, and the calamities that overwhelmed them from different quarters, were extremely assiduous in propagating the doctrines of Mohammed; nor were their efforts unsuccessful. Multitudes of Christians fell into their snares; and the Turks, a valiant and fierce nation, who inhabited the northern coast of the Caspian sea, received their doctrine. The uniformity of religion did not, however, produce a solid union of interest between the Turks and Saracens; on the contrary, their dissensions and quarrels were never more violent than from the time that Mohammed became their common chief in religious matters. The Persians, whose country was a prey to the ambitious usurpations of the latter, implored the aid of the former, by whom succours were granted with the utmost alacrity and readiness. The Turks accordingly fell upon the Saracens in a furious manner, drove them out of the whole extent of the Persian territories, and afterwards, with incredible rapidity and success, invaded, seized, and plundered the other provinces that belonged to that people, whose desolation, in reality, came on like a whirlwind. Thus the powerful empire of the Saracens, which its enemies had for so many years attempted in vain to overturn, fell at last by the hands of its allies and friends. The Turks accomplished what the Greeks and Romans ineffectually aimed at; they struck suddenly that dreadful blow, which ruined at once the affairs of the Saracens in Persia, and then deprived them by degrees of their other dominions; and thus the Ottoman empire, which is still an object of terror to the Christians, was established upon the ruins of the Saracen dominion.[d]

of the introduction of Christianity into Groenland, in his Histor. Norveg. tom. ii. p. 374, and also in his Groenlandia Antiqua, c. xvii. p. 127.

[a] See the life of the empress, whose name was Adelaide, in the Lectiones Antiquæ of Henry Canisius, tom. iii.

[b] This is the twenty-eighth Epistle in the first part of the collection of the letters of Sylvester II. published by Du-Chesne, in the third volume of his Scriptor. Histor. Franc.

[c] See Muratori, Scriptores Rerum Italicarum, tom. iii. p. 400.

[d] For a more ample account of these revolutions, see the Annales Turcici of Leunclavius, and Elmacini Historia Saracenica.

II. In the western provinces, the Christians had much to suffer from the hatred and cruelty of those who remained under the darkness of paganism. The Normans, during a great part of this century, committed, in several parts of France, the most barbarous hostilities, and involved the Christians, wherever they carried their victorious arms, in numberless calamities. The Sarmatians, Sclavonians, Bohemians, and others, who had either conceived an aversion for the Gospel, or were sunk in a stupid ignorance of its intrinsic excellence and its immortal blessings, not only endeavoured to extirpate Christianity out of their own territories by the most barbarous efforts of cruelty and violence, but infested the adjacent countries, where it was professed, with fire and sword, and left, wherever they went, the most dreadful marks of their unrelenting fury. The Danes, moreover, did not cease to molest the Christians, until they were subdued by Otho the Great, and thus, from being the enemies, became the friends of the Christian cause. The Hungarians also contributed their part to the sufferings of the church, by their incursions into several parts of Germany, which they turned into scenes of desolation and misery; while the fierce Arabs, by their tyranny in Spain, and their depredations in Italy and the neighbouring islands, spread calamity and oppression all around them, of which, no doubt, the Christians established in those parts had the heaviest portion.

III. Whoever considers the endless vexations, persecutions, and calamities, which the Christians suffered from the nations that continued in their ancient superstitions, will easily perceive the reason of that fervent and inextinguishable zeal, which Christian princes discovered for the conversion of those nations, whose impetuous and savage fury they experienced from time to time. A principle of self-preservation, and a prudent regard to their own safety, as well as a pious zeal for the propagation of the Gospel, engaged them to put in practice every method that might open the eyes of their barbarous adversaries, from a rational and well-grounded hope that the precepts of Christianity would mitigate, by degrees, the ferocity of these nations, and soften their rugged and intractable tempers. Hence it was, that Christian kings and emperors left no means unemployed to draw these infidels within the pale of the church. For this purpose, they proposed to their chiefs alliances of marriage, and offered them certain districts and territories, with auxiliary troops to maintain them against their enemies, upon condition that they would abandon the superstition of their ancestors, which tended to nourish their ferocity, and to increase their passion for blood and carnage. These offers were attended with the desired success, as they induced the infidel chiefs not only to lend an ear themselves to the instructions and exhortations of the Christian missionaries, but also to oblige their subjects and armies to follow their examples in this important respect.

PART II.

THE INTERNAL HISTORY OF THE CHURCH.

CHAPTER I.

Concerning the State of Letters and Philosophy during this Century.

I. The deplorable ignorance of this barbarous age, in which the drooping arts were totally neglected, and the sciences seemed to be on the point of expiring for want of encouragement, is unanimously confessed and lamented by all the writers who have transmitted to us any accounts of this period. Nor, indeed, will this fatal revolution, in the republic of letters, appear astonishing to such as consider, on one hand, the terrible vicissitudes, tumults, and wars, that threw all things into confusion both in the eastern and western world, and, on the other, the ignominious stupidity and dissoluteness of those sacred orders which had been appointed as the guardians of truth and learning. Leo, surnamed the philosopher, who ascended the imperial throne of the Greeks toward the commencement of this century, was himself an eminent lover of learning, and an auspicious and zealous protector of such as distinguished themselves in the culture of the sciences.[a] This noble and generous disposition appeared with still greater lustre in his son Constantine Porphyrogeneta, who evinced the greatest ardour for the revival of the arts and sciences in Greece,[b] and employed what he deemed the most effectual measures for the accomplishment of this excellent purpose. It was with this view that he spared no expense in drawing to his court, and supporting in his dominions, a variety of learned men, each of whom excelled in some of the different branches of literature, and in causing the most diligent search to be made for the writings of the ancients. With this view, also, he became himself an author,[c] and thus animated by his example, as well as by his protection, men of genius and abilities to enrich the sciences with their learned productions. He employed, moreover, a considerable number of able pens, in making valuable extracts from the commentaries and other compositions of the ancients; which extracts were preserved in certain places for the benefit and satisfaction of the curious; and thus, by various exertions of liberality and zeal, this learned prince restored the arts and sciences to a certain degree of life and vigour.[d] But there were few of the Greeks who followed this great and illustrious example; nor did any of the succeeding emperors equal these two excellent princes in zeal for the advancement of learning, or in lending, by protection and encouragement, an auspicious hand to raise, out of obscurity and dejection, neglected and depressed genius. But (what is still more remarkable) Constantine Porphyrogeneta, whom we have now been representing as the restorer of letters, and whom the Greeks unanimously admire in this character, is supposed by some to have done considerable prejudice to the cause of learning by the very means he employed to promote its advancement; for, by employing learned men to extract from the writers of antiquity what they thought might contribute to the improvement of the various arts and sciences, he gave too much occasion to neglect the sources, and flattered the indolence of the effeminate Greeks, who confined their studies to these extracts, and neglected, in effect, the perusal of the writers from whom they were drawn. Hence it unfortunately happened, that many of the most celebrated authors of antiquity were lost, at this time, through the sloth and negligence of the Greeks.

II. This method, as the event manifestly showed, was really detrimental to the progress of true learning and genius. And accordingly we find among the Greek writers of this century only a small number, who acquired a distinguished and shining reputation in the republic of letters; so that the fair and engaging prospects which seemed to arise in the cause of learning from the munificence and zeal of its imperial patrons, vanished in a short time; and though the seeds of science were richly sown, the natural expectations of an abundant harvest were unhappily disappointed. Nor did the cause of philosophy succeed better than that of literature. Philosophers indeed there were; and some of them were not destitute of genius and abilities: but not one of them rendered his name immortal by productions that were worthy of being transmitted to posterity. A certain number of rhetoricians and grammarians, a few poets who were above contempt, and several historians who, without deserving the highest encomiums, were not totally destitute of merit, were the members that composed, at this time, the republic of letters in Greece, whose inhabitants seemed to take pleasure in those kinds of literature alone, in which industry, imagination, and memory, are concerned.

III. Egypt, though at this time it groaned under a heavy and exasperating yoke of oppression and bondage, produced writers, who, in genius and learning, were nowise inferior to the most eminent of the Grecian literati. Among the many examples we might mention to prove the truth of this assertion, we shall confine ourselves to that of Eutychius, bishop of Alexandria, who cultivated the sciences of physic and theology with the greatest success, and cast a new light upon them both by his excellent writings. The Arabians, during this whole century, preserved that noble passion for the arts and sciences, which had been kindled among them in the preceding age; and hence their country abounded with physicians, mathematicians, and philosophers, whose names and characters, together with an account of their respective abilities and talents, are given by Leo Africanus, and other literary historians.

IV. The Latins present to us a spectacle of a very dif-

[a] See Jo. Alb. Fabricii Biblioth. Græc. lib. v. part ii. cap. v. p. 363.

[b] Fabricius, lib. v. part ii. cap. v. p. 486.

☞ [c] We have yet remaining the following productions of this prince: The Life of the Emperor Basilius;—a Treatise upon the art of Governing, in which he investigates the origin of several nations, treats of their power, their progress, their revolutions, and their decline, and gives a series of their princes and rulers;—a Discourse concerning the Manner of forming a Land Army and Naval Force in Order of Battle; Two Books concerning the eastern and western Provinces, which may be considered as an account of the state of the empire in the time of this prince.

[d] All this appears evident from the accounts left upon record by Zonaras, in his Annales, tom. iii.

ferent kind. They were almost without exception sunk in the most brutish and barbarous ignorance; so that, according to the unanimous accounts of the most credible writers, nothing could be more melancholy and deplorable than the darkness that reigned in the western world during this century, which, with respect to learning and philosophy at least, may be called the *Iron Age* of the Latins.[a] Some learned men of modern times have, we confess, ventured to call this in question: but their doubts are certainly without foundation, and the matter of fact is too firmly established by unquestionable authorities to lose any part of its credit in consequence of the objections they allege against it.[b] It is true, there were public schools founded in most of the European provinces, some of which were erected in the monasteries, and the rest in those cities where the bishops resided. It is also true, that through this dismal night of ignorance there shone forth from time to time, and more especially toward the conclusion of this century, some geniuses of a superior order, who eyed with ardour the paths of science, and cast some rays of light upon the darkness of a barbarous age. But they were very few in number, and their extreme rarity is a sufficient proof of the infelicity of the times in which they appeared. In the seminaries of learning, such as they were, the seven liberal arts were taught in the most unskilful and miserable manner by the monks, who esteemed the arts and sciences no farther than as they were subservient to the interests of religion, or, to speak more properly, to the views of superstition.

V. They who were the most learned and judicious among the monastic orders, and who were desirous of employing usefully a part of their leisure, applied themselves to the composition of annals and histories, which savoured of the ignorance and barbarism of the times. Such were Abo, Luitprand, Wittekind, Fulcuin, Johannes Capuanus, Ratherius, Flodoard, Notker, Ethelbert, and others, who, though very different from each other in their respective degrees of merit, were all ignorant of the true nature and rules of historical composition. Several of the poets of this age gave evident marks of true genius; but they were strangers to the poetic art, which was not indeed necessary to satisfy a people utterly destitute of elegance and taste. The grammarians and rhetoricians of these unhappy times are scarcely worthy of mention; their method of instructing was full of absurdities; and their rules were trivial, and, for the most part, injudicious. The same judgment may be formed in general of the geometry, arithmetic, astronomy, and music, which were more or less taught in the public schools, and of which a more particular account would be uninstructive and insipid.

VI. The philosophy of the Latins extended no farther than the single science of logic or dialectics, which they looked upon as the sum and substance of all human wisdom. But this logic, which was so highly admired, was drawn without the least perspicuity or method from a book of Categories, which some have unjustly attributed to Augustin, and others to Porphyry. It is true, indeed, that the Timæus of Plato, the Topica of Cicero and Aristotle, and the book of the latter concerning interpretation, with other compositions of the Greeks and Romans, were in the hands of several of the doctors of this century, as we learn from credible accounts; but the same accounts inform us, that the true sense of these excellent authors was scarcely understood by any of those who daily perused them.[c] It will appear, no doubt, surprising, that in such an ignorant age such a subtle question as that concerning universal ideas should ever have been thought of; true however it is, that the famous controversy, whether universal ideas belonged to the class of objects or of mere names (a controversy which perplexed and bewildered the Latin doctors in succeeding times, and gave rise to the opposite sects of the Nominalists and Realists,) was started for the first time in this century. Accordingly we find, in several passages of the writers of this period, the seeds and beginnings of this tedious and intricate dispute.[d]

VII. The drooping sciences found an eminent and illustrious patron, toward the conclusion of this century, in the learned Gerbert, a native of France, who, upon his elevation to the pontificate, assumed the title of Sylvester II The genius of this famous pontiff was extensive and sublime, embracing all the branches of literature; but its more peculiar bent was turned toward mathematical studies. Mechanics, geometry, astronomy, arithmetic, and every other kind of knowledge that had the least affinity to these important sciences, were cultivated by this restorer of learning with the most ardent zeal, and not without success, as his writings abundantly testify; nor did he stop here, but employed every method that was proper to encourage and animate others to the culture of the liberal arts and sciences. The effects of this noble zeal were visible in Germany, France, and Italy, both in this and in the following century; as by the writings, example, and exhortations of Gerbert, many were incited to the study of physic, mathematics, and philosophy, and in general to the pursuit of science in all its branches. If, indeed, we compare this learned pontiff with the mathematicians of modern times, his merit, in that point of view,

[a] The testimonies that prove the ignorance which prevailed in the tenth century, are collected by du Boulay, in his Historia Acad. Paris. tom. i. p. 288; and also by Lud. Ant. Muratori, in his Antiquitat. Ital. medii Ævi, tom. iii. p. 831, et tom. ii. p. 141, &c.

[b] The famous Leibnitz, in his preface to the Cod. Juris Nat. et Gentium Diplomat. affirms that more knowledge and learning existed in the tenth century, than in the succeeding ages, particularly in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. But this is washing the Ethiopian; it is an extravagant assertion, and borders upon paradox. We shall be better directed in our notions of this matter by Mabillon, in his Præfat. ad Act. Bened. Quint. Sæc. p. 2; by the authors of the Histoire Literaire de la France; and by Le Bœuf's Dissertat. de Statu Literarum in Franciâ, a Carolo M. ad Regem Robertum; who all agree in acknowledging the gross ignorance of this century, though they would engage us to believe that its barbarism and darkness were not so hideous as they are commonly represented. There are, indeed, several considerations that render the reasons and testimonies even of these writers not a little defective; but we agree with them so far as to grant that all learning and knowledge were not absolutely extinguished in Europe at this time, and that, in the records of this century, we shall find a few chosen spirits, who pierced through the cloud of ignorance that covered the multitude.

[c] Gunzo, Epistol. ad Monachos Augiensis in Martenne's Collect. Ampliss. Monumentor. Veter. tom. iii. p. 304.

[d] This appears evident from the following remarkable passage, which the reader will find in the 304th page of the work cited in the preceding note, and in which the learned Gunzo expresses himself in the following manner: "Aristoteles, genus, speciem, differentiam, proprium et accidens, subsistere denegavit, quæ Platoni subsistentia persuasit. Aristoteli an Platoni magis credendum putatis? Magna est utriusque auctoritas, quatenus vix audeat quis alterum alteri dignitate præferre." Here we see plainly the seeds of discord sown, and the foundation laid for that knotty dispute which puzzled the metaphysical brains of the Latin doctors in after times. Gunzo was not adventurous enough to attempt a solution of this intricate question, which he leaves undecided; others were less modest, without being more successful.

will almost totally disappear under such a disadvantageous comparison; for his Geometry, though it be easy and perspicuous, is merely elementary and superficial.[a] Yet, such as it was, it was marvellous in an age of barbarism and darkness, and surpassed the apprehension of those pigmy philosophers, whose eyes, under the auspicious direction of Gerbert, were just beginning to open upon the light. Hence it was, that the geometrical figures, described by this mathematical pontiff, were regarded by the monks as magical operations, and the pontiff himself was treated as a magician and a disciple of Satan.[b]

VIII. It was not however to the fecundity of his genius alone, that Gerbert was indebted for the knowledge with which he now began to enlighten the European provinces; he had derived a part of his erudition, particularly in physic, mathematics, and philosophy, from the writings and instructions of the Arabians, who were settled in Spain. Thither he had repaired in pursuit of knowledge, and had spent some time in the seminaries of learning at Cordova and Seville, with a view of hearing the Arabian doctors;[c] and it was, perhaps, by his example, that the Europeans were directed and engaged to have recourse to this source of instruction in after times; for it is undeniably certain, that from the time of Gerbert, such of the Europeans as were ambitious of making any considerable progress in physic, arithmetic, geometry, or philosophy, entertained the most eager and impatient desire of receiving instruction either from the academical lessons, or from the writings of the Arabian philosophers, who had founded schools in several parts of Spain and Italy. Hence it was, that the most celebrated productions of these doctors were translated into Latin; their tenets and systems were adopted with zeal in the European schools; and numbers went over to Spain and Italy to receive instruction from the mouths of these famous teachers, which were supposed to utter nothing but the deepest mysteries of wisdom and knowledge. However excessive this veneration for the learned Arabians may have been, it must be owned, that all the knowledge, whether of physic, astronomy, philosophy, or mathematics, which flourished in Europe from the tenth century, was originally derived from them: and that the Spanish Saracens, in a more particular manner, may be looked upon as the fathers of European philosophy.

CHAPTER II.

Concerning the Doctors and Ministers of the Church, and its Form of Government during this Century.

I. To those who consider the primitive dignity and the solemn nature of the ministerial character, the corruptions of the clergy must appear deplorable beyond all expression. These corruptions had risen to the most enormous height in that dismal period of the church which we have now before us. Both in the eastern and western provinces, the clergy were, for the most part, a most worthless set of men, shamefully illiterate and stupid, ignorant more especially in religious matters, equally enslaved to sensuality and superstition, and capable of the most abominable and flagitious deeds. This dismal degeneracy of the sacred order, according to the most credible accounts, principally arose from the scandalous examples of those who ought to have presented models of good conduct,—namely, the pretended chiefs and rulers of the universal church, who indulged themselves in the commission of odious crimes, and abandoned themselves to the lawless impulse of the most licentious passions without reluctance or remorse; who confounded, in short, all difference between just and unjust acts, to satisfy their impious ambition; and whose spiritual empire was such a diversified scene of iniquity and violence, as never was exhibited under any of those temporal tyrants, who have been the scourges of mankind. We may form some notion of the Grecian patriarchs from the single example of Theophylact, who, according to the testimonies of the most respectable writers, made the most impious traffic of ecclesiastical promotions, and expressed no sort of care about any thing but his dogs and horses.[d] Degenerate, however, and licentious as these patriarchs might be, they were, in general, less profligate and indecent than the Roman pontiffs.

II. The history of the popes, who lived in this century, is a history of so many monsters, and not of men, and exhibits a horrible series of the most flagitious, tremendous, and complicated crimes, as all writers, even those of the Romish communion, unanimously confess. The source of these disorders must be sought principally in the calamities that fell upon the greatest part of Europe, and which afflicted Italy in a particular manner, after the extinction of the race of Charlemagne. On the death of Benedict IV., in 903, Leo V. was raised to the pontificate, which he enjoyed no longer than forty days, being dethroned by Christopher, and cast into prison. Christopher, in his turn, was deprived of the pontifical dignity in the following year by Sergius III., a Roman presbyter, seconded by the protection and influence of Adalbert, a most powerful Tuscan prince, who had a supreme and unlimited direction in all the affairs that were transacted at Rome. Anastasius III., and Lando, who, on the death of Sergius, in 911, were raised successively to the papal dignity, enjoyed it but for a short time, and did nothing that could contribute to render their names illustrious.

III. After the death of Lando, which happened in 914, Alberic,[e] marquis or count of Tuscany, whose opulence was prodigious, and whose authority in Rome was despotic and unlimited, obtained the pontificate for John X., archbishop of Ravenna, in compliance with the solicitation of Theodora, his mother-in-law, whose lewdness was the principle that interested her in this promotion.[f] This infamous election will not surprise such as know that the

[a] This work was published by Pezius, in his Thesaurus Anecdotorum, tom. iii. part ii. p. 7.

[b] See the Hist. Liter. de la France, tom. vi. p. 558.—Du Boulay, Hist. Acad. Paris. tom. i. p. 314, 319.—Naude, Apologie pour les Grands Hommes faussement accusés de la Magie, chap. xix. sect. 4.

[c] Du Boulay, tom. i. p. 314.

☞ [d] This *exemplary* prelate, who sold every ecclesiastical benefice as soon as it became vacant, had in his stable above 2000 hunting horses, which he fed with pig-nuts, pistachios, dates, dried grapes, and figs steeped in the most exquisite wines, to all which he added the richest perfumes. On Holy Thursday, as he was celebrating high-mass, his groom brought him the joyful news that one of his favourite mares had foaled; upon which he threw down the liturgy, left the church, and ran in raptures to the stable, where having expressed his joy at that *grand* event, he returned to the altar to finish the divine service, which he had left interrupted during his absence. See Fleury, Hist. Eccles. livre lv.

☞ [e] It was Albert or Adalbert, of whom Dr. Mosheim here speaks. Alberic was grandson to the elder Theodora, by her daughter Marozia, who was married to Albert. See Spanheim, Eccles. Hist. Secul. X. p. 1432.—Fleury, Hist. Eccles. livre liv. The latter historian is of opinion, that it was the younger Theodora, the sister of Marozia, who, from an amorous principle, raised John to the pontificate.

☞ [f] Theodora, mistress of Rome, procured the elevation of John,

laws of Rome were at this time absolutely silent; that the dictates of justice and equity were overpowered and suspended; and that all things were carried on in that great city by interest or corruption, by violence or fraud. John X., though in other respects a scandalous example of iniquity and lewdness in the papal chair, acquired a certain degree of reputation by his glorious campaign against the Saracens, whom he drove from the settlement which they had made upon the banks of the Garigliano.[a] He did not, however, long enjoy his glory; for the enmity of Marozia, daughter of Theodora and wife of Alberic, proved fatal to him; for this inhuman female, having espoused Wido, or Guy, marquis of Tuscany, after the death of her first consort, engaged him to seize the wanton pontiff, who was her mother's lover, and to put him to death in the prison where he lay confined. This licentious pontiff was succeeded by Leo VI., who sat but seven months in the apostolic chair, which was filled after him by Stephen VII. The death of the latter, which happened in 931, presented to the ambition of Marozia an object worthy of its grasp; and accordingly she raised to the papal dignity John XI., who was the fruit of her lawless amours with one of the pretended successors of St. Peter, Sergius III., whose adulterous commerce with that infamous woman gave an *infallible* guide to the Romish church.[b]

IV. John XI., who was placed at the head of the church by the credit and influence of his mother, was pulled down from this summit of spiritual grandeur, in 933, by Alberic his half-brother, who had conceived the utmost aversion against him. His mother Marozia had, after the death of Wido, entered anew into the bonds of matrimony with Hugo, king of Italy, who, having offended his step-son Alberic, felt severely the weight of his resentment, which vented its fury upon the whole family; for Alberic drove out of Rome not only Hugo, but also Marozia and her son the pontiff, and confined them in prison, where the latter ended his days in 936. The four pontiffs, who, in their turns, succeeded John XI., and filled the papal chair until the year 956, were Leo VII., Stephen VIII., Marinus II., and Agapet, whose characters were much better than that of their predecessor, and whose government, at least, was not attended with those tumults and revolutions that had so often shaken the pontifical throne, and banished from Rome the inestimable blessings of peace and concord. On the death of Agapet, which happened in 956, Alberic II., who to the dignity of Roman consul joined a degree of authority and opulence which nothing could resist, raised to the pontificate his son Octavian, who was yet in the early bloom of youth, and destitute, besides, of every quality that was requisite for discharging the duties of that high and important office. This unworthy pontiff assumed the name of John XII., and thus introduced the custom that has since been adopted by all his successors in the see of Rome, of assuming another name upon the acquisition of the pontificate.

V. The fate of John XII. was as unhappy as his promotion had been scandalous. Unable to bear the oppressive yoke of Berenger II., king of Italy, he sent ambassadors, in 960, to Otho the Great, urging him to march into Italy at the head of a powerful army, to deliver the church and the people from the tyranny under which they groaned. To these entreaties the perplexed pontiff added a solemn promise, that, if the German monarch would come to his assistance, he would array him with the purple and the other ensigns of sovereignty, and proclaim him emperor of the Romans. Otho received this embassy with pleasure, marched into Italy at the head of a large body of troops, and was accordingly saluted by John with the promised title. The pontiff, however, soon perceiving that he had acted with too much precipitation, repented of the step he had taken, and, though he had sworn allegiance to the emperor, as his lawful sovereign, in the most solemn manner, he broke his oath, and joined with Adalbert, the son of Berenger, against Otho. This revolt was not left unpunished. The emperor returned to Rome in 963; called a council, before which he accused and convicted the pope of many crimes; and, after having degraded him in the most ignominious manner from his high office, he appointed Leo VIII. to fill his place. On Otho's departure from Rome, John returned to that city, and in a council, which he assembled in 964, condemned the pontiff whom the emperor had elected, and soon after died in a miserable and violent manner. After his death the Romans chose Benedict V., bishop of Rome, in opposition to Leo; but the emperor annulled this election, restored Leo to the papal chair, and carried Benedict to Hamburg, where he died in exile.[c]

VI. The prelates who governed the see of Rome from Leo VIII., who died in 965, to Gerbert, or Sylvester II., who was raised to the pontificate toward the conclusion of this century, were more happy in their administration, as well as more decent in their conduct, than their infamous predecessors; yet none of them acted in so exemplary a manner as to deserve the applause that is due to eminent virtue. John XIII., who was raised to the pontificate, in 965, by the authority of Otho the Great, was driven out of Rome in the beginning of his administration; but in the following year, on the emperor's return to Italy, he was restored to his high dignity, in the calm possession of which he ended his days in 972. His successor Benedict VI. was not so happy. Thrown into prison by Crescentius, son of the famous Theodora, in consequence of the hatred which the Romans had conceived both against his person and government, he was loaded with all sorts of ignominy, and was strangled in 974, in the apartment where he lay confined. Unfortunately for him, Otho the Great, whose

that she might continue the licentious commerce in which she had lived with that carnal ecclesiastic for many years before.

☞[a] In the original we have *Montem Garilianum*, which is, undoubtedly a mistake, as the Garigliano is a river in the kingdom of Naples, and not a mountain.

[b] The character and conduct of Marozia are acknowleged to have been most infamous by the general testimony both of ancient and modern historians, who affirm, with one voice, that John XI. was the fruit of her commerce with Sergius III. Eccard alone (in his Origines Guelphicæ, tom. i. lib. iii.) has ventured to clear her from this reproach, and to assert, that Sergius, before his elevation to the pontificate, was her lawful and first husband. The attempt, however, is highly extravagant, if not imprudent, to pretend to acquit, without the least testimony or proof of her innocence, a woman who is known to have been entirely destitute of every principle of virtue.

[c] In the account I have here given of the pontiffs of this century, I have consulted Muratori's Scriptores Rerum Italicarum, as also Baronius, Peter de Marca, Sigonius de Regno Italiæ (with the learned annotations of Ant. Saxius,) the same Muratori in his Annales Italiæ, Pagi, and other writers, all of whom had access to the fountain-head, and to several ancient manuscripts, not yet published. The narrations I have here given, are certainly true upon the whole. It must, however, be confessed, that many parts of the papal history lie yet in great obscurity, and, therefore, require farther illustration; nor will I deny that a spirit of partiality has been extremely detrimental to the history of the pontiffs, by corrupting it, and rendering it uncertain in a multitude of places.

power and severity had kept the Romans in awe, died in 973; and with him expired that order and discipline which he had restored in Rome by salutary laws executed with impartiality and vigour. That event changed the aspect of affairs. Licentiousness and disorder, seditions and assassinations, resumed their former sway, and diffused their horrors through that miserable city. After the death of Benedict, the papal chair was filled by Franco, who assumed the name of Boniface VII., but enjoyed his dignity only for a short time, for scarcely a month had passed after his promotion, when he was deposed from his office, expelled from the city, and succeeded by Donus II.,[a] who is known by no other circumstance than his name. Upon his death, which happened in 975, Benedict VII. was created pontiff; and, during the space of nine years, ruled the church without much opposition, and ended his days in peace. This peculiar happiness, without doubt, principally resulted from the opulence and credit of the family to which he belonged; for he was nearly related to the famous Alberic, whose power, or rather despotism, had been unlimited in Rome.

VII. His successor John XIV., who from the bishopric of Pavia was raised to the pontificate, derived no support from his birth, which was obscure; nor did he continue to enjoy the protection of Otho III., to whom he owed his promotion. Unsupported as he thus was, calamities fell upon him with fury, and misery concluded his transitory grandeur; for Boniface VII., who had usurped the papal throne, in 974, and in a little time after had been banished from Rome, returned from Constantinople, (whither he had fled for refuge,) seized the unhappy pontiff, threw him into prison, and afterwards put him to death. Thus Boniface resumed the government of the church: but his reign was also transitory; for he died about six months after his restoration.[b] He was succeeded by John XV., whom some writers call John XVI., because, as they allege, there was another John, who ruled the church during a period of four months, and whom they consequently call John XV.[c] Leaving it to the reader's choice to call that John of whom we speak, the XVth or the XVIth of that name, we shall only observe, that he possessed the papal dignity from the year 985 to 996; that his administration was as happy as the troubled state of the Roman affairs would permit; and that the tranquillity he enjoyed was not so much the effect of his wisdom and prudence, as of his being a Roman by birth, and a descendant from noble and illustrious ancestors. It is certain, at least, that his successor Gregory V., who was a German, and who was elected pontiff by the order of Otho III., in 996, met with a quite different treatment; for Crescens, the Roman consul, drove him out of the city, and conferred his dignity upon John XVI., formerly known by the name of Philagathus. This revolution was not, however, permanent in its effects; for Otho III., alarmed by these disturbances at Rome, marched into Italy, in 998, at the head of a powerful army; and, imprisoning the new pontiff, whom the soldiers, in the first moment of their fury, had maimed and abused in a most barbarous manner, he re-instated Gregory in his former honours. It was on the death of the latter pontiff, which happened soon after his restoration, that the same emperor raised to the papal dignity his preceptor and friend, the famous and learned Gerbert, or Sylvester II., whose promotion was attended with the universal approbation of the Roman people.[d]

VIII. Amidst these frequent commotions, and even amidst the repeated enormities and flagitious crimes of those who gave themselves out for Christ's vicegerents upon earth, the power and authority of the Roman pontiffs gradually and imperceptibly increased; such were the effects of that ignorance and superstition which reigned without control in these miserable times. Otho the Great had indeed published a solemn edict, prohibiting the election of any pontiff without the previous knowledge and consent of the emperor; which decree, as all writers unanimously agree, remained in force from the time of its publication to the conclusion of this century. It is also to be observed, that the same emperor (and likewise his son and grandson, who succeeded him in the empire) maintained, without interruption, the right of supremacy over the city of Rome, its territory, and its pontiff, as may be clearly proved by a multitude of examples. It is, moreover, equally certain that the German, French, and Italian bishops, who were not ignorant of the nature of their privileges and the extent of their jurisdiction, were, during this whole century, perpetually upon their guard against every eventual attempt of the pope for the exclusive assumption of a legislative authority in the church. But, notwithstanding all this, the bishops of Rome found the means of augmenting their influence, and partly by open violence, partly by secret and fraudulent stratagems, encroached, not only upon the privileges of the bishops, but also upon the jurisdiction and rights of kings and emperors.[e] Their ambitious attempts were seconded and vindicated by the scandalous adulation of certain mercenary prelates, who exalted the dignity and prerogatives of, what they called, the apostolic see, in the most pompous and extravagant terms. Several learned writers have observed, that in this century certain bishops maintained publicly that the popes were not only bishops of Rome, but of the whole world, an assertion which hitherto none had ventured to make;[f] and that even among the French clergy it had been affirmed by some, that the authority of the bishops, though divine in its origin, was conveyed to them by St. Peter, the prince of the apostles.[g]

IX. The adventurous ambition of the bishops of Rome, who left no means unemployed to extend their jurisdiction, exhibited an example which the inferior prelates followed with the most zealous and indefatigable emulation. Several bishops and abbots had begun, even from the time that the descendants of Charlemagne sat on the imperial throne, to enlarge their prerogatives, and had actually ob

☞ [a] Some writers place Donus II. before Benedict VI. See the Tabulæ Synopticæ Hist. Eccles. by the learned Pfaff.

☞ [b] Fleury says, eleven months.

☞ [c] Among these authors, is the learned Pfaff: but the Roman catholic writers, whom Dr. Mosheim follows with good reason, do not reckon, among the number of the pontiffs, that John who governed the church of Rome, during the space of four months after the death of Boniface VII., because he was never duly invested, by consecration, with the papal dignity.

[d] The history of the pontiffs of this period is not only extremely barren of interesting events, but also obscure, and uncertain in many respects. In the accounts I have here given of them, I have followed principally Lud. Ant. Muratori's Annales Italiæ, and the Conatus Chronologico-Historicus de Romanis Pontificibus, which the learned Papebrochius prefixed to his Acta Sanctorum Mensis Maii.

[e] Several examples of these usurpations may be found in the Histoire du Droit Eccles. François, tom. i. p. 217, edit. in 8vo.

[f] Hist. Lit. de la France, t. vi. p. 98. [g] The same work, p. 186.

tained, for their tenants and their possessions, an immunity from the jurisdiction of the counts and other magistrates, as also from taxes and imposts of all kinds. But in this century they carried their pretensions still farther; aimed at the civil jurisdiction over the cities and territories in which they exercised a spiritual dominion, and even aspired to the honours and authority of dukes, marquises, and counts of the empire. Among the principal circumstances that animated their zeal in the pursuit of these dignities, we may reckon the perpetual and bitter contests concerning jurisdiction and other matters, that reigned between the dukes and counts, who were governors of cities, and the bishops and abbots, who were their spiritual rulers. The latter, therefore, seizing the opportunity that was offered to them by the superstition of the times, used every method that might be effectual to obtain that high rank, which had hitherto stood in the way of their ambition; and the emperors and kings to whom they addressed their presumptuous requests, generally granted them, either from a desire of pacifying the contentions and quarrels that arose between civil and military magistrates, or from a devout reverence for the sacred order, or with a view to augment their own authority, and to confirm their dominion by the good services of the bishops, whose influence was very great over the minds of the people. Such were the different motives that engaged princes to enlarge the authority and jurisdiction of the clergy; and hence we see from this century downwards so many bishops and abbots invested with characters, employments, and titles so foreign to their spiritual offices and functions, and clothed with the honours of dukes, marquises, counts, and viscounts.[a]

X. Beside the reproach of the grossest ignorance, which the Latin clergy in this century so justly deserved,[b] they were also chargeable, in a heinous degree, with two other odious vices, even *concubinage* and *simony*, which the greatest part of the writers of these unhappy times acknowledge and deplore. As to the former of these vices, it was practised too openly to admit any doubt. The priests, and what is still more surprising, even the sanctimonious monks, fell victims to the triumphant charms of the sex, and to the imperious dominion of their carnal lusts; and, entering into the bonds of wedlock, or concubinage, squandered away in a most luxurious manner, with their wives and mistresses, the revenues of the church.[c] The other vice reigned with an equal degree of impudence and licentiousness. Elections of bishops and abbots were no longer adjusted by the laws of the church; but kings and princes, or their ministers and favourites, either conferred these ecclesiastical dignities upon their friends and creatures, or sold them, without shame, to the highest bidder.[d] Hence it happened, that the most stupid and flagitious wretches were frequently advanced to the most important stations in the church; and that, upon several occasions, even soldiers, civil magistrates, and counts, were by a strange metamorphosis converted into bishops and abbots. Gregory VII. endeavoured, in the following century, to put a stop to these two growing evils.

XI. While the monastic orders, among the Greeks and Orientals, still maintained an external appearance of religion and decency, the Latin monks, toward the commencement of this century, had so entirely lost sight of all subordination and discipline, that the greatest part of them knew not even by name the rule of St. Benedict, which they were obliged to observe. A noble Frank, whose name was Odo, a man as learned and pious as the ignorance and superstition of the times would permit, endeavoured to remedy this disorder; nor were his attempts totally unsuccessful. This zealous ecclesiastic being created, in 927, abbot of Clugni, in the province of Burgundy, on the death of Berno, not only obliged the monks to live in a rigorous observance of their rules, but also added to their discipline a new set of ceremonies, which, notwithstanding the air of sanctity that attended them, were, in reality, insignificant and trifling, and yet, at the same time, severe and burdensome.[e] This new rule of discipline covered its author with glory, and, in a short time, was adopted in all the European convents: for the greatest part of the ancient monasteries, which had been founded in France Germany, Italy, Britain, and Spain, received the rule of the monks of Clugni, to which also the convents, newly established, were subjected by their founders; and thus it was, that the Order of Clugni attained that high degree of eminence and authority, opulence and dignity, which it exhibited to the Christian world in the following century.

[a] The learned Louis Thomassin, in his book, de Disciplinâ Ecclesiæ veteri et novâ, tom. iii. lib. i. cap. xxviii., has collected a multitude of examples to prove that the titles and prerogatives of dukes and counts were conferred upon certain prelates so early as the ninth century; and some bishops trace even as far back as the eighth century the beginning of that princely dominion which they now enjoy. But notwithstanding all this, if I do not grossly err, there cannot be produced any evident and indisputable example of this princely dominion, previous to the tenth century.

[b] Ratherius, speaking of the clergy of Verona in his Itinerarium, which is published in the Spicilegium of M. d'Acheri, tom. i. p. 381, says, that he found many among them who could not even repeat the Apostles' Creed. His words are, 'Sciscitatus de fide illorum, inveni plurimos neque ipsum sapere Symbolum, qui fuisse creditur Apostolorum.'

[c] That this custom was introduced toward the commencement of this century is manifest, from the testimony of Ordericus Vitalis and other writers, and also from a letter of Mantio, bishop of Chalons in Champagne, published by Mabillon, in his Analecta veterum. As to the charge brought against the Italian monks, of their spending the treasures of the church upon their wives or mistresses, see Hugo's narrative de Monasterii Farfensis destructione, in Muratori's Antiq. Ital. medii Ævi tom. vi. p. 278.

[d] Many infamous and striking examples and proofs of simoniacal practice may be found in the work entitled Gallia Christiana, tom. i. p. 23, 37; tom. ii. p. 173, 179. Add to this Abbonis Apologeticum, published at the end of the Codex Canon. Pithæi, p. 398, as also Mabillon's Annal. Benedict. tom. v.

[e] See Mabillon, Annal. Benedict. tom. iii. p. 386, and Præf. ad Acta Sanct. Ord. Benedict. Sæc. V. p. 26. See also the Acta Sanctor. Bened. Sæc. V. p. 66, in which he speaks largely of Berno, the first abbot of Clugni, who laid the foundations of that order, and of Odo, (p. 122,) who gave it a new degree of perfection. The learned Helyot, in his Histoire des Ordres Religieuses, tom. v. p. 184, has given a complete and elegant history of the order of Clugni; and the subsequent state of that famous monastery is described by Martenne, in his Voyage Liter. de deux Benedict. part i. p. 227.

[f] The majority of ecclesiastical historians do not appear to have perceived the true meaning and force of the word *order* in its application to the Cistertian monks, those of Clugni, and other convents. They imagine that this term signifies a new monastic institution, as if the Order of Clugni imported a new sect of monks never before heard of. But this is apparently a great error, into which they fall by confounding the ancient meaning of that term with the sense in which it is used in modern times. The word *order*, when employed by the writers of the tenth century, signified no more at first than a certain form or rule of monastic discipline; but, from this primitive signification, another (a secondary one) was gradually derived: so that by the same word is also understood, an association or confederacy of several monasteries, subjected to the same rule of discipline under the jurisdiction and inspection of one common chief. Hence we conclude, that the Order of Clugni was not a new sect of monks, such as were the Carthusian, Dominican, and Franciscan Orders; but signified only, first, that new institution or rule of discipline, which Odo had prescribed to the Benedictine monks, who were settled at Clugni, and, afterwards, that prodigious multitude of monasteries throughout Europe, which received the rule established at Clugni, and were form-

XII. The more eminent Greek writers of this century are easily numbered; among them we find Simeon, high treasurer of Constantinople, who, from his giving a new and more elegant style to the Lives of the Saints, which had been originally composed in a gross and barbarous language, was distinguished by the title of Metaphrast, or Translator.[a] He did not, however, content himself with digesting, polishing, and embellishing the saintly chronicle, but went so far as to augment it with a multitude of trifling fables drawn from the fecundity of his own imagination.

Nicon, an Armenian monk, composed a treatise concerning the Religion of the Armenians, which is not altogether contemptible.

Some place in this century Olympiodorus and Œcumenius,[b] who distinguished themselves by those compilations which were known by the name of *Catenæ*, or Chains, and of which we have had occasion to speak more than once in the course of this history. But it is by no means certain, that these two writers belong to the tenth century, and they are placed there only by conjecture.

It is much more probable, that the learned Suidas, author of the celebrated Greek Lexicon, lived in the period now before us.

Among the Arabians, no author acquired a higher reputation than Eutychius, bishop of Alexandria, whose Annals, with several other productions of his learned pen, are still extant.[c]

XIII. The most eminent of the Latin writers of this century was Gerbert, or Sylvester II., who has already been mentioned with the applause due to his singular merit. The other writers of this age were not very eminent in any respect.

Odo, who laid the foundations of the celebrated Order of Clugni, left several productions in which the grossest superstition reigns, and in which it is difficult to perceive the smallest marks of true genius or solid judgment.[d]

The learned reader will form a different opinion of Ratheir, bishop of Verona, whose works, yet extant, afford evident proofs of sagacity and judgment, and breathe throughout an ardent love of virtue.[e]

Atto, bishop of Vercelli, composed a treatise, *de pressuris Ecclesiasticis*, i. e. concerning the Sufferings and Grievances of the Church, which shows in their true colours the spirit and complexion of the times.[f]

Dunstan, the famous abbot of Glastonbury, and afterwards archbishop of Canterbury, composed in favour of the monks a book *de Concordiâ Regularum*, i. e. concerning the Harmony of the Monastic Rules.[g]

Elfric, archbishop of Canterbury, acquired a considerable reputation, among the Anglo-Saxons established in Britain, by various productions.[h]

Burchard, bishop of Worms, is highly esteemed among the canonists on account of his celebrated Decreta, divided into twenty books, though a part of the merit of this collection of canons may be considered as due to Olbert, with whose assistance it was composed.[i]

Odilo, archbishop of Lyons,[k] was the author of some insipid discourses, and other productions, whose mediocrity has almost sunk them in a total oblivion.

As to the historical writers and annalists who lived in this century, their works and abilities have been already considered in their proper place.

CHAPTER III.

Concerning the Doctrine of the Christian Church during this Century.

I. THE state of religion in this century was such as might be expected in times of prevailing ignorance and corruption. The most important doctrines of Christianity were disfigured and perverted in the most wretched manner; and such as had preserved, in unskilful hands, their primitive purity, were nevertheless obscured with a multitude of vain opinions and idle fancies, so that their intrinsic excellence and lustre were little attended to. This will appear evident to those who look with the smallest degree of attention into the writers of this age. Both Greeks and Latins placed the essence and life of religion in the worship of images and departed saints; in seeking with zeal, and preserving with a devout care and veneration, the sacred relics of holy men and women, and in accumulating riches upon the priests and monks, whose opulence increased with the progress of superstition. Scarcely did any Christian dare to approach the throne of God, without rendering first the saints and images propitious by a solemn round of expiatory rites and lustrations. The ardour with which relics were sought almost surpasses credibility; it had seized all ranks and orders among the people, and had become a sort of fanaticism and phrensy; and, if the monks are to be believed, the Supreme Being interposed, in a special and extraordinary manner, to discover, to doting old women, and bareheaded friars, the places where the bones or carcases of the saints lay dispersed or interred. The fears of purgatory, of that fire which was to destroy the remaining impurities of departed souls, were now carried to the greatest height, and far exceeded the terrifying apprehensions of infernal torments; for they hoped to avoid the latter easily, by dying enriched with the prayers of the clergy, or covered with the merits and mediation of the saints, while from the pains of purgatory they thought there was no exemption. The clergy, therefore, finding these superstitious terrors admirably adapted to increase their authority and to promote their interest, used every method to augment them; and by the most pathetic discourses, accompanied with monstrous fables and fictitious miracles, they laboured to establish the

---

ed by association into a sort of community, of which the abbot of Clugni was the chief.

[a] See Leo Allatius, de Simeonum Scriptis, p. 24.—Jo. Bollandus, Præf. ad Acta Sanctorum Antwerp. sect. iii. p. 6.

[b] For an account of Œcumenius, see Montfaucon's Biblioth. Coisliniana, p. 274.

[c] See Jo. Albert. Fabricii Bibliographia Antiquaria, p. 179—as also Eusebii Renaudoti Historia Patriarch. Alexandr. p. 347.

[d] Histoire Literaire de la France, tom. vi. p. 229.

[e] Id. ibid. p. 339. [f] Id. ibid. p. 281.

☞ [g] See the ample account that is given of this eminent prelate in Collier's Ecclesiastical History of England, vol. i. cent. X. p. 181, 183, &c.

☞ [h] We have a Grammar and a Dictionary composed by this learned prelate; as also an Anglo-Saxon translation of the first books of the Holy Scripture, a History of the Church, and 180 sermons. See Fleury, Hist. Eccl. livre lviii.

[i] See the Chronicon Wormatiense in Ludwig's Reliquiæ Manuscriptorum, tom. ii. p. 43.—Histoire Liter. de la France, tom. vii. p. 295.

☞ [k] Odilo was abbot of Clugni, and not archbishop of Lyons; for he obstinately refused the latter station, notwithstanding the urgent entreaties employed both by pontiffs and emperors to engage him to accept it. See Fleury, Hist. Eccl. livre lix.

doctrine of purgatory, and also to make it appear that they had a mighty influence in that formidable region.

II. The contests concerning predestination and grace, as also concerning the eucharist, that had agitated the church in the preceding century, were in this happily reduced to silence. This was the result of the mutual toleration that was practised by the contending parties, who as we learn from writers of undoubted credit, left it to each other's free choice to retain, or to change their former opinions. Besides, the ignorance and stupidity of this degenerate age were ill suited to such deep inquiries as these contests demanded; nor was there any great degree of curiosity among an illiterate multitude to know the opinions of the ancient doctors concerning these and other knotty points of theology. Thus it happened, that the followers of Augustin and Pelagius flourished equally in this century; and that, if there were many who maintained the corporal presence of the body and blood of Christ in the holy sacrament, there were still more who either came to no fixed determination upon this point, or declared it publicly as their opinion, that the Divine Saviour was really absent from the eucharistical sacrament, and was received only by a certain inward impulse of faith, in a manner wholly spiritual.[a] This mutual toleration, as it is easy to conclude from what has been already observed, must not be attributed either to the wisdom, or virtue of an age, which was almost totally destitute of both. The truth of the matter is, that the divines of this century wanted both the capacity and the inclination to attack, or defend any doctrine, whose refutation or defence required the smallest portion of learning or logic.

III. That the whole Christian world was covered, at this time, with a thick and gloomy veil of superstition, is evident from a prodigious number of testimonies and examples, which it is needless to mention. This horrible cloud, which hid almost every ray of truth from the eyes of the multitude, furnished the priests and monks with many opportunities of propagating absurd and ridiculous opinions, which contributed not a little to confirm their credit. Among these opinions, which so frequently dishonoured the Latin church, and produced from time to time such violent agitations, none occasioned such a general panic, or such dreadful impressions of terror or dismay, as a notion that now prevailed of the immediate approach of the day of judgment. This notion, which took its rise from a remarkable passage in the Revelations of St. John,[b] and had been entertained by some doctors in the preceding century, was advanced publicly by many at this time; and, spreading itself with an amazing rapidity through the European provinces, it threw them into the deepest consternation and anguish; for they imagined that St. John had clearly foretold that, after a thousand years from the birth of Christ, Satan was to be let loose from his prison; that Antichrist was to come, and the conflagration and destruction of the world were to follow these great and terrible events. Hence prodigious numbers of people abandoned all their civil connexions and their parental relations, and, giving over to the churches or monasteries all their lands, treasures, and worldly effects, repaired with the utmost precipitation to Palestine, where they imagined that Christ would descend from heaven to judge the world. Others devoted themselves by a solemn and voluntary oath to the service of the churches, convents, and priesthood, whose slaves they became, in the most rigorous sense of that word, performing daily their heavy tasks; and all this from a notion that the Supreme Judge would diminish the severity of their sentence, and look upon them with a more favourable and propitious eye, on account of their having made themselves the slaves of his ministers. When an eclipse of the sun or moon happened to be visible, the cities were deserted, and their miserable inhabitants fled for refuge to deep caverns, and hid themselves among the craggy rocks, and under the bending summits of steep mountains. The opulent attempted to bribe the Deity, and the saintly tribe, by rich donations conferred upon the sacerdotal and monastic orders, who were regarded as the immediate vicegerents of heaven. In many places, temples, palaces, and noble edifices, both public and private, were suffered to decay, and were even deliberately pulled down, from a notion that they were no longer of any use, since the final dissolution of all things approached. In a word, no language is sufficient to express the confusion and despair that tormented the minds of miserable mortals upon this occasion. This general delusion was, indeed, opposed and combated by the discerning few, who endeavoured to dispel these groundless terrors, and to efface the notion from which they arose, in the minds of the people. But their attempts were ineffectual; nor could the dreadful apprehensions of the superstitious multitude be entirely removed before the conclusion of this century. Then, when they saw that the dreaded period had passed without the arrival of any great calamity, they began to understand that St. John had not really foretold what they so much feared.[c]

---

[a] It is certain, that the Latin theologians of this century differed much in their sentiments about the manner in which the body and blood of Christ were present in the eucharist; this is granted by such of the Roman catholic writers as have been ingenuous enough to sacrifice the spirit of party to the love of truth. That the doctrine of transubstantiation, as it is commonly called, was unknown to the English in this century, has been abundantly proved from the public homilies, by Rapin de Thoyras, in his History of England, vol. i. It is, however, to be confessed, on the other hand, that this absurd doctrine was already adopted by several French and German divines. ☞ For a more judicious account of the opinions of the Anglo-Saxon church concerning the eucharist, see Collier's Ecclesiastical History of Great Britain, vol. i. cent. X.

☞ [b] The passage here referred to, is in the twentieth chapter of the Book of Revelations, at the 2d, 3d, and 4th verses: "And he took hold of the dragon, that old serpent, which is the devil and Satan, and bound him a *thousand years*;—and cast him into the bottomless pit, and shut him up, and set a seal upon him, that he should deceive the nations no more till the thousand years should be fulfilled; and after that he must be loosed a little season.—And I saw thrones, and they sat upon them, and judgment was given unto them; and I saw the souls of them that were beheaded for the witness of Jesus, and for the word of God, and which had not worshipped the beast, neither his image, neither had received his mark upon their foreheads, or in their hands; and they lived and reigned with Christ a thousand years."

[c] Almost all the donations that were made to the church during this century, bear evident marks of this groundless panic that had seized all the European nations, as the reasons of these donations are generally expressed in the following words: 'Appropinquante mundi termino,' &c. i. e. 'The end of the world being now at hand,' &c. Among the many undeniable testimonies that we have from ancient records of this universal delusion, that was so profitable to the sacerdotal order, we shall confine ourselves to the quotation of one very remarkable passage in the Apologeticum of Abbo, abbot of Fleury, adversus Arnulphum, i. e. Arnoul bishop of Orleans: which apology is published by the learned Francis Pithou, in the Codex Canonum Ecclesiæ Romanæ, p. 401. The words of Abbo are as follows: "De fine quoque mundi coram populo sermonem in ecclesiâ Parisiorum adolescentulus audivi, quod statim finito mille annorum numero Antichristus adveniret, et non longo post tempore universale judicium succederet; cui prædicationi ex evangeliis, ac apocalypsi, et libro Danielis, quâ potui virtute restiti. Denique et errorem, qui de fine mundi inolevit, abbas meus beatæ memoriæ Richardus sagaci animo propulit, postquam litera- à Lotharicnsibus accepit, quibus

IV. The number of the saints, who were looked upon as ministers of the kingdom of heaven, and whose patronage was esteemed such an unspeakable blessing, had now an extraordinary increase; and the celestial courts were filled with new legions of this species of beings, some of which, as we have had formerly occasion to observe, had no existence but in the imagination of their deluded clients and worshippers. This multiplication of saints may be easily accounted for, when we consider that superstition, the source of fear, had risen to such an enormous height in this age, as rendered the creation of new patrons necessary to calm the anxiety of trembling mortals. Besides, the corruption and impiety that now reigned with a horrid sway, and the licentiousness and dissolution that had so generally infected all ranks and orders of men, rendered the reputation of sanctity very easy to be acquired; for, amidst such a perverse generation, it demanded no great efforts of virtue to be esteemed holy, and this, no doubt, contributed to increase considerably the number of the celestial advocates. All those, to whom nature had given an austere complexion, a gloomy temper, or enthusiastic imagination, were, in consequence of an advantageous comparison with the profligate multitude, revered as the favourites of heaven and the friends of God.

The Roman pontiff, who before this period had pretended to the right of creating saints by his sole authority, gave, in this century, the first specimen of this spiritual power; for in the preceding ages there is no example of his having exercised this privilege alone. This specimen was given, in 993, by John XV., who, with all the formalities of a solemn canonisation, enrolled Udalric, bishop of Augsburg, in the number of the saints, and thus conferred upon him a title to the worship and veneration of Christians.[a] We must not, however, hence conclude, that after this period the privilege of canonising new saints was vested solely in the pontiffs;[b] for there are several examples upon record, which prove, that not only provincial councils, but also several of the first order among the bishops, advanced to the rank of saints such as they thought worthy of that high dignity, and continued thus to augment the celestial patrons of the church, without consulting the pope, until the twelfth century.[c] Then Alexander III. abrogated this privilege of the bishops and councils, and placed *canonisation* in the number of the more important acts of authority,[d] which the sovereign pontiff alone, by a peculiar prerogative, was entitled to exercise.

V. The expositors and commentators, who attempted in this century to illustrate and explain the sacred writings, were too mean in their abilities, and too unsuccessful in their undertakings, to deserve more than a slight and transient notice; for it is extremely uncertain, whether or no the works of Olympiodorus and Œcumenius are to be considered as the productions of this age. Among the Latins, Remi, or Remigius, bishop of Auxerre, continued the exposition of the Scriptures, which he had begun in the preceding century; but his work is highly defective in various respects; for he took very little pains in explaining the literal sense of the words, and employed the whole force of his fantastic genius in unfolding their pretended mystical signification, which he looked upon as infinitely more interesting than their plain and literal meaning. Besides, his explications are rarely the fruit of his own genius and invention, but are, generally speaking, mere compilations from ancient commentators. As to the Moral Observations of Odo upon the book of Job,[e] they are transcribed from a work of Gregory the Great, which bears the same title. We mention no more; if, however, any are desirous of an ample account of those who were esteemed the principal commentators in this century, they will find it in a book written professedly upon this subject by Notkerus Balbulus.

VI. The science of theology was absolutely abandoned in this century; nor did either the Greek or Latin church furnish any writer who attempted to explain in a regular method the doctrines of Christianity. The Greeks were contented with the works of Damascenus, and the Latins with those of Augustin and Gregory, who were now considered as the greatest doctors that had adorned the church. Some added to these the writings of venerable Bede and Rabanus Maurus. The moral science was still more neglected than that of theology in this wretched age, and was reduced to a certain number of dry and insipid homilies, and to the lives of the saints, which Simeon among the Greeks, and Hubald, Odo, and Stephen,[f] among the Latins, had drawn up with a seducing eloquence that covered the most impertinent fictions. Such was the miserable state of morals and theology in this century; in which, we may add, there did not appear any defence of the Christian religion against its professed enemies.

VII. The controversies between the Greek and Latin churches, were now carried on with less noise and impetuosity than in the preceding century, on account of the troubles and calamities of the times; yet they were not entirely reduced to silence.[g] The writers therefore who affirm, that this unhappy schism was healed, and that the contending parties were really reconciled to each other for a certain space of time, have grossly mistaken the matter;[h] though it be, indeed, true that the tumults of the times produced now and then a cessation of these contests, and occasioned several truces, which insidiously concealed the bitterest enmity, and served often as a cover to the most treacherous designs. The Greeks were, moreover, divided among themselves, and disputed with great warmth concerning the lawfulness of repeated[i] marriages, to which violent contest the cause of Leo, surnamed the Philosopher, gave rise. This emperor, having buried successively three wives without having had by them any male issue, espoused a fourth, whose name was Zoe Carbinopsina, and who was born in the obscurity of a mean condition. As marriages contracted for the fourth

me respondere jussit. Nam fama pæne totum mundum impleverat, quod, quando Annunciatio Dominica in Parasceve contigisset, absque ullo scrupulo finis sæculi esset.

[a] Franc. Pagi Breviar. Pontif. Roman. tom. ii. p. 259.

[b] This absurd opinion has been maintained with warmth by Phil. Bonanni, in his Numismata Pontif. Romanorum, tom. i. p. 41.

[c] See Franc. Pagi Breviar. tom. ii. p. 260; tom. iii. p. 30.—Arm. de la Chapelle, Biblioth. Angloise, tom. x. p. 105.—Mabillon, Præfat. ad Sæc. V. Benedict. p. 53.

[d] These were called the Causæ Majores.

[e] Moralia in Jobum.

[f] Bishop of Liege.

[g] Mich. Lequien, Dissert. i. Damascenica de Processione Spiritus Sancti, sect. xiii. p. 12.—Fred. Spanheim, de perpetuâ Dissensione Ecclesiæ Oriental. et Occidental. part iv. sect. vii. p. 529, tom. ii. op.

[h] Leo Allatius, de perpetuâ Consensione Ecclesiæ Orient. et Occident. lib. ii. cap. vii. viii. p. 600.

☞ [i] Fourth marriages our author undoubtedly means, since second and third nuptials were allowed on certain conditions.

time were pronounced impure and unlawful by the Greek canons, Nicolas, the patriarch of Constantinople, suspended the emperor, on this occasion, from the communion of the church. Leo, incensed at this rigorous proceeding, deprived Nicolas of the patriarchal dignity, and raised Euthymius to that high office, who, though he re-admitted the emperor to the bosom of the church, opposed the law which he had resolved to enact in order to render fourth marriages lawful. Upon this a schism, attended with the bitterest animosities, divided the clergy; one part of which declared for Nicolas, the other for Euthymius. Some time after this, Leo died, and was succeeded in the empire by Alexander, who deposed Euthymius, and restored Nicolas to his eminent rank in the church. No sooner was this zealous patriarch re-instated in his office, than he began to load the memory of the late emperor with the bitterest execrations and the most opprobrious invectives, and to maintain the unlawfulness of fourth marriages with the utmost obstinacy. In order to appease these tumults, which portended numberless calamities to the state, Constantine Porphyrogeneta convoked an assembly of the clergy of Constantinople, in 920, in which fourth marriages were absolutely prohibited, and marriages for the third time were permitted on certain conditions; and thus the public tranquillity was restored.[a]

Several other contests of like moment arose among the Greeks during this century; and they serve to convince us of the ignorance that prevailed among that people, and of their blind veneration and zeal for the opinions of their ancestors.

CHAPTER IV.

Concerning the Rites and Ceremonies used in the Church during this Century.

I. IN order to have some notion of the load of ceremonies under which the Christian religion groaned during this superstitious age, we have only to cast an eye upon the acts of the various councils which were assembled in England, Germany, France, and Italy. The number of ceremonies increased in proportion to that of the saints, which multiplied from day to day; for each new saintly patron had appropriated to his service a new festival, a new form of worship, a new round of religious rites; and the clergy, notwithstanding their gross stupidity in other matters, discovered, in the creation of new ceremonies, a marvellous fertility of invention, attended with the utmost dexterity and artifice. It is also to be observed, that a great part of these new rites derived their origin from the various errors which the barbarous nations had received from their ancestors, and still retained, even after their conversion to Christianity. The clergy, instead of extirpating these errors, either gave them a Christian aspect by inventing certain religious rites to cover their deformity, or by explaining them in a forced allegorical manner; and thus they were perpetuated in the church, and devoutly transmitted from age to age. We may also attribute a considerable number of the rites and institutions, that dishonoured religion in this century, to absurd notions both concerning the Supreme Being and departed saints; for it was imagined that God was like the princes and great ones of the earth, who are rendered propitious by costly presents, and are delighted with those cringing salutations, and other marks of veneration and homage, which they receive from their subjects; and it was believed likewise, that departed spirits were agreeably affected with the same kind of services.

II. The famous yearly festival that was celebrated in remembrance of all departed souls, was instituted by the authority of Odilo, abbot of Clugni, and added to the Latin calendar toward the conclusion of this century.[b] Before this time, a custom had been introduced in many places of offering up prayers on certain days, for the souls that were confined in purgatory; but these prayers were made by each religious society, only for its own members, friends, and patrons. The pious zeal of Odilo could not be confined within such narrow limits; and he therefore extended the benefit of these prayers to all the souls that laboured under the pains and trials of purgatory.[c] To this proceeding Odilo was prompted by the exhortations of a Sicilian hermit, who pretended to have learned, by an immediate revelation from heaven, that the prayers of the monks of Clugni would be effectual for the deliverance of departed spirits from the expiatory flames of a middle state.[d] Accordingly this festival was, at first, celebrated only by the congregation of Clugni; but, having afterwards received the approbation of one of the popes, it was, by his order, kept with particular devotion in all the Latin churches.

III. The worship of the Virgin Mary, which, before this century, had been carried to a very high degree of idolatry, now received new accessions of solemnity and superstition. Near the close of this century, a custom was introduced among the Latins of celebrating masses, and abstaining from flesh, in honour of the blessed Virgin, every Sabbath-day. After this, what the Latins called the *minor office* was instituted in honour of St. Mary, which was, in the following century, confirmed by Urban II. in the council of Clermont. There are also to be found in this age manifest indications of the institution of the *rosary* and *crown* of the Virgin, by which her worshippers were to reckon the number of prayers that they were to offer to this new divinity; for, though some place the invention of the rosary in the thirteenth century, and attribute it to St. Dominic, yet this supposition is made without any foundation.[e] The rosary consists in fifteen repetitions of the Lord's prayer, and a hundred and fifty salutations of the blessed Virgin; while the crown, according to the different opinions of the learned concerning the age of the blessed Virgin, consists in six or seven recitations of the Lord's prayer, and six or seven times ten salutations.[f]

---

[a] These facts are faithfully collected from Cedrenus, Leunclavius de Jure Græco-Rom. tom. i. p. 104, from Leo the Grammarian, Simeon the Treasurer, and other writers of the Byzantine history.

[b] In the year 998.

[c] See Mabillon, Acta SS. Ord. Bened. Sæc. VI. part i. p. 584, where the reader will find the Life of Odilo, with his decree for the institution of this festival.

[d] Benedict XIV. was artful enough to observe a profound silence with respect to the superstitious and dishonorable origin of this anniversary festival, in his treatise de Festis J. Christi, Mariæ, et Sanctorum, lib. iii. cap. xxii. p. 671, tom. x. oper., and by his silence he has plainly shown to the world what he thought of this absurd festival. This is not the only mark of prudence that is to be found in the works of that famous pontiff.

[e] This is demonstrated by Mabillon, Præf. ad Acta SS. Ord. Bened. Sæc. V. p. 58.

[f] In these words—Ave, Maria!

CHAPTER V.

Concerning the Divisions and Heresies that troubled the Church during this Century.

I. THE profound ignorance and stupidity, that were productive of so many evils in this century, had at least this advantage attending them, that they contributed much to the tranquillity of the church, and prevented the rise of new sects and new commotions of a religious kind. But, though no new inventions were broached, the ancient errors still remained. The Nestorians and Monophysites still lived under the Arabian government: they were, however, much more rigorously treated than in former times, and were often persecuted with the utmost injustice and violence. But, as some of them excelled in medical knowledge, which was highly esteemed among the Arabians, while others rendered themselves acceptable to the great, by the dexterous management of their domestic affairs, as overseers and stewards, all this contributed to diminish the violence of the storms which arose against them from time to time.

II. The Manichæans or Paulicians, whose errors have been already pointed out, gathered considerable strength in Thrace under the reign of John Tzimisces. A great part of this restless and turbulent sect had been transported into that province, by the order of Constantine Copronymus, so early as the eighth century, to put an end to the commotions which they had excited in the east; but a still greater number of them were left behind, especially in Syria and the adjacent countries. Hence it was, that Theodore, bishop of Antioch, from a pious apprehension of the danger to which his flock lay exposed from the neighbourhood of such pernicious heretics, engaged the emperor, by his ardent and importunate solicitations, to send a new colony of these Manichæans from Syria to Philippi.[a] From Thrace they passed into Bulgaria and Sclavonia, where they long resided under the jurisdiction of their own pontiff, or patriarch. After the council of Basil had commenced its deliberations, these sectaries removed into Italy, and thence spreading themselves through the other provinces of Europe, they became extremely troublesome to the popes on many occasions.[b]

III. In the last year of this century arose a certain teacher, whose name was Leutard, who lived at Vertus, in the diocese of Chalons, and, in a short time, drew after him a considerable number of disciples. This new doctor could not bear the superstitious worship of images, which he is said to have opposed with the utmost vehemence, and even to have broken in pieces an image of Christ, which he found in a church where he went to perform his devotions. He, moreover, exclaimed with the greatest warmth against the payment of tithes to the priests, and in several other respects showed that he was no cordial friend to the sacerdotal order. But that which showed evidently that he was a dangerous fanatic, was his affirming that in the prophecies of the Old Testament there was a manifest mixture of truth and falsehood. Gebouin, bishop of Chalons, examined the pretensions which this man made to divine inspiration, and exposed his extravagance to the view of the public, whom he had so artfully seduced; upon which he threw himself into a well, and ended his days like many other fanatics.[c] It is highly probable, that this upstart doctor taught many other absurd notions beside those which we have now mentioned, and that, after his death, his disciples formed a part of the sect that was afterwards known in France under the name of the Albigenses, and which is said to have adopted the Manichæan errors.

IV. There were yet subsisting some remains of the sect of the Arians in several parts of Italy, and particularly in the territory of Padua; but Ratherius, bishop of Verona, had a still more enormous heresy to combat in the system of the Anthropomorphites, which was revived in 939. In the district of Vicenza, a considerable number, not only of the illiterate multitude, but also of the sacerdotal order, adopted that most absurd and extravagant notion, that the Deity was clothed with a human form, and seated, like an earthly monarch, upon a throne of gold, and that his angelic ministers were men arrayed in white garments, and furnished with wings, to render them more expeditious in executing their sovereign's orders. This monstrous error will appear less astonishing, when we consider that the stupid and illiterate multitude had constantly before their eyes, in all the churches, the Supreme Being and his angels represented in pictures and images with the human figure.

The superstition of another set of blinded wretches, mentioned also by Ratherius, was yet more unaccountable and absurd than that of the Anthropomorphites; for they imagined that, every Monday, mass was performed in heaven by St. Michael in the presence of God; and hence on that day, they resorted in crowds to all the churches which were dedicated to that highly honoured saint.[d] It is more than probable that the avarice of the priests, who officiated in the church of St. Michael, was the real source of this extravagant fancy; and that in this, as in many other cases, the rapacity of the clergy took advantage of the credulity of the people, and made them believe whatever they thought would contribute to augment the opulence of the church.

[a] Jo. Zonaras, Annal. lib. xvii.

[b] It is extremely probable, as we have already had occasion to observe, that the remains of this sect are still to be found in Bulgaria.

[c] All this is related by Glaber Radulphus, Hist. lib. ii. cap. xi.

[d] Ratherii Epist. Synodica in Dacherii Spicilegio Script. Veter. tom. ii. p. 294.—Sigeberti Gemblacens. Chron. ad annum 939.

THE ELEVENTH CENTURY.

PART I.

THE EXTERNAL HISTORY OF THE CHURCH.

CHAPTER I.

Concerning the prosperous Events which happened to the Church during this Century.

I. In the preceding century some faint notions of the Christian religion, some scattered rays of that divine light which it administers to mortals, had been received among the Hungarians, Danes, Poles, and Russians; but the rude and savage spirit of those nations, together with their deplorable ignorance and their violent attachment to the superstitions of their ancestors, rendered their total conversion to Christianity a work of great difficulty, which could not be very rapidly accomplished. The zeal, however, with which this important work was carried on, did great honour to the piety of the princes and governors of these unpolished countries, who united their influence with the labours of the learned men whom they had invited into their dominions, to open the eyes of their subjects upon the truth.[a] In Tartary,[b] and the adjacent countries, the zeal and diligence of the Nestorians gained over considerable numbers, almost daily, to the profession of Christianity. It appears also evident from a multitude of unexceptionable testimonies, that metropolitan prelates, with a greater number of inferior bishops under their jurisdiction, were established at this time in the provinces of Casgar, Nuacheta, Turkestan, Genda, and Tangut;[c] from which we may conclude, that, in this and the following century, a prodigious number of Christians lived in those very countries which are at present overrun with idolatry, or with the Mohammedan errors. All these Christians were undoubtedly Nestorians, and lived under the jurisdiction of the patriarch of that sect, who resided in Chaldæa.

II. Among the European nations that lay yet grovelling in their native darkness and superstition, were the Sclavonians, the Obotriti,[d] the Venedi,[e] and the Prussians, whose conversion had been attempted, but with little or no success, by certain missionaries, from whose piety and zeal better fruits might have been expected. Toward the conclusion of the preceding century, Adalbert, bishop of Prague, had endeavoured to instil, into the minds of the fierce and savage Prussians, the salutary doctrines of the Gospel; but he perished in the fruitless attempt, and received, in 996, from the murdering lance of Siggo, a pagan priest, the crown of martyrdom.[f] Boleslaus, king of Poland, revenged the death of this pious apostle by entering into a bloody war with the Prussians; and he obtained, by the force of penal laws and of a victorious army, what Adalbert could not effect by exhortation and argument.[g] He dragooned this savage people into the Christian church; yet, beside this violent method of conversion, others of a more gentle kind were certainly practised by the attendants of Boleslaus, who seconded the military arguments of their prince by the more persuasive influence of admonition and instruction. A certain ecclesiastic of illustrious birth, whose name was Boniface, and who was one of the disciples of St. Romuald, undertook the conversion of the Prussians, and was succeeded in this pious enterprise by Bruno,[h] who set out from Germany with a company of eighteen persons, who had entered with zeal into the same laudable design. These were, however, all barbarously massacred by the fierce and cruel Prussians; and neither the vigorous efforts of Boleslaus, nor of the succeeding kings of Poland, could engage this rude and inflexible nation to abandon totally the idolatry of their ancestors.[i]

III. Sicily had been groaning under the dominion of the Saracens from the ninth century; nor had the repeated attempts of the Greeks and Latins to dispossess them of that rich and fertile country, been hitherto crowned with the desired success. But in this century the face of affairs changed entirely in that island; for, in 1059, Robert Guiscard, who had formed a settlement in Italy, at the head of a Norman colony, and was afterwards created duke of Apulia, encouraged by the exhortations of pope Nicolas II., and seconded by the assistance of his brother Roger, at-

[a] For an account of the Poles, Russians, and Hungarians, see Romualdi Vita in Actis Sanctor. tom. ii. Februar.

[b] Tartary is taken here in its most comprehensive sense; for between the inhabitants of Tartary, properly so called, and the Calmucs, Mogols, and the inhabitants of Tangut, there is a manifest difference.

[c] Marcus Paul. Venetus de Regionibus Orientalibus, lib. i. cap. 38, 40, 45, 47, 48, 49, 62, 63, 64, lib. ii. cap. 39.—Euseb. Renaudot, Anciennes Relations des Indes et de la Chine, p. 420.—Assemani Biblioth. Orient. Vatican. tom. iii. part ii. p. 502, &c. The successful propagation of the Gospel, by the ministry of the Nestorians, in Tartary, China, and the neighbouring provinces, is a most important event, and every way worthy to employ the researches and the pen of some able writer, well acquainted with oriental history. It must, indeed, be acknowledged, that, if this subject be important, it is also difficult on many accounts. It was attempted, however, notwithstanding its difficulty, by the most learned Theoph. Sigefred Bayer, who had collected a great quantity of materials relative to this interesting branch of the history of Christianity, both from the works that have been published upon this subject, and from manuscripts that lie yet concealed in the cabinets of the curious. But, unhappily for the republic of letters, the death of that excellent man interrupted his labours, and prevented him from executing a design which was worthy of his superior abilities, and his well known zeal for the interests of religion.

[d] The Obotriti were a great and powerful branch of the Vandals, whose kings resided in the country of Mecklenburg, extending their dominion along the coasts of the Baltic from the river Pene in Pomerania to the duchy of Holstein.

[e] The Venedi dwelt upon the banks of the Weissel, or Vistula, in, what is at present called, the Palatinate of Marienburg.

[f] See the Acta Sanctor. ad d. xxii. Aprilis, p. 174.

[g] Solignac's Hist. de Pologne, tom. i. p. 133.

[h] Fleury differs from Dr. Mosheim in his account of Bruno, in two points. First, he maintains, that Boniface and Bruno were one and the same person, and here he is manifestly in the right; but he maintains farther, that he suffered martyrdom in Russia, which is an evident mistake. It is proper farther to admonish the reader to distinguish carefully the Bruno here mentioned, from a monk of the same name, who founded the order of the Carthusians.

[i] Ant. Pagi Critica in Baronium, tom. iv. ad annum 1008, p. 97.—Christ. Hartknoch's Eccles. Hist. of Prussia, book i. chap. i.

tacked with the greatest vigour and intrepidity the Saracens in Sicily; nor did the latter chieftain sheathe the victorious sword before he had rendered himself master of that island, and cleared it absolutely of its former tyrants. As soon as this great work was accomplished, which was not before the year 1090, count Roger not only restored to its former glory and lustre the Christian religion, which had been almost totally extinguished under the Saracen yoke, but also established bishoprics, founded monasteries, erected magnificent churches throughout that province, and bestowed upon the clergy those immense revenues and those distinguished honours which they still enjoy.[a] It is in the privileges conferred upon this valiant chief, that we find the origin of that supreme authority in matters of religion, which is still vested in the kings of Sicily, within the limits of their own territories, and which is known by the name of the Sicilian monarchy; for pope Urban II. is said to have granted, in 1097, by a special diploma, to Roger and his successors, the title, authority, and prerogatives, of hereditary legates of the apostolic see. The court of Rome affirms, that this diploma is not authentic; and hence warm contentions, about the spiritual supremacy, have arisen even in our times between the popes and the kings of Sicily. The successors of Roger governed that island, under the title of dukes, until the twelfth century, when it was erected into a kingdom.[b]

IV. The pontiffs, from the time of Sylvester II., had been forming plans for extending the limits of the church in Asia, and especially for driving the Moslems out of Palestine; but the troubles in which Europe was so long involved, prevented the execution of these arduous designs. Gregory VII., the most enterprising and audacious priest that ever sat in the apostolic chair, animated and inflamed by the repeated complaints which the Asiatic Christians made of the cruelty of the Saracens, resolved to undertake in person a holy war for the deliverance of the church; and above fifty thousand men were speedily mustered to follow him in this bold expedition.[c] But his quarrel with the emperor Henry IV., of which we shall have occasion to speak hereafter, and other unforeseen occurrences, obliged him to relinquish a personal invasion of the holy land. The project, however, was renewed toward the conclusion of this century, by the enthusiastic zeal of an inhabitant of Amiens, who was known by the name of Peter the Hermit, and who suggested to Urban II. the means of accomplishing what had been unfortunately suspended. This famous hermit, in a journey, which he had made through Palestine, in 1093, had observed, with inexpressible anguish, the vexations and persecutions which the Christians, who visited the holy places, suffered from the barbarous and tyrannic Saracens. Inflamed therefore with a holy indignation and a furious zeal, which he looked upon as the effects of a divine impulse, he implored the assistance of Simeon, patriarch of Constantinople, and also of the pope, but without effect. Far from being discouraged by this, he renewed his efforts with the utmost vigour, went through all the countries of Europe sounding the alarm of a holy war against the infidel nations, and exhorting all Christian princes to draw the sword against the tyrants of Palestine; nor did he stop here; but, with a view to engage the superstitious and ignorant multitude in his cause, he carried about with him a letter, which he said was written in heaven, and addressed to all true Christians, to animate their zeal for the deliverance of their brethren, who groaned under the oppressive burthen of a Mohammedan yoke.[d]

V. When Urban saw the way prepared by the exhortations of the hermit, who had put the spirits of the people every where in a ferment, and had kindled in their breasts a vehement zeal for that holy carnage which the church had been so long meditating, he assembled a grand and numerous council at Placentia, in 1095, and recommended warmly, for the first time, the sacred expedition against the Saracens.[e] This arduous enterprise was far from being approved by the greatest part of this numerous assembly, notwithstanding the presence of the emperor's legates, who, in their master's name, represented most pathetically how necessary it was to set limits to the power of the victorious infidels, whose authority and dominion increased from day to day. The pontiff's proposal was, however, renewed with the same zeal, and with the desired success, some time after this, in the council assembled at Clermont, where Urban was present. The pompous and pathetic speech which he delivered on this occasion, made a deep and powerful impression upon the minds of the French, whose natural character renders them much superior to the Italians in encountering difficulties, facing danger, and attempting the execution of the most perilous designs: so that an innumerable multitude, composed of all ranks and orders in the nation, offered themselves as volunteers in this sacred expedition.[f] This numerous host was looked upon as formidable in the highest degree, and equal to the most glorious enterprises and exploits, while, in reality, it was no more than an unwieldy body without life and vigour, and was weak and contemptible in every respect. This will appear sufficiently evident when we consider that this army was a motley assemblage of monks, prostitutes, artists, labourers, lazy tradesmen, merchants, boys, girls, slaves, malefactors, and profligate debauchees, and that it was principally composed of the lowest dregs of the multitude, who were animated solely by the prospect of spoil and plunder, and hoped to make their fortunes by this holy campaign. Every one will perceive how little discipline, counsel, or fortitude, were to be expected from such a miserable rabble. This expedition was distinguished, in the French language, by the name of a *croisade*, and all who embarked in it were called *croisés*, *croisards*, or cross-bearers, not only because the end of this holy war was to wrest the cross of Christ out of the hands of the infidels, but also on account of the consecrated cross of various colours, which every soldier wore upon his right shoulder.[g]

[a] See Burigni's Histoire Generale de la Sicile, tom. i. p. 386.

[b] See Baronii Liber de Monarchiâ Siciliæ, tom. xi. Annal.; as also the Traité de la Monarchie Sicilienne, by M. Du-Pin.

[c] Gregorii VII. Epist. lib. ii. 3, in Harduini Concil. tom. vi.

[d] This circumstance is mentioned by the abbot Dodechinus, in his Continuat. Chronici Mariani Scoti, apud Scriptores Germanicos Jo. Pistorii, tom. i. p. 402. For an account of Peter, see Du-Fresne's notes upon the Alexias of Anna Comnena.

☞ [e] This council was the most numerous of any that had been hitherto assembled, and was, on that account, holden in the open fields. There were present at it two hundred bishops, four thousand ecclesiastics, and three hundred thousand laymen.

[f] Theod. Ruinart. in Vit. Urbani II. sect. ccxxv. p. 224, 229, 240, 272, &c. tom. iii. op. posthum. Mabilloni et Ruinarti.—Jo. Harduini Concilia, tom. xi. part ii. p. 1726.—Baron. Annal. Eccles. tom. xi. ad annum 1095, n. xxxii. p. 648.

[g] See Abrah. Bzovius, Continuat. Annal. Baronii, tom. xv. ad annum 1410, n. ix. p. 322, edit. Colon.—L'Enfant, Histoire du Concile de Pise,

VI. In consequence of these grand preparations, eight hundred thousand men, in separate bodies, and under different commanders, set out for Constantinople, in 1096, that, after receiving both assistance and direction from Alexis Comnenius the Grecian emperor, they might pursue their march into Asia. One of the principal divisions of this great body marched under the guidance of Peter the Hermit, the author and fomenter of the war, who was girded with a rope, and continued to appear with all the marks of an austere solitary. The adventurers who composed this first division committed the most flagitious crimes, which so incensed the inhabitants of the countries through which they passed, particularly those of Hungary and Bulgaria, that they rose up in arms and massacred the greatest part of them. A like fate attended several other divisions of the same army, who, under the conduct of weak and unskilful chiefs, wandered about like an undisciplined band of robbers, plundering the cities that lay in their way, and spreading misery and desolation wherever they came. The armies that were headed by illustrious commanders, distinguished by their birth and their military endowments, arrived more happily at the capital of the Grecian empire. That which was commanded by Godfrey of Bouillon, duke of Lorrain, who deserves a place among the greatest heroes, whether of ancient or modern times,[a] and by his brother Baldwin, was composed of eighty thousand well chosen troops, horse and foot,[b] and directed its march through Germany and Hungary. Another host, which was headed by Raymond, earl of Toulouse, passed through the Sclavonian territories. Robert, earl of Flanders, Robert, duke of Normandy,[c] Hugh, brother to Philip I. king of France, embarked their respective forces in a fleet which was assembled at Brundisi and Tarento, whence they were transported to Durazzo, or Dyrrhachium, as it was anciently called. These armies were followed by Boemond, duke of Apulia and Calabria, at the head of a chosen and numerous body of valiant Normans.

VII. This army was the greatest, and, in outward appearance, the most formidable, that had been known in the memory of man; and though, before its arrival at Constantinople, it was diminished considerably by the difficulties and oppositions it had met with on the way, yet, such as it was, it made the Grecian emperor tremble, and filled his mind with the most anxious and terrible apprehensions of some secret design against his dominions. His fears, however, were dispelled, when he saw these legions pass the straits of Gallipolis, and direct their march toward Bithynia.[d]

The first successful enterprise,[e] that was formed against the infidels, was the siege of Nice, the capital of Bithynia, which was taken in 1097; thence the victorious army proceeded into Syria, and in the following year subdued Antioch, which, with its fertile territory, was granted, by the assembled chiefs, to Boemond, duke of Apulia. Edessa fell next into the hands of the victors, and became the property of Baldwin, brother to Godfrey of Bouillon. The conquest of Jerusalem, which, after a siege of five weeks, submitted to their arms in 1099, seemed to crown their expedition with the desired success. In this city were laid the foundations of a new kingdom, at the head of which was placed the famous Godfrey, whom the army saluted king of Jerusalem with an unanimous voice.

But this illustrious hero, whose other eminent qualities were adorned with the greatest modesty, refused that high title,[f] though he governed Jerusalem with that valour, equity, and prudence, which have rendered his name immortal. Having chosen a small army to support him in his new dignity, he permitted the rest of the troops to return into Europe. He did not, however, long enjoy the fruits of a victory, in which his heroic valour had been so gloriously displayed, but died about a year after the conquest of Jerusalem, leaving his dominions to his brother Baldwin, prince of Edessa, who assumed the title of king without the least hesitation.

VIII. If we examine the motives that engaged the popes, more particularly Urban II., to kindle this holy war, which in its progress and issue was so detrimental to almost all the countries of Europe, we shall probably be persuaded that its origin is to be derived from the corrupt notions of religion, which prevailed in those barbarous times. It was thought inconsistent with the duty and character of Christians, to suffer that land which was blessed with the ministry, distinguished by the miracles, and consecrated by the blood of the Saviour of men, to remain under the dominion of his most inveterate enemies. It was also deemed a very important branch of true piety to visit the holy places in Palestine; but such peregrinations were

tom. ii. lib. v. p. 60.—The writers who have treated of this holy war are mentioned by Jo. Alb. Fabricius, in his Lux Evangelii toto Orbe exoriens, cap. xxx. p. 518.

[a] The Benedictine monks have given an ample account of this magnanimous chief, whose character was a bright assemblage of all Christian, civil, and heroic virtues, in their Hist. Lit. de la France, t. viii. p. 598.

[b] The engaging and illustrious virtues of Godfrey had drawn from all parts a prodigious number of volunteers, who were ambitious to fight under his standard. The magnitude of this host, however, perplexed the valiant chief, who on that account, divided it into several bodies, and, finding in Peter the Hermit the same ambitious and military spirit that had prevailed in him before his retreat from the world, declared him the general of the first division, which was detached from the rest, and ordered to march immediately to Constantinople. By this measure Godfrey freed himself from the dregs of that astonishing multitude which flocked to his camp. Father Maimbourg, notwithstanding his immoderate zeal for the holy war, and that fabulous turn which enabled him to represent it in the most favourable points of view, acknowledges frankly, that the first divisions of this prodigious army committed the most abominable enormities in the countries through which they passed, and that there was no kind of insolence, injustice, impurity, barbarity, and violence, of which they were not guilty. Nothing perhaps in the annals of history can equal the flagitious deeds of this infernal rabble. See particularly Maimbourg, Histoire des Croisades, tom. i. liv. i. p. 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, second edit. in 12mo.

[c] Eldest son of William the Conqueror.

[d] Our author, for the sake of brevity, passes over the contests and jealousies that subsisted between the chief of the crusade and the Grecian emperor. The character of the latter is differently painted by different historians. The warm defenders of the crusade represent him as a most perfidious prince, who, under the show of friendship and zeal, aimed at the destruction of Godfrey's army. Others consider him as a wise, prudent politician, who, by artifice and stratagem, warded off the danger he had reason to apprehend from the formidable legions that passed through his dominions; and part of which, particularly the army commanded by Peter the Hermit, ravaged his most fruitful territories in the most barbarous manner, and pillaged even the suburbs of the capital of the empire. The truth of the matter is, that, if Alexis cannot be vindicated from the charge of perfidy, the holy warriors are, on the other hand, chargeable with many acts of brutality and injustice. See Maimbourg, Hist. des Crois. liv. i. et ii.

[e] Before the arrival of Godfrey in Asia, the army, or rather rabble, commanded by Peter the Hermit in such a ridiculous manner as might be expected from a wrong-headed monk, received a ruinous defeat from the young Soliman.

[f] All the historians, who have written of this holy war, applaud the answer which Godfrey returned to the offer that was made him of a crown of gold, as a mark of his accession to the throne of Jerusalem; the answer was, that "he could not bear the thought of wearing a crown of gold in that city, where the King of kings had been crowned with thorns." This answer was sublime in the eleventh century.

extremely dangerous, while the despotic Saracens were in possession of that country. Nor is it to be denied, that these motives of a religious kind were accompanied and rendered more effectual by an anxious apprehension of the growing power of the Turks, who had already subdued the greatest part of the Grecian empire, and might soon carry into Europe, and more particularly into Italy, their victorious arms.

There are, it must be confessed, several learned men who have accounted otherwise for this pious, or rather fanatical, expedition. They imagine that the Roman pontiffs recommended this sacred campaign with a view of augmenting their own authority, and weakening the power of the Latin emperors and princes; and that these princes countenanced and encouraged it in hopes of getting rid, by that measure, of their powerful and warlike vassals, and of becoming masters of their lands and possessions.[a] These conjectures, however plausible in appearance, are still no more than conjectures. The truth seems to be this; that the pope and the European princes were engaged at first in these crusades by a principle of superstition only; but when, in process of time, they learned by experience, that these holy wars contributed much to increase their opulence and to extend their authority, by sacrificing their wealthy and powerful rivals, new motives were presented to encourage these expeditions into Palestine, and ambition and avarice seconded and enforced the dictates of fanaticism and superstition.

IX. Without determining any thing concerning the justice or injustice[b] of these wars, we may boldly affirm, that they were highly prejudicial, both to the cause of religion, and to the civil interests of mankind; and that, in Europe more especially, they occasioned innumerable evils and calamities, the effects of which are yet perceptible in

[a] The part of this hypothesis, that relates to the views of the Roman pontiffs, has been adopted as an undoubted truth, not only by many protestant historians, but also by several writers of the Romish communion. See Bened. Accoltus de bello Sacro in Infideles, lib. i. p. 16.—Basnage, Histoire des Eglises Reformées, tom. i. period. v. p. 235.—Vertot, Histoire des Chevaliers de Malthe, tom. i. liv. iii. p. 302, 308; liv. iv. p. 428.—Baillet, Histoire des Demelez de Boniface VIII. avec Philippe le Bel, p. 76.—Histoire du Droit Ecclesiastique François, tom. i. p. 296, 299. To such, however, as consider matters attentively, this hypothesis will appear destitute of any solid foundation. Certain it is, that the pontiffs could never have either foreseen, or imagined, that so many European princes, and such prodigious multitudes of people, would take arms against the infidels, and march into Palestine; nor could they be assured before-hand, that this expedition would tend to the advancement of their opulence and authority; for all the accessions of influence and wealth, which the popes, and the clergy in general, derived from these holy wars, were of a much later date than their origin, and were acquired by degrees, rather by lucky hits, than by deep-laid schemes; and this alone is sufficient to show, that the pontiffs, in forming the plan, and exhorting to the prosecution of these wars, had no thoughts of extending thereby the limits of their authority. We may add, to this consideration, another of no less weight in the matter before us; and that is, the general opinion which prevailed at this time, both among the clergy and the people, that the conquest of Palestine would be finished in a short time, in a single campaign; that the Divine Providence would interpose, in a miraculous manner, to accomplish the ruin of the infidels; and that, after the taking of Jerusalem, the greatest part of the European princes would return home with their troops, which last circumstance was by no means favourable to the views which the popes are supposed to have formed of increasing their opulence and extending their dominion. Of all the conjectures that have been entertained upon this subject, the most improbable and groundless is that which supposes that Urban II. recommended, with such ardour, this expedition into Palestine, with a view of weakening the power of the emperor Henry IV. with whom he had a violent dispute concerning the investiture of bishops. They who adopt this conjecture, must be little acquainted with the history of these times: or at least they forget, that the first armies that marched into Palestine against the infidels, were chiefly composed of Franks and Normans, and that the Germans, who were the enemies of Urban II., were, in the beginning, extremely averse to this sacred expedition. Many other considerations might be added to illustrate this matter, which, for the sake of brevity, I pass in silence.

That part of the hypothesis, which relates to the kings and princes of Europe, and supposes that they countenanced the holy war to get rid of their powerful vassals, is as groundless as the other, which we have been now refuting. It is, indeed, adopted by several eminent writers, such as Vertot, (Hist. de Malthe, liv. iii. p. 309,) Boulainvilliers, and others, who pretend to a superior and uncommon insight into the policy of these remote ages. The reasons, however, which these great men employed to support their opinion, may be all comprehended in this single argument, viz. "Many kings, especially among the Franks, became more opulent and powerful, by the number of their vassals who lost their lives and fortunes in this holy war; therefore, these princes not only permitted, but warmly countenanced the prosecution of this war from selfish and ambitious principles." The weakness of this conclusion must strike every one at first sight.

We are wonderfully prone to attribute both to the Roman pontiffs, and to the princes of this barbarous age, much more sagacity and cunning than they really possessed; and we deduce from the events the principles and views of the actors, which is a defective and uncertain manner of reasoning. With respect to the pontiffs, it appears most probable that their immense opulence and authority were acquired, rather by their improving dexterously the opportunities that were offered to them, than by the schemes they had formed for extending their domiion, or filling their coffers.

[b] I do not pretend to decide the question concerning the lawfulness of the crusades; a question which, when it is considered with attention and impartiality, will appear not only extremely difficult, but also highly doubtful. It is, however, proper to inform the reader, that in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries the justice of this holy war was called in question, and warmly disputed among Christians. The Waldenses and Albigenses, who were distinguished by the name of Cathari, and Puritans, considered these expeditions into Palestine as absolutely unlawful. The reasons they alleged were collected and combated by Francis Moneta, a Dominican friar of the thirteenth century, in a book entitled Summa contra Catharos et Waldenses, lib. v. cap. xiii. p. 531, which was published at Rome by Riccini. But neither the objections of the Waldenses, nor the answers of Moneta, were at all remarkable for their weight and solidity, as will appear evidently from the following examples. The former alleged against the holy war, the words of St. Paul, 1 Cor. x. 32. "Give none offence; neither to the Jews nor to the Gentiles." By the Gentiles, said they, are to be understood the Saracens. And therefore the European Christians are to abstain from making war upon the Saracens, lest they give offence to the Gentiles. We shall give Moneta's answer to this argument in his own words: "We read," says he, "Gen. xii. 7, that God said unto Abraham, Unto thy seed will I give this land: Now we (Christians who dwell in Europe) are the seed of Abraham, as the apostle affirms, Galat. iii. 29. Therefore we are heirs of the promise, and the holy land is given to us by the covenant as our lawful possession. Hence it appears, that it is the duty of civil and temporal rulers to use their most zealous efforts to put us in possession of the promised land, while it is, at the same time, incumbent upon the church and its ministers to exhort these rulers in the most urgent manner to the performance of their duty." A rare argument this truly! but let us hear him out. "The church has no design to injure or slaughter the Saracens, nor is such the intention of the Christian princes engaged in this war. Yet the blood of the infidels must of necessity be shed, if they make resistance and oppose the victorious arms of the princes. The church of God therefore is entirely innocent and without reproach in this matter, and gives no offence to the Gentiles, because it does no more, in reality, than maintain its undoubted right." Such is the subtle reasoning of Moneta, on which it is not necessary to make any reflections.

☞ Dr. Mosheim seems too modest, and even timorous, in his manner of arraigning the justice of this holy war, which was so absurd in its principle, and so abominable in the odious circumstances that attended it. His respect, perhaps, for the Teutonic crosses which abound in Germany, and are the marks of an order that derives its origin from these fanatical expeditions into Palestine, may have occasioned that ambiguity and circumspection in his expressions, through which, however, it is easy to perceive his disapprobation of the crusades. The holy place profaned by the dominion of infidels, was the apparent pretext for this fanatical war. What holy place? Jerusalem, say the knights errant of Palestine. But they forget that Jerusalem was a city which, by the conduct of its inhabitants and the crucifixion of Christ, had become most odious in the eye of God; that it was visibly loaded with a divine malediction, and was the miserable theatre of the most tremendous judgments and calamities that ever were inflicted upon any nation. Had the case been otherwise, we know of no right which Christianity gives its professors to seize the territories, and invade the possessions of unbelievers. Had the Jews attempted the conquest of Palestine, they would have acted conformably with their apparent rights, because it was formerly their country; and consistently also with their religious principles, because they expected a Messiah who was to bind the kings of the Gentiles in chains, and to reduce the whole world under the Jewish yoke.

our times. The European nations were deprived of the greatest part of their inhabitants by these ill-judged expeditions; immense sums of money were exported into Asia for the support of the war; and numbers of the most powerful and opulent families either became extinct, or were involved in the deepest miseries of poverty and want. It could not easily be otherwise, since the heads of the most illustrious houses either mortgaged or sold their lands and possessions in order to pay the expenses of their voyage,[a] while others imposed such intolerable burthens upon their vassals and tenants, as obliged them to abandon their houses and all their domestic concerns, and to enlist themselves, rather through wild despair than religious zeal, under the sacred banner of the cross. Hence the face of Europe was totally changed, and all things were thrown into the utmost confusion. We pass in silence the various enormities that were occasioned by these crusades, the murders, rapes, and robberies of the most infernal nature, that were every where committed with impunity by these holy soldiers of God and of Christ, as they were impiously called; nor shall we enter into a detail of the new privileges and rights, to which these wars gave rise, and which were often attended with the greatest inconveniences.[b]

X. These holy wars were not less prejudicial to the cause of religion, and the true interests of the Christian church, than they were to the temporal concerns of men. One of their first and most pernicious effects was the enormous augmentation of the influence and authority of the Roman pontiffs: they also contributed, in various ways, to enrich the churches and monasteries with daily accessions of wealth, and to open new sources of opulence to all the sacerdotal orders. For they, who assumed the cross, disposed of their possessions as if they were at the point of death, on account of the great and innumerable dangers to which they were to be exposed in their passage to the holy land, and the opposition they were to encounter there upon their arrival.[c] They therefore, for the most part, made their wills before their departure, and left a considerable part of their possessions to the priests and monks, in order to obtain, by these *pious* legacies, the favour and protection of the Deity.[d] Many examples of these donations are to be found in ancient records. Such of the *holy* soldiers, as had been engaged in suits of law with the priests or monks, renounced their pretensions, and submissively gave up whatever it was that had been the subject of debate; and others, who had seized any of the possessions of the churches or convents, or had heard of any injury that had been committed against the clergy by the remotest of their ancestors, made the most liberal restitution, both for their own usurpations and those of their forefathers, and made ample satisfaction, for the real or pretended injuries committed against the church, by rich and costly donations.[e]

Nor were these the only unhappy effects of these holy expeditions, considered with respect to their influence upon the state of religion, and the affairs of the Christian church; for, while whole legions of bishops and abbots girded the sword to the thigh, and went as generals, volunteers, or chaplains, into Palestine, the priests and monks, who had lived under their jurisdiction, and were more or less awed by their authority, threw off all restraint, led the most lawless and profligate lives, and abandoned themselves to all sorts of licentiousness, committing the most flagitious and extravagant excesses without reluctance or remorse. The monster superstition, which was already grown to an enormous size, received new accessions of strength and influence from this holy war, and exercised with greater vehemence than ever its despotic dominion over the minds of the Latins. To the crowd of saints and tutelar patrons, whose number was prodigious before this period, were now added many fictitious saints of Greek and Syrian origin,[f] hitherto unknown in Europe; and an incredible quantity of relics, the greatest part of which were ridiculous in the highest degree, were imported into the European churches. The armies, that returned from Asia after the taking of Jerusalem, brought with them a vast number of these saintly relics, which they had bought at a high price from the crafty Greeks and Syrians, and which they considered as the noblest spoils that could crown their return from the holy land. These they committed to the custody of the clergy in the churches and monasteries, or ordered them to be most carefully preserved in their families from one generation to another.[g]

---

[a] We find many memorable examples of this in the ancient records. Robert, duke of Normandy, mortgaged his duchy to his brother William, king of England, to defray the expenses of his voyage to Palestine. See the Histor. Major of Matthew Paris, lib. i. p. 24.—Odo, viscount of Bourges, sold his territory to the king of France. Gallia Christiana Benedictinorum, tom. ii. p. 45. See, for many examples of this kind, Car. du Fresne, Adnot. ad Joinvillii Vitam Ludovici S. p. 52.—Boulainvilliers sur l'Origine et les Droits de la Noblesse, in Molet's Memoires de Literature et de l'Histoire, tom. ix. part i. p. 68.—Jo. George Cramer, de Juribus et Prærogativis Nobilitatis, tom. i. p. 81, 409. From the commencement therefore of these holy wars, a vast number of estates, belonging to the European nobility, were either mortgaged, or totally transferred, some to kings and princes, others to priests and monks, and not a few to persons of a private condition, who by possessing considerable sums of ready money, were enabled to make advantageous purchases.

[b] Such persons as entered into these expeditions, and were distinguished by the badge of the military cross, acquired thereby certain remarkable rights, which were extremely prejudicial to the rest of their fellow-citizens. Hence it happened, that when any of these *holy* soldiers contracted any civil obligations, or entered into conventions of sale, purchase, or any such transactions, they were previously required to renounce all privileges and immunities, which they had obtained, or might obtain, in time to come, by assuming the cross. See Le Bœuf, Memoires sur l'Histoire d'Auxerre, Append. tom. ii. p. 292.

[c] The translator has here inserted, in the text, the note (r) of the original, as it is purely historical, and makes an interesting part of the narration.

[d] See Plessis, Hist. de Meaux, tom. ii. p. 76, 79, 141.—Gallia Christiana, tom. ii. p. 138, 139.—Le Bœuf, Append. p. 31.—Du Fresne, Notæ ad Vitam Ludovici Sancti, p. 52.

[e] Du-Fresne, p. 52.

[f] The Roman catholic historians acknowledge, that, during the time of the crusades, many saints unknown to the Latins before that period, were imported into Europe from Greece and the eastern provinces, and were treated with the utmost respect and the most devout veneration. Among these new patrons, there were some, whose exploits and even existence are called in question. Such, among others, was St. Catharine, whom Baronius and Cassander represent as having removed from Syria into Europe. See Baronius, ad Martyrol. Roman. p. 728.—George Cassander, Schol. ad Hymnos Ecclesiæ. It is extremely doubtful, whether this Catharine, who is honoured as the patroness of learned men, ever existed.

[g] The sacred treasures of musty relics which the French, Germans, Britons, and other European nations, preserved formerly with so much care, and show even in our times with such pious ostentation, are certainly not more ancient than these holy wars, but were then purchased at a high rate from the Greeks and Syrians. These cunning traders in superstition, whose avarice and fraud were excessive, frequently imposed upon the credulity of the simple and ignorant Latins, by the sale of fictitious relics. Richard, king of England, bought in 1191, from the famous Saladin, all the relics that were to be found in Jerusalem, as appears from the testimony of Matthew Paris, who tells us also, that the Dominicans brought from Palestine, a white stone, in which Jesus Christ had left the print of his feet. The Genoese pretended to have received from

CHAPTER II.

Concerning the Calamitous Events that happened to the Church during this Century.

I. THE greatest opposition the Christians met with, in this century, was from the Saracens and Turks. To the latter, the Christians and Saracens were equally odious, and felt equally the fatal consequences of their increasing dominion. The Saracens, notwithstanding their bloody contests with the Turks, which gave them constant occupation, and the vigorous, though ineffectual efforts they were continually making to set limits to the power of that fierce nation, which was daily extending the bounds of its empire, persisted in their cruelty toward their Christian subjects, whom they robbed, plundered, maimed, or murdered in the most barbarous manner, and loaded with all sorts of injuries and calamities. The Turks, on the other hand, not only reduced the Saracen dominion to very narrow bounds, but also seized the richest provinces of the Grecian empire, the fertile countries situated upon the coasts of the Euxine sea, and subjected them to their yoke, while they impoverished and exhausted the rest by perpetual incursions, and by the most severe and unmerciful exactions. The Greeks were not able to oppose this impetuous torrent of prosperous ambition. Their force was weakened by intestine discords, and their treasures were exhausted to such a degree as rendered them incapable of raising new troops, or of paying the armies they had already in their service.

II. The Saracens in Spain opposed the progress of the Gospel in a different, yet still more pernicious way. They used all sorts of methods to allure the Christians into the profession of the Mohammedan faith. Alliances of marriage, advantageous contracts, flattering rewards, were employed to seduce them with too much success; for great numbers fell into these fatal snares, and apostatized from the truth;[a] and these allurements would have, undoubtedly, still continued to seduce multitudes of Christians from the bosom of the church, had not the face of affairs been changed in Spain by the victorious arms of the kings of Arragon and Castile, and more especially Ferdinand I.; for these princes, whose zeal for Christianity was equal to their military courage, defeated the Saracens in several battles, and deprived them of a great part of their territories and possessions.[b]

The number of those among the Danes, Hungarians, and other European nations, who retained their prejudices in favour of the idolatrous religion of their ancestors, was yet very considerable; and they persecuted, with the utmost cruelty, the neighbouring nations, and also such of their fellow-citizens as had embraced the Gospel. To put a stop to this barbarous persecution, Christian princes exerted their zeal in a terrible manner, proclaiming capital punishment against all who persisted in the worship of the Pagan deities. This dreadful severity contributed much more toward the extirpation of paganism, than the exhortations and instructions of ignorant missionaries, who were unacquainted with the true nature of the Gospel, and dishonoured its pure and holy doctrines by their licentious lives and superstitious practices.

The Prussians, Lithuanians, Sclavonians, Obotriti, and several other nations, who dwelt in the lower parts of Germany, and lay still grovelling in the darkness of paganism, continued to harass the Christians, who lived in their neighbourhood, by perpetual acts of hostility and violence, by frequent incursions into their territories, and by putting numbers of them to death in the most inhuman manner.[c]

Baldwin, second king of Jerusalem, the very dish in which the paschal lamb was served up to Christ and his disciples at the last supper; though this famous dish excites the laughter of even father Labat, in his Voyages en Espagne et en Italie, tom. ii. For an account of the prodigious quantity of relics, which St. Louis brought from Palestine into France, we refer the reader to the life of that prince composed by Joinville, and published by Du-Fresne; as also to Plessis, Histoire de l'Eglise de Meaux, tom. i. p. 120; and Lancelot, Memoires pour la Vie de l'Abbé de St. Cyran, tom. i. p. 175. Christ's handkerchief, which is worshipped at Besançon, was brought thither from the holy land. See J. Jaques Chiflet, Visontio, part. ii. p. 108; and de Linteis Christi Sepulchralibus, c. ix. p. 50. Many other examples of this miserable superstition may be seen in Anton. Matthæi Analecta veteris Ævi, tom. ii. p. 677.—Jo. Mabillon, Annal. Bened. tom. vi. p. 52; and principally Chiflet's Crisis Historica de Linteis Christi Sepulchralibus, c. ix. x. p. 50, and also 59, where we find the following passage: "Sciendum est, vigente immani et barbarâ Turcorum persecutione, et imminente Christianæ religionis in oriente naufragio, educta e sacrariis et per Christianos quovis modo recondita ecclesiarum pignora.—Hisce plane divinis opibus illecti præ aliis, sacra Ἀειψανα quà vi, quà pretio, a detinentibus hac illac extorserunt."

[a] Jo. Henr. Hottingeri Histor. Ecclesiast. Sæc. XI. §. ii. p. 452; and Michael Geddes' History of the Expulsion of the Morescoes out of Spain, which is to be found in the Miscellan. Tracts of that Author, tom. i.

[b] For an account of these wars between the first Christian kings of Spain and the Moslems or Moors, see the Spanish histories of Mariana and Ferreras.

[c] Helmoldi Chron. Slavorum, lib. i. cap. xvi. p. 52.—Adami Bremens Histor. lib. ii. cap. xxvii.

PART II.

THE INTERNAL HISTORY OF THE CHURCH.

CHAPTER I.

Concerning the State of Letters and Philosophy during this Century.

I. The declining condition of the Grecian empire was fatal to the progress of letters and philosophy. Its glory and power diminished from day to day under the insults and usurpations of the Turks and Saracens; and, while the empire suffered by these attacks from without, it was consumed gradually by the internal pestilence of civil discord, by frequent seditions and conspiracies, and by those violent revolutions which shook from time to time the imperial throne, and were attended with the sudden fall and elevation of those who held the reins of government.[a] So many foreign invasions, so many internal troubles, so many emperors dethroned, deprived the political body of its strength and consistency, broke in upon the public order, rendered all things precarious, and, dejecting the spirits of the nation, damped the fire of genius, and discouraged the efforts of literary ambition. There were, however, some emperors, such as Alexius Comnenus, who seemed to cherish and encourage the drooping sciences, and whose zeal was seconded by several prelates, who were willing to lend a supporting hand to the cause of letters. The controversies also that subsisted between the Greeks and Latins, impelled the former, amidst all their disadvantages, to a certain degree of application to study, and prevented them from abandoning entirely the culture of the sciences. And hence it is, that we find among the Greeks of this century some writers, at least, who have deserved well of the republic of letters.

II. We pass in silence the poets, rhetoricians, and philologists of this century, who were neither highly eminent nor absolutely contemptible. Among the writers of history, Leo the *grammarian*, John Scylizes, Cedrenus, and a few others, deserve to be mentioned with some share of praise, notwithstanding the palpable partiality with which they are chargeable, and the zeal they discover for many of the fabulous records of their nation. But the greatest ornament of the republic of letters, at this time, was Michael Psellus, a man illustrious in every respect, and deeply versed in all the various kinds of erudition that were known in his age. This great man recommended warmly to his countrymen the study of philosophy, and particularly the system of Aristotle, which he embellished and illustrated in several learned and ingenious productions.[b] If we turn our eyes toward the Arabians, we shall find that they still retained a high degree of zeal for the culture of the sciences; as appears evidently from the number of physicians, mathematicians, and astronomers, who flourished among them in this century.[c]

III. The arts and sciences seemed, in some measure, to revive in the west, among the clergy, at least, and the monastic orders; they were not indeed cultivated by any other set of men; and the nobility, if we except such of them as were designed to fill certain ecclesiastical dignities, or had voluntarily devoted themselves to a religious solitude, treated all sorts of learning and erudition with indifference and contempt. The schools of learning flourished in several parts of Italy about the year 1050; and of the Italian doctors, who acquired a name by their writings, or their academical lectures, several removed afterwards into France, and particularly into Normandy, where they instructed the youth, who had consecrated themselves to the service of the church.[d] The French also, though they acknowledge their obligations to the learned Italians who settled in their provinces, exhibit, at the same time, a considerable list of their countrymen, who, without any foreign succours, cultivated the sciences, and contributed not a little to the advancement of letters in this century; they mention also several schools erected in different parts of that kingdom, which were in the highest reputation, both on account of the fame of their masters, and the multitude of disciples that resorted to them.[e] And, indeed, it is certain beyond all contradiction, that the liberal arts and sciences were cultivated in France, which abounded with learned men, while the greatest part of Italy lay as yet covered with a thick cloud of ignorance and darkness. For Robert, king of France, son and successor of Hugh Capet, disciple of the famous Gerbert (afterwards Sylvester II.) and the great protector of the sciences, and friend of the learned, reigned from the close of the preceding century to the year 1031,[f] and exerted upon all occasions the most ardent zeal for the restoration of letters; nor were his noble efforts without success.[g] The provinces of Sicily, Apulia, Calabria, and other southern parts of Italy, were indebted, for the introduction of the sciences among them, to the Normans, who became their masters, and who brought with them from France the knowledge of letters to a people benighted in the darkest ignorance. To the Normans also was due the restoration of learning in England. William the Conqueror, a prince of uncommon sagacity and genius, and the great Mæcenas of his time, upon his accession to the throne of England, in the year 1066, engaged, by the most alluring solicitations, a considerable number of learned men, from Normandy, and other countries, to settle in his new dominions, and exerted his most zealous endeavours to dispel that savage ignorance, which is always a source of innumerable evils.[h] The reception of Christianity had polished and civilized, in an extraordinary manner, the rugged minds of the valiant Normans: for those fierce warriors, who, under the

☞ [a] The sentence which begins with the words *so many foreign*, and ends with the words *literary ambition*, is added by the translator to render the connexion with what follows more evident.

[b] Leo Allatius, Diatriba de Psellis, p. 14, edit. Fabricii.

[c] Elmacini Historia Saracen. p. 281.—Jo. Henr. Hottinger, Histor. Eccles. Sæc. XI. p. 449.

[d] See Muratori, Antiquitates Ital. medii Ævi, tom. iii. p. 871.—Giannone, Historia di Napoli,' vol. ii.

[e] Histoire Literaire de la France, tom. vii. at the Introduction.—Du Boulay, Hist. Academ. Paris. tom. i. p. 355.—Le Bœuf, Diss. sur l'Etat des Sciences en France depuis la Mort du Roi Robert, which is published among his Dissertations sur l'Histoire Ecclesiastique et Civile de Paris, tom. ii. part i.

☞ [f] Robert succeeded Hugh Capet, and reigned thirty-five years.

[g] Daniel, Histoire de la France, tom. iii. p. 58.—Du Boulay, Hist. Academ. Paris. tom. i. p. 636, et passim.

[h] See Hist. Liter. de la France, tom. viii. p. 171.—"The English," says Matthew Paris, "were so illiterate and ignorant before the time of

darkness of paganism, had manifested the utmost aversion to all branches of knowledge and every kind of instruction, distinguished themselves, after their conversion, by their ardent application to the study of religion and the pursuits of learning.

IV. This vehement desire of knowledge, that increased from day to day, and became, at length, the predominant passion of the politest European nations, produced many happy effects. To it, more particularly, we must attribute the considerable number of public schools that were opened in various places, and the choice of more able and eminent masters, than those who had formerly presided in the seminaries of learning. Toward the conclusion of the preceding age, there were no schools in Europe but those which belonged to monasteries, or episcopal residences; nor were there any other masters, except the Benedictine monks, to instruct the youth in the principles of sacred and profane erudition. But, not long after the commencement of this century, the face of things was totally changed, in a manner the most advantageous to the cause of letters. In many cities of France and Italy, learned men, both among the clergy and laity, undertook the weighty and important charge of instructing the youth, and succeeded much better in this worthy undertaking than the monks had done, not only by comprehending in their course of instruction more branches of knowledge than the monastic doctors were acquainted with, but also by teaching in a better method, and with more perspicuity and precision, many of the same branches of science, which the others had taught before them. The most eminent of these new masters were such as had either travelled into Spain with a view to study in the schools of the Saracens, (which was extremely customary in this age among those who were ambitious of a distinguished reputation for wisdom and knowledge) or had improved their stock of erudition and philosophy by a diligent and attentive perusal of the writings of the Arabians, of which a great number were translated into Latin; for with these foreign succours they were enabled to teach philosophy, mathematics, physic, astronomy, and the other sciences that are connected with them, in a much more learned and solid manner than the monks, or such as had received their education from them alone. The school of Salernum, in the kingdom of Naples, was renowned above all others for the study of physic in this century, and vast numbers crowded thither from all the provinces of Europe to receive instruction in the art of healing: but the medical precepts which rendered the doctors of Salernum so famous, were all derived from the writings of the Arabians, or from the schools of the Saracens in Spain and Africa.[a] It was also from the schools and writings of the Arabian sages, that the absurd and puerile tricks of divination, and the custom of foretelling future events from the position of the stars, the features of the face, and the lines of the hand, derived their origin. These ridiculous practices, proceeding from so respectable a source, and moreover adapted to satisfy the idle curiosity of impatient mortals, were carried on in all the European nations; and in process of time the pretended sciences of astrology and divination acquired the highest reputation and authority.

V. The *seven liberal arts*, as they were now styled, were taught in the greatest part of the schools that were erected in this century for the education of youth. The first stage was grammar, which was followed by rhetoric and logic. When the disciple, having learned these three branches, which were generally known by the name of *trivium*, extended his ambition, and was desirous of new improvement in the sciences, he was conducted slowly through the *quadrivium*[b] to the very summit of literary fame. But this method of teaching, which had been received in all the western schools, was considerably changed toward the latter end of this century; for, as the science of logic, under which metaphysics were in part comprehended, received new degrees of perfection from the deep meditations and the assiduous industry of certain acute thinkers, and was taught with more detail and subtlety than in former times, the greatest part of the studious youth became so enamoured of this branch of philosophy, as to abandon grammar, rhetoric, and all the other liberal arts, that they might consecrate their whole time to the discussion of logical questions, and the pursuit of metaphysical speculations. Nor was this surprising, when we consider, that, according to the opinion which now prevailed in the republic of letters, a man who was well versed in *dialectics*, i. e. in logical and metaphysical knowledge, was reputed sufficiently learned, and was supposed to stand in need of no other branches of erudition.[c] Hence arose that contempt of languages and eloquence, of the more elegant sciences, and the fine arts, which spread its baneful influence through the Latin provinces; and hence that barbarism and pedantic sophistry which dishonoured, in succeeding ages, the republic of letters, and deplorably corrupted the noble simplicity of true theology, and the purest systems of philosophical wisdom.

VI. The philosophy of the Latins, in this century, was absolutely confined within the circle of dialectics, while the other philosophical sciences were scarcely known by name.[d] This dialectic, indeed, was miserably dry and

William the Conqueror, that a man who understood the principles of grammar was universally looked upon as a prodigy of learning.

[a] Muratori, Antiq. Ital. tom. iii. p. 935.—Giannone, Hist. di Napoli, tom. ii. p. 151.—Freind's History of Physic.—It is well known, that the famous precepts of the school of Salernum, for the preservation of health, were composed in this century, at the request of the king of England.

[b] The *trivium* was a term invented in the times of barbarism to express the three sciences that were first learned in the schools, viz. grammar, rhetoric, and logic; and the schools in which these sciences alone were taught, were called *triviales*. The *quadrivium* comprehended the four mathematical sciences,—arithmetic, music, geometry, and astronomy.

[c] See Boulay, tom. i. p. 408, 511.—This is too likely to become the prevailing taste even in our times; but it is an ancient taste, as we may easily perceive, by casting an eye upon the literary history of the eleventh century, and to confirm still farther the truth of the vulgar saying, that there is *nothing new under the sun*, we shall quote the following passage from the Metalogicum of John of Salisbury, a writer of no mean abilities, lib. i. cap. iii. "Poetæ, historiographi habebantur infames, et si quis incumbebat laboribus antiquorum, notabatur ut non modo asello Arcadiæ tardior, sed obtusior plumbo vel lapide, omnibus erat in risum. Suis enim, aut magistri sui, quisque incumbebat inventis.—Fiebant ergo summi repente philosophi: nam qui illiteratus accesserat, fere non morabatur in scholis ulterius quam eo curriculo temporis, quo avium pulli plumescunt.—Sed quid docebant novi doctores, et qui plus somniorum quam vigiliarum in scrutinio philosophiæ consumserant? Ecce nova fiebant omnia: innovabatur grammatica, immutabatur dialectica, contemnebatur rhetorica, et novas totius quadrivii vias, evacuatis priorum regulis, de ipsis philosophiæ adytis proferebant. Solam *convenientiam* sive *rationem* loquebantur, argumentum sonabat in ore omnium—ac ineptum nimis aut rude et a philosopho alienum, impossibile credebatur *convenienter* et ad rationis normam quicquam dicere aut facere, nisi *convenientiæ* et *rationis* mentio expressim esset inserta." Many more passages of this nature are to be found in this author.

[d] We shall, indeed, find many, in the records of this century, honoured with the title of *Philosophers*. Thus we hear of Manegoldus the philo-

barren, as long as it was drawn from no other source than the ten categories falsely attributed to St. Augustin, or from the explications of the Aristotelian philosophy, composed by Porphyry and Averroes. These, however, were the only guides which the schools had to follow in the beginning of this century; nor had the public teachers either genius or courage enough to enlarge the system, or to improve upon the principles of these dictators in philosophy, whose authority was treated as infallible, and whose productions, for a long time, were regarded as perfect, to the great detriment of true science. But, about the year 1050, the face of philosophy began to change, and the science of logic assumed a new aspect. This revolution began in France, where several of the books of Aristotle had been brought from the schools of the Saracens in Spain; and it was effected by a set of men highly renowned for their abilities and genius, such as Berenger, Roscelinus, Hildebert, and after them by Gilbert de la Porrée, the famous Abelard, and others. These eminent logicians, though they followed the Stagirite as their guide, took the liberty to illustrate and model anew his philosophy, and to extend it far beyond its ancient limits.

VII. The philosophers of this age, who were most famous for their zealous and successful endeavours to improve the science of logic, and accommodate it to general use, were Lanfranc, an Italian by birth, (who was abbot of St. Stephen's at Caen, and was thence called by William the Conqueror to the see of Canterbury,) Anselm his successor, and Odo, whose last promotion was the bishopric of Cambray. Lanfranc was so deeply versed in this science, that he was commonly called the Dialectician; and he employed with great dexterity the subtleties of logic in the controversy which was carried on between him and the learned Berenger, against whom he maintained the real presence of Christ's body and blood in the holy sacrament. Anselm, in a very learned dialogue, throws much light upon the darkness and perplexity in which the science of logic had been so long involved; and, among other things, he investigates, with no small sagacity, the nature of substance, and mode or quality, in order to convey more just notions of these metaphysical entities than had been hitherto entertained.[a] This great prelate, who shone with a distinguished lustre in several branches of literature both sacred and profane, was the first of the Latin doctors who dispelled the clouds of ignorance and obscurity that hung over the important sciences of metaphysics and natural theology, as appears from two books of his composition, wherein the truths concerning the Deity, which are deducible from the mere light of nature, are enumerated and explained with a degree of sagacity which could not well be expected from a writer of this century. He was the inventor of that famous argument, vulgarly and erroneously attributed to Des-Cartes, which demonstrates the existence of God from the idea of an infinitely perfect Being naturally implanted in the mind of man, and which is to be found, without exception, in the breast of every mortal. The solidity of this argument was, indeed, called in question, almost as soon as it was proposed, by Gaunilo, a French monk, whose objections were answered by Anselm, in a treatise professedly written for that purpose.[b] Odo, the third restorer of logic whom we mentioned above, taught that science with the greatest applause, and illustrated it in three learned productions, which have not survived the ruins of time.[c]

VIII. The restoration of logic was immediately followed by a vehement dispute between its restorers and patrons, concerning the *object* of that science; such was the term employed by the contending parties. This controversy, which was long agitated in the schools, was in its nature extremely trivial and unimportant: but, considered in its consequences, it became a very serious and weighty affair, since the disputants on both sides made use of their respective opinions in explaining the doctrines of religion, and reciprocally loaded each other with the most odious invectives and the most opprobrious accusations. In one point only they were unanimous, acknowledging that logic or dialectic had for its essential object the consideration of universals in their various relations and points of comparison, since particular and individual things, being liable to change, could not be the objects of a sure and immutable science. But the great question was, whether these universals, which came within the sphere of logical inquiries, belonged to the class of real *things*, or to that of mere *denominations*. One set of these subtle disputants maintained, that universals were undoubted realities, and supported their hypothesis by the authority of Plato, Boetius, and other ancient sages; the other affirmed, that they were mere words and outward denominations, and pleaded in behalf of their cause the respectable suffrages of Aristotle and Porphyry. The former were called Realists, on account of their doctrine, and the latter Nominalists, for the same reason. The contending parties were, in process of time, subdivided into various sects, on account of the different modes in which many explained the doctrine

---

gopher, Adalardus the Philosopher, &c. But we must not attribute to that term, when applied to these grammarians, the sense which it bore among the ancient Greeks and Latins, and which it still bears in our times. In the style of what we call the middle ages, every man of learning, of whatever kind his erudition might be, was called a philosopher; and this title was also given to the interpreters of Scripture, though that set of men were, generally speaking, destitute of true philosophy.

See the Chronicon Salernitanum in Muratori's collection Scriptor. Rerum Italicar. tom. ii., part ii. cap. cxxiv. p. 265, where we are told, that in the tenth century, in which the sciences were almost totally extinguished in Italy, there were thirty-two philosophers at Benevento. We learn, however, by what follows, that these philosophers were partly grammarians, and partly persons who were more or less versed in certain liberal arts.

[a] This dialogue, *de Grammatico*, is to be found in the works of Anselm, published by father Gerberon, tom. i. p. 143.

[b] Gaunilo's Treatise is to be found in the works of Anselm, with the answer of that learned prelate. ☞ As Anselm makes such a shining figure in the literary history of England, it will not be improper to add here a more ample account of his character and writings than that which is given by Dr. Mosheim. His life and manners were without reproach, though his spiritual ambition justly exposed him to censure. His works are divided into three parts. The first contains his dogmatical tracts, and begins with a discourse concerning the Existence of God, the Divine Attributes, and the Trinity. This discourse is called Monologia, because it is drawn up in the form of a soliloquy. In this first part of the works of Anselm, there are many curious researches upon subjects of a very difficult and mysterious nature, such as the fall of Satan, the Reason why God created Man, the doctrine of Original Sin, and the Manner of its Communication to Adam's Posterity, the Liberty of the Will, and the Consistency of Freedom with the Divine Prescience. The second and third parts of the writings of this eminent prelate contain his practical and devotional performances, such as Homilies, Poems, Prayers, &c. and his Letters, which are divided into four books.

[c] The titles of these three treatises are as follow: de Sophistâ de Complexionibus, de Re et Ente. The learned Heriman, in his Narratio Restaurationis Abbatiæ Sti. Martini Tornacensis, which is published in M. D'Acheri's Spicilegium Scriptor. Veter. tom. ii. p. 889, speaks of Odo in the following honourable manner: "Cum Odo septem liberalium artium esset peritus, præcipue tamen in dialecticâ eminebat, et pro ipsâ maximè clericorum frequentia eum expetebat."

that was the badge and characteristic of their sect.[a] This controversy made a prodigious noise in all the schools throughout Europe during many succeeding ages, and often produced unhappy contentions and animosities between philosophers and divines. Some are of opinion, that it derived its origin from the disputes between Berenger and his adversaries, concerning the eucharist;[b] a notion which, though it be advanced without authority, is by no means destitute of probability, since the hypothesis of the Nominalists might be very successfully employed in defending the doctrine of Berenger, concerning the sacrament of the Lord's supper.

IX. The Nominalists had for their chief a person named John, who, on account of his logical subtlety, was surnamed the Sophist, which is the only circumstance we know of his history.[c] His principal disciples were Robert of Paris, Roscelin of Compiegne, and Arnoul of Laon, who propagated his doctrine with industry and success; to whom we may add, with some probability, Raimbert, the master of a famous school at Lisle, who is said, according to the quibbling humour of the times, 'to have read *nominal* logic to his disciples, while Odo (whom we have already had occasion to mention) instructed his scholars in *reality*.[d] The most renowned of all the *nominal* philosophers of this age was Roscelin: hence many considered him as the chief and founder of that sect, and he is still regarded as such by several learned men.

CHAPTER II.

Concerning the Doctors and Ministers of the Church, and its Form of Government during this Century.

I. ALL the records of this century loudly complain of the vices that reigned among the rulers of the church, and, in general, among all the sacerdotal orders; they also deplore that universal decay of piety and discipline, which was the consequence of this corruption in a set of men, who were bound to support, by their example, their authority, and their instructions, the sacred interests of religion and virtue. The western bishops were no sooner elevated to the rank of dukes, counts, and nobles, and enriched with ample territories, than they gave themselves up entirely to the dominion of pleasure and ambition, and, wholly employed in displaying the magnificence of their temporal stations, frequented the courts of princes, accompanied always with a splendid train of attendants and domestics.[e] The inferior orders of the clergy were also licentious in their own way; few among them preserved any remains of piety and virtue, we might add, of decency and discretion. While their rulers were wallowing in luxury, and basking in the beams of worldly pomp and splendour, they were indulging themselves, without the least sense of shame, in fraudulent practices, in impure and lascivious gratifications, and even in the commission of flagitious crimes. The Grecian clergy were less chargeable with these shocking irregularities, as the calamities under which their country groaned, imposed a restraint upon their passions, and gave a check to their licentiousness. Yet, notwithstanding these salutary restraints, there were few examples of piety and virtue to be found among them.

II. The authority and lustre of the Latin church, or, to speak more properly, the power and dominion of the Roman pontiffs, rose in this century to the highest point, though they rose by degrees, and had much opposition and many difficulties to conquer. In the preceding age the pontiffs had acquired a great degree of authority in religious affairs, and in every thing that related to the government of the church; and their credit and influence increased prodigiously toward the commencement of this century. For then they received the pompous titles of 'masters of the world,' and 'popes,' i. e. universal 'fathers;' they presided also every where in the councils by their legates; assumed the authority of supreme arbiters in all controversies that arose concerning religion or church discipline; and maintained the pretended rights of the church against the encroachments and usurpations of kings and princes. Their authority, however, was confined within certain limits; for, on one hand, it was restrained by sovereign princes, that it might not arrogantly aim at civil dominion; and, on the other, it was opposed by the bishops themselves, that it might not rise to a spiritual despotism, and utterly destroy the liberty and privileges of synods and councils.[f] From the time of Leo IX. the popes employed every method which the most artful ambition could suggest, to remove these limits, and to render their dominion both despotic and universal. They not only aspired to the character of supreme legislators in the church, to an unlimited jurisdiction over all synods and councils, whether general or provincial, to the sole distribution of all ecclesiastical honours and benefices, as being divinely authorised and appointed for that purpose; but they carried their insolent pretensions so far as to give themselves out for

[a] The learned Brucker (in his Historia Critica Philosophiæ, tom. iii. p. 904,) gives an ample account of the sect of the Nominalists, and enlarges upon the nature and circumstances of this logical contest; he also mentions the various writers, who have made this sect and its doctrine the object of their researches. Among these writers, the principal was John Salabert, presbyter in the diocese of Agen, who, in 1651, published a treatise entitled Philosophia Nominalium Vindicata. This book, which is extremely rare, has been seen by none of the authors who have written professedly concerning the sect of the Nominalists. A copy of it, taken from the manuscript in the French king's library, was communicated to me, from which it appears, that Salabert, who was certainly a very acute and ingenious logician, employed his labour rather in defending the doctrine of the Nominalists, than in giving an accurate account of their sect. There are, however, several things to be found in his book, which are far from being generally known, even among the learned.

[b] Du Boulay, Histor. Acad. Paris. tom. i. p. 443.—Ger. du Bois, Histor. Ecclesiæ Paris. tom. i. 770.

[c] This account we have from the unknown author of the Fragmentum Historiæ Francicæ à Roberto Rege ad Mortem Philippi I., which is published in Du Chesne's Scriptores Historiæ Francicæ, tom. iv. His words are as follow: "In dialecticâ hi potentes extiterunt sophistæ, Johannes, qui artem sophisticam vocalem esse disseruit," &c.—Du Boulay conjectures that this John the Sophist was the same person with John of Chartres, surnamed the Deaf, who was first physician to Henry I. king of France, and had acquired a great degree of renown by his genius and erudition. The same author tells us, that John had for his master Giraldus of Orleans, who was an incomparable poet, and an excellent rhetorician; but he advances this without any proof. Mabillon, on the other hand, in his Annal. Benedict. tom. v. supposes, that John the Nominalist was the same person who made known to Anselm the error of Roscelinus concerning the Three Persons in the Godhead.

[d] The passage in the original is: "Qui dialecticam clericis suis in *voce* legebat, quam Odo in *re* discipulis legeret." See Herimannus, Histor. Restaurationis Monasterii Sti. Martini Tornacens. in D'Acheri's Spicileg. Vet. Scriptorum, vol. iii. p. 889.

[e] See among other examples of this episcopal grandeur, that of Adalbert, in Adam. Bremens. lib. iii. cap. xxiii. p. 38. lib. iv. cap. xxxv. p. 52. that of Gunther, in the Lectiones Antiquæ of Canisius, tom. iii. part i. p. 185. and that of Manasses, in the Museum Italicum of Mabillon, tom. i. p. 114. Add to all these Muratori's Antiq. Ital. medii Ævi, tom. vi. p. 72.

[f] The very learned Launoy, (in his Assertio contra Privilegium Sti. Medardi, part ii.) cap. xxxi. op. tom. ii. has given us an accurate account of the ecclesiastical laws, and of the power of the hierarchy, during this century, which he collected from the letters of pope Gregory VII.; from which account it appears, that Gregory, ambitious as he was, did not pretend to a supreme and despotic authority in the church.

lords of the universe, arbiters of the fate of kingdoms and empires, and supreme rulers over the kings and princes of the earth. Before Leo IX. no pope was so enormously impudent as to claim this unbounded authority, or to assume the power of transferring territories and provinces from their lawful possessors to new masters. This pontiff gave the example of such an amazing pretension to his *holy* successors, by granting to the Normans, who had settled in Italy, the lands and territories which they had already usurped, or were employed in forcing out of the hands of the Greeks and Saracens.[a] The ambitious views, however, of the aspiring popes were opposed by the emperors, the kings of France, by William the Conqueror, who was now seated on the throne of England, and was the boldest assertor of the rights and privileges of royalty against the high claims of the apostolic see,[b] and also by several other princes. Nor did the bishops, particularly those of France and Germany, sit tamely silent under the papal yoke; many of them endeavoured to maintain their rights and the privileges of the church; but others, seduced by the allurements of interest or the dictates of superstition, sacrificed their liberties, and yielded to the pontiffs. Hence it happened, that these imperious lords of the church, though they did not entirely gain their point, or satisfy to the full their raging ambition, yet obtained vast augmentations of power, and extended their authority from day to day.

III. The see of Rome, after the death of Sylvester II. which happened in 1003, was filled successively by John XVII., John XVIII., and Sergius IV., whose pontificates were not distinguished by any memorable events. It is, however, proper to observe, that these three popes were confirmed in the see of Rome by the approbation and authority of the emperors under whose reigns they were elected to that high dignity. Benedict VIII., who was raised to the pontificate in 1012, being obliged by his competitor Gregory to leave Rome, fled into Germany for succour, and threw himself at the feet of Henry II., by whom he was reinstated in the apostolic chair, which he possessed in peace until the year 1024. It was during his pontificate, that those Normans, who make such a shining figure in history, came into Italy, and reduced several of its richest provinces under their dominion. Benedict was succeeded by his brother John XIX. who ruled the church until the year 1033. The five pontiffs whom we have now been mentioning were not chargeable with dishonouring their high station by that licentiousness and immorality which rendered so many of their successors infamous; their lives were virtuous; at least their conduct was decent. But their examples had little effect upon Benedict IX., a most abandoned profligate, and a wretch capable of the most horrid crimes, whose flagitious conduct drew upon him the just resentment of the Romans, who in 1038, removed him from his station. He was afterwards indeed restored, by the emperor Conrad, to the papal chair; but, instead of learning circumspection and prudence from his former disgrace, he became still more scandalous in his life and manners, and so provoked the Roman people by his repeated crimes, that they deposed him a second time, in 1044, and elected in his place John, bishop of Sabina, who assumed the name of Sylvester III. About three months after this new revolution, the relatives and adherents of Benedict rose up in arms, drove Sylvester out of the city, and restored the degraded pontiff to his forfeited honours, which, however, he did not long enjoy; for, perceiving that there was no possibility of appeasing the resentment of the Romans, he sold the pontificate to John Gratian, arch-presbyter of Rome, who took the name of Gregory VI. Thus the church had, at the same time, two chiefs, Sylvester and Gregory, whose rivalry was the occasion of much trouble and confusion. This contest was terminated, in 1046, in the council holden at Sutri by the emperor Henry III., who so ordered matters, that Benedict, Gregory, and Sylvester, were declared unworthy of the pontificate, and Suidger, bishop of Bamberg, was raised to that dignity, which he enjoyed for a short time under the title of Clement II.[c]

IV. After the death of Clement II., which happened in 1047, Benedict IX., though twice degraded, aimed anew at the papal dignity, and accordingly forced himself into St. Peter's chair for the third time. But, in the following year, he was obliged to surrender the pontificate to Poppo, bishop of Brixen, known by the name of Damasus II., whom Henry II. elected pope in Germany, and sent into Italy to take possession of that dignity. On the death of Damasus, who ruled the see of Rome only three and twenty days, the same emperor, in the diet holden at Worms, in 1048, appointed Bruno, bishop of Toul, to succeed him in the pontificate. This prelate is known in the list of the popes by the name of Leo IX.; and his private virtues, as well as his public acts of zeal and piety in the government of the church, were deemed meritorious enough to entitle him to a place among the saintly order. But if we deduct from these pretended virtues his vehement zeal for augmenting the opulence and authority of the church of Rome, and his laudable severity in correcting and punishing certain enormous vices,[d] which were common among the clergy during his pontificate, there will remain little in the life and administration of this pontiff, that could give him any pretension to such a dis-

[a] See Gaufr. Malaterra, Hist. Sicula, lib. i. cap. xiv. p. 553, tom v. Scriptor. Ital. Muratori. ☞ The translator has here incorporated the note (s) of the original into the text.

[b] See Eadmeri Historia Novorum, which is published at the end of the works of Anselm, archbishop of Canterbury. It is proper to observe here, that if it is true on one hand, that William the Conqueror opposed, on many occasions, with the utmost vehemence and zeal, the growing power of the Roman pontiffs, and of the aspiring bishops, it is no less certain, on the other, that to accomplish his ambitious views, he, like many other European princes, had recourse to the influence of the pontiffs upon the minds of the multitude, and thereby nourished and encouraged the pride and ambition of the court of Rome. For, while he was preparing all things for his expedition into England, he sent embassadors to pope Alexander II. "in order, (as Matthew Paris says, Hist. Major. lib. i.) to have his undertaking approved and justified by apostolical authority; and the pope having considered the claims of the contending parties, sent a standard to William as the omen of his approaching royalty." It is highly probable, that the Normans in Italy had made the same humble request to Leo IX., and demanded his confirmation both of the possessions they had acquired, and of those which they intended to usurp. And when we consider all this, it will not appear so surprising that the popes aimed at universal empire, since they were encouraged in their views by the mean submissions and servile homage of the European princes.

[c] In this compendious account of the popes, I have followed the relations of Francis and Anthony Pagi, Papebrock, and also those of Muratori, in his Annales Italiæ, persuaded that the learned and judicious reader will justify my treating, with the utmost contempt, what Baronius and others have alleged in favour of Gregory VI.

☞ [d] In several councils which he assembled in Italy, France, and Germany, he proposed rigorous laws against simony, sodomy, incestuous and adulterous marriages, the custom of carrying arms, (which had become general among the clergy,) the apostacy of the monks, who abandoned their habit and renounced their profession, &c.

tinction. It is at least certain, that many, who industriously conceal or excuse the numerous infirmities and failings of the pontiffs, censure, with the utmost freedom, the temerity and injustice of the measures he took toward the conclusion of his days. Such, among others, was the war into which he inconsiderately entered, in 1053, with the Normans, whom he was grieved to see in the possession of Apulia. His temerity, indeed, was severely punished by the issue of this war, from which he derived the bitterest fruits, being taken prisoner by the enemy, and led captive to Benevento. Here dismal reflections upon his unhappy fate preyed upon his spirits, and threw him into a dangerous illness; so that, after a year's imprisonment, he was sent to Rome, where he concluded his days on the 19th of April, 1054.[a]

V. After the death of Leo the papal chair was filled, in 1055, by Gebhard, bishop of Eichstadt, who assumed the name of Victor II., and, after governing the church about three years, was succeeded by Stephen IX., brother to Godfrey, duke of Lorrain, who died a few months after his election. Nothing memorable happened under the administration of these two pontiffs. Gerard, bishop of Florence, who obtained the papacy in 1058, and took the name of Nicolas II., makes a greater figure in history than several of his predecessors.[b] We pass in silence John, bishop of Veletri, who usurped the pontificate, as also the title of Benedict X., after the death of Stephen, and who was deposed with ignominy, after having possessed about nine months the dignity to which he had no other title, than what he derived from lawless violence. Nicolas, on the removal of this usurper, assembled a council at Rome, in 1059, in which, among many salutary laws for healing the inveterate disorders that had afflicted the church, one remarkable decree was passed for altering the ancient form of electing the pontiff. This alteration was intended to prevent the tumults and commotions which arose in Rome, and the factions which divided Italy, when a new pope was to be elected. The same pontiff received the homage of the Normans, and solemnly created Robert Guiscard duke of Apulia, Calabria, and Sicily, on condition that he should observe, as a faithful vassal, an inviolable allegiance to the Roman church, and pay an annual tribute in acknowledgment of his subjection to the apostolic see. By what authority Nicolas confirmed the Norman prince in the possession of these provinces, is more than we know; certain it is, that he had no sort of property in the lands which he granted so liberally to the Normans, who held them already by the odious right of conquest.[c] Perhaps the lordly pontiff founded this right of cession upon the fictitious donation of Constantine, which has been already noticed in the course of this history; or, probably, seduced by the artful and ambitious suggestions of Hildebrand, who had himself an eye upon the pontificate, and afterwards filled it under the adopted name of Gregory VII., he imagined that, as Christ's vicegerent, the Roman pontiff was the king of kings, and had the whole universe for his domain. It is well known that Hildebrand had a supreme ascendency over the mind of Nicolas, and that the latter neither undertook nor executed any thing without his direction. Be that as it may, it was the feudal grant made to Guiscard by this pope, that laid the foundation of the kingdom of Naples, or of the two Sicilies, and of the sovereignty over that kingdom which the Roman pontiffs constantly claim, and which the Sicilian monarchs annually acknowledge.

VI. Before the pontificate of Nicolas II., the popes were chosen not only by the suffrages of the cardinals, but also by those of the whole Roman clergy, the nobility, the burgesses, and the assembly of the people. An election, in which such a confused and jarring multitude was concerned, could not but produce continual factions, animosities, and tumults. To prevent these, as far as was possible, this artful and provident pontiff had a law passed, by which the cardinals, as well presbyters as bishops, were empowered, on a vacancy in the see of Rome, to elect a new pope, without any prejudice to the ancient privileges of the Roman emperors in this important matter.[d] Nor were the rest of the clergy, with the burgesses and people, excluded from all participation in this election, since their consent was solemnly demanded, and also esteemed of much weight.[e] In consequence, however, of this new regulation, the cardinals acted the principal part in the creation of the new pontiff, though they suffered for a long time much opposition, both from the sacerdotal orders and the Roman citizens, who were constantly either reclaiming their ancient rights, or abusing the privilege they yet

---

[a] See the Acta Sanctorum ad d. xix. Aprilis, tom. iii. p. 642.—Histoire Literaire de la France, tom. vii. p. 459.—Giannone, Historia di Napoli, tom. ii.

[b] Beside the accounts given of Nicolas II. by the writers of the papal history, there is a particular and accurate history of this pontiff drawn up by the Benedictine monks, in the Histoire Literaire de la France, tom. vii. p. 515.

[c] See Muratori's Annali d'Italia, tom. vi. p. 186.—Baronius Annales ad anno 1060.

☞ [d] It does not appear, that Nicolas was at all solicitous about the privileges of the emperor, and his authority in the election of the bishop of Rome; for the words of the decree in all the various copies of it are to this import: "The cardinals shall first deliberate concerning the election of a pontiff, and the consent of the other clergy and of the people shall be required to confirm their choice. The pope shall be chosen out of the members that compose the church of Rome, if a proper person can be found among them: if not, he shall be elected elsewhere: all this without any prejudice to the honour of our dear son Henry, (who is now king, and shall be soon emperor, as we have already promised him,) or to the honour of his successors on whom the apostolic see shall confer personally and successively the same high privilege." Here we see the good pontiff manifestly taking advantage of the minority of Henry IV. to depreciate and diminish the ancient prerogatives of the imperial crown, and to magnify the authority of the papal mitre; for he declares, as a *personal right* granted by the Roman see to each emperor for himself, the privilege of confirming the pope's election; whereas it is well known that this privilege had been vested in the emperors of Germany during many preceding ages. See Fleury, Eccles. Hist. vol. xiii. liv. lx. It is proper to observe here, that the cringing and ignoble submission of Charles the Bald, who would not accept the title of emperor before it was conferred upon him by the pontiff, occasioned, in process of time, that absurd notion, that the papal consecration was requisite in order to qualify the kings of Germany to assume the title of Roman emperors, though, without that consecration, these kings had all Italy under their dominion, and exercised in every part of it various rights and prerogatives of sovereignty. Hence the kings of Germany were first styled kings of the Franks and Lombards, afterwards kings of the Romans until the year 1508, when Maximilian I. changed the title of *king* into that of *emperor*.

[e] The decree of Nicolas concerning the election of the pontiff is to be found in many authors, and particularly in the Concilia. But, upon comparing several copies of this famous decree, I found them in many respects very different from each other. In some copies the decree appears abridged; in others, it is long and prolix. In some it seems favourable to the rights and privileges of the emperors; in others it appears to have the contrary tendency. The most ample copy is that which we find in the Chronicon Farfense in Muratori's Script. Rerum Italicarum, tom. ii. part ii. p. 645, which differs, however, in various circumstances, from that which was published by Hugo Floriacensis, in his book de regiâ Potestate et sacerdotali Dignitate, in Baluzii Miscellaneis, tom. iv. p. 62. Notwithstanding the diversity that exists in the copies of this famous decree, they all agree in confirming the accounts we have given of the plans and pontificate of Nicolas.

retained of confirming the election of every new pope by their approbation and consent. In the following century an end was put to all these disputes by Alexander III., who was so fortunate as to complete what Nicolas had only begun, and who transferred and confined to the college of cardinals the right of electing to the apostolic see, excluding the nobility, the people, and the rest of the clergy, from all concern in this important matter.[a]

It may not be improper here to give some account of the origin of the cardinals,[b] and the nature of their privileges and functions. Many writers[c] have treated this subject in an ample manner, and have shed upon it a profusion of erudition, which deserves, no doubt, the highest applause; but they are, generally speaking, defective in perspicuity and precision; nor do I know of any, who have confined themselves to the true state of the question, and investigated, in a satisfactory manner, the origin of the office of cardinal, and the reasons that occasioned the institution of that order of ecclesiastics. Several learned men have employed much time and labour in fixing the sense of the word *cardinal*, and in illustrating its meaning from ancient monuments and records; but, however worthy of a curious philologist these researches may be, they contribute little to clear up the point in question, or to convey an accurate and satisfactory notion of the true origin of the college of cardinals, and the nature of that ecclesiastical dignity. It is certain, that the word in question, when applied to persons or things, and more especially to the sacred order, was, in the language of the middle ages, a term of dubious signification, and was susceptible of various senses. It is also well known, that, in former times, this title was by no means peculiar to the priests and ministers of the church of Rome, but was in use in all the Latin churches, and that not only the secular clergy, but also the regular, such as abbots, canons, and monks, were capable of this denomination, though in different senses. But, after the pontificate of Alexander III., the common use of the term was gradually diminished, and it was confined to such only as were immediately concerned in the election of the pope, and had the right of suffrage in this weighty matter; so that, when we inquire into the origin of the sacred college at Rome, the question is not, who they were, that in the remoter periods of the church were distinguished, among the Latins in general, or at Rome in particular, from the rest of the clergy, by the name of cardinals; nor do we inquire into the proper signification of that term, or into the various senses in which it was formerly employed. The true state of the question is this: who the persons were that Nicolas II. comprehended under that denomination, when he vested in the Roman cardinals alone the right of electing the new pontiff, and excluded from that important privilege the rest of the clergy, the nobility, the burgesses, and the people? When this is known with certainty, we shall have a just notion of the college of cardinals in its rise, and shall also perceive the difference existing between the first cardinals and those of our times. Now this may easily be learned from the edict of Nicolas II. which sets the matter in the clearest light. "We have thought proper to enact (says the pontiff,) that, on the decease of the bishop of the Roman catholic, or universal church, the affair of the election be treated principally, and previously to all other deliberations, among the *cardinal bishops* alone, who shall afterwards call in to their council the *cardinal clerks*, and require finally the consent of the rest of the clergy, and the people, to their election."[d] Here we see that the pontiff divides into two classes the persons who were to have the right of suffrage in the election of his successors. By the former we are manifestly to understand the seven prelates who belonged to the city and territory of Rome, whom Nicolas calls, in the same edict, *comprovinciales episcopi*, (an epithet which had been used before by Leo I.,) and who had been distinguished by the title of cardinal bishops long before the century of which we are treating. The words of Nicolas confirm this account of the matter, and place it beyond all possibility of contradiction; for he declares, that by cardinal bishops he understands those to whom it belonged to consecrate the pontiff elect; "Since the apostolic see," observes the papal legislator, "cannot be under the jurisdiction of any superior or metropolitan,[e] the cardinal bishops must necessarily supply the place of a metropolitan, and fix the elected pontiff on the summit of apostolic exaltation and empire."[f] Now it is well known that the seven bishops of Rome above mentioned, had the privilege of consecrating the pontiff.

All these things being duly considered, we shall immediately perceive the true nature and meaning of the famous edict, according to which it is manifest, that, upon the death of a pontiff, the cardinal bishops were first to deliberate alone with regard to a proper successor, and to examine the respective merit of the candidates who might pretend to this high dignity, and afterwards to call in the cardinal clerks, not only to demand their counsel, but also to join with them in the election. The word *clerk* here bears the same sense with that of *presbyter*, and it is undeniably certain that the name of cardinal presbyter was given to the ministers of the eight and twenty Roman parishes, or principal churches. All the rest of the clergy, of whatever order or rank they might be, were, together with the people, expressly excluded from the right of voting in the election of the pontiff, though they were allowed what is called a *negative* suffrage, and their consent was required to what the others had done; from all which it appears that the college of electors, who chose the Roman pontiff, and who after this period were

[a] See Mabillon, Comm. in Ord. Roman. tom. ii. Musei Italici, p. 114.—Constant. Cenni Præf. ad Concilium Lateran. Stephani iii. p. 18.—Franc. Pagi Breviarium Pontif. Romanor. tom. ii. p. 374.

☞ [b] The translator has here incorporated into the text the long and important note (c) of the original concerning the cardinals. The citations and references only are thrown into the notes.

[c] The authors who have written of the name, origin, and rights of the cardinals, are enumerated by Jo. Alb. Fabricius, in his Bibliogr. Antiquar. p. 455.—Casp. Sagittarius, Introd. ad Historiam Ecclesiast. cap. xxix. p. 771, et Jo. And. Schmidius in Supplement. p. 644.—Christ. Gryphius, Isagoge ad Historiam Sæculi XVII. p. 430. Add to these Ludov. Thomassini Disciplina Ecclesiæ vetus et nova, tom. i. lib. ii. cap. 115, 116, p. 616, and Lud. Ant. Muratori, whose learned dissertation, de Origine Cardinalatus, is published in his Antiq. Ital. medii Ævi, tom. v.

☞ [d] The passage of the edict (which we have here translated from Hugo Floriacus, in Baluzii Miscel. tom. iv. p. 62.) runs thus in the original: "Constituimus ut, obeunte hujus Romanæ universalis ecclesiæ pontifice, imprimis, cardinales episcopi diligentissimâ simul consideratione tractantes, mox sibi clericos cardinales adhibeant, sicque reliquus clerus et populus ad consensum novæ electionis accedant."

☞ [e] In the consecration of a new bishop in any province, the metropolitan always bore the principal part: as therefore there was no metropolitan to install the pope, cardinal bishops performed that ceremony.

[f] Such are the swelling and bombastic terms of the edict: "Quia sedes apostolica super se metropolitanum habere non potest, cardinales

called cardinals in a new and unusual acceptation of that term, consisted, according to their original establishment by Nicolas II., of only two orders, namely, cardinal bishops, and cardinal clerks or presbyters.[a]

It is necessary to observe, before we finish this digression, that the famous decree of Nicolas could not obtain the force of a law. "It is evident (says Anselm, bishop of Lucca[b]) that the edict of Nicolas is, and always has been, without the smallest degree of weight or authority. But, in affirming this, I have not the least design to cast any reflection upon the blessed memory of that pontiff, or to derogate from the applause that is due to his virtues.... As a man, however, he was fallible, and, through the weakness that is inseparable from humanity, was liable to be seduced into measures that were inconsistent with equity and justice." It is true, the prelate has here principally in view that part of the edict in which Nicholas acknowledges and confirms the right of the emperors to ratify the election of the Roman pontiff; yet what he says is undoubtedly true of the whole edict in all its parts. For the seven Palatine judges,[c] who were excluded by this decree from the important privilege they had formerly enjoyed of voting in the election to the apostolic see, complained loudly of the injury that was done them; and, seconded in their complaints by the various orders of the clergy, and by the clamours of the army, the citizens, and the multitude, they declared their opposition to the execution of this edict, and gave much trouble and uneasiness to the cardinals, who had been constituted electors by Nicolas. To appease these tumults, Alexander III. augmented the college of the electing cardinals, by conferring that dignity upon the prior, or arch-presbyter, of St. John Lateran, the arch-presbyters of St. Peter and St. Mary the Greater, the abbots of St. Paul and St. Laurence without the wall, and lastly, upon the seven Palatine judges.[d] By this dexterous stratagem, the higher order of the clergy was defeated, and ceased to oppose the measures of the cardinal electors; nor, indeed, could its opposition be of any significancy, since its chiefs and leaders were become members of the sacred college instituted by Nicolas. The inferior clergy continued yet obstinate; but their opposition was vanquished in the same manner, and they were reduced to silence by the promotion of their chiefs, the cardinal deacons, to the dignity of electors. Who it was (whether Alexander III. or some other pontiff) that raised the principal Roman deacons to the rank of cardinals, is not certain; but nothing is more evident than that the design of this promotion was to put an end to the murmurs and complaints of the inferior clergy, who highly resented the violation of their privileges.

When the various orders of the clergy were drawn off from the opposition, it was no difficult matter to silence the people, and to exclude them from all part in the election of the pontiff. And accordingly, when, upon the death of Alexander III., it was proposed to choose Lucius III.[e] as his successor, the consent and approbation of the clergy and people, which had hitherto been always esteemed necessary to ratify the election, were not even demanded, and the affair was transacted by the college of cardinals alone, who have continued to maintain that exclusive and important privilege even to our times. Some writers affirm, that Innocent II. had been elected in the same manner, by the cardinals alone, without the consent of the clergy or the people, several years before the pontificate of Lucius;[f] this may be true, but it is nothing to the purpose; for, as the election of Innocent II. was irregular, it cannot properly be alleged in the case before us

VII. From what has been observed in the preceding section, we may conclude, that the college of cardinals, and the extensive authority and important privileges they enjoy at this day, derive their origin from the edict published at the request and under the pontificate of Nicolas II.; that, under the title of cardinals, this pontiff comprehended the seven Roman bishops, who were considered as his suffragans, and of whom the bishop of Ostia was the chief, as also the eight and twenty ministers, who had inspection over the principal Roman churches: and that to these were added, in process of time, under Alexander III. and other pontiffs, new members, in order to appease the resentment of those who looked upon themselves as injured by the edict of Nicolas, and also to answer other purposes of ecclesiastical policy. We see, also from an attentive view of this matter, that though the high order of purpled prelates, commonly called cardinals, had its rise in the eleventh century, yet it does not seem to have acquired the firm and undisputed authority of a legal council before the following age, and the pontificate of Alexander III.

VIII. Though Nicolas II. had expressly acknowledged and confirmed in his edict the right of the emperor to ratify by his consent the election of the pontiff, his eyes were no sooner closed, than the Romans, at the instigation of Hildebrand, arch-deacon and afterwards bishop of Rome, violated this imperial privilege in the most presumptuous manner; for they not only elected to the pontificate Anselm, bishop of Lucca, who assumed the name of Alexander II., but also solemnly installed him in that high office without consulting the emperor Henry IV. or giving him the least information of the matter. Agnes, the mother of the young emperor, no sooner received an account of this irregular transaction from the bishops of Lombardy, to whom the election of Anselm was extremely disagreeable, than she assembled a council at

episcopi metropolitani vice procul-dubio fungantur, qui electum antistitem ad apostolici culminis apicem provehant."

[a] We must therefore take care that we be not misled by the error of Onuphr. Panvinius, who affirms,* that the cardinal bishops were not added to the college of cardinals before the pontificate of Alexander III. Nor are we to listen to the supposition of those writers, who imagine that certain deacons were, from the beginning, members of that college of cardinals by whom the popes were elected. There were, indeed, in the Roman church, long before the edict of Nicolas, (and there still remain) cardinal deacons, i. e. superintendents of those churches which have hospitals annexed to them, and whose revenues are appropriated to the support of the poor; but they were evidently excluded from the election of the pope, which, by the edict of Nicolas, was to be made by the cardinal bishops and clerks alone Hence we find the cardinals plainly distinguished from the deacons in the diploma that was drawn up for the election of Gregory VII.

[b] Anselm. Luccensis, lib. ii. contra Wibertum Antipapam et sequaces ejus, in Canisii Lection. Antiquis. tom. iii. part i. p. 383.

[c] These judges were the *Primicerius, Secundicerius, Arcarius, Saccellarius, Protoscriniarius, Primicerius Defensorum, et Adminiculator;* for a particular account of whose respective offices, services, and privileges, see Grævius, Du Cange, &c.

[d] Cenni Præf. ad Concil. Lateran. Stephan. iii. p. 19.—Mabillon, Comment. ad Ord. Roman. p. 115. ex Panvinio.

[e] In the original, instead of Lucius III., we read Victor III., which was certainly a mistake of inadvertency in the learned author.

[f] See Pagi Breviar. Pontif. Romanor. tom. ii. p. 615.

* See Mabillon, Comment. in Ord. Rom. p. 115, tom. ii. Musei Italici.

Basil, and, in order to maintain the authority of her son, who was yet a minor, caused Cadolaus, bishop of Parma, to be created pope, under the title of Honorius II. Hence arose a long and furious contest between the rival pontiffs, who maintained their respective pretensions by the force of arms, and presented a scene of bloodshed and horror in the church of Christ, which was designed to be the centre of charity and peace. In this violent contention Alexander triumphed, though he could never engage his obstinate adversary to desist from his pretensions.[a]

IX. This contest, indeed, was of little consequence when viewed in comparison with the dreadful commotions which Hildebrand, who succeeded Alexander, and assumed the name of Gregory VII., excited both in church and state, and nourished and fomented until the end of his days. This vehement pontiff, who was a Tuscan, born of mean parents, rose, by various steps, from the obscure station of a monk of Clugni, to the rank of archdeacon in the Roman church, and, from the time of Leo IX., who treated him with peculiar marks of distinction, was accustomed to govern the Roman pontiffs by his counsels, which had acquired the highest degree of influence and authority. In the year 1073, and on the same day that Alexander was interred, he was raised to the pontificate by the unanimous suffrages of the cardinals, bishops, abbots, monks, and people, without regard to the edict of Nicolas II.; and his election was confirmed by the approbation and consent of Henry IV., king of the Romans, to whom ambassadors had been sent for that purpose. This prince, indeed, had soon reason to repent of the consent he had given to an election, which became so prejudicial to his own authority and to the interests and liberties of the church, and so detrimental, in general, to the sovereignty and independence of kingdoms and empires.[b] Hildebrand was a man of uncommon genius, whose ambition in forming the most arduous projects was equalled by his dexterity in bringing them into execution. Sagacious, crafty, and intrepid, he suffered nothing to escape his penetration, defeat his stratagems, or daunt his courage: haughty and arrogant beyond all measure, obstinate, impetuous, and intractable, he looked up to the summit of universal empire with a wishful eye, and laboured up the steep ascent with uninterrupted ardour and invincible perseverance: void of all principle, and destitute of every pious and virtuous feeling, he suffered little restraint in his audacious pursuits, from the dictates of religion or the remonstrances of conscience. Such was the character of Hildebrand, and his conduct was every way suitable to it; for no sooner did he find himself in the papal chair, than he displayed to the world the most odious marks of his tyrannic ambition. Not content to enlarge the jurisdiction, and to augment the opulence of the see of Rome, he laboured indefatigably to render the universal church subject to the despotic government and the arbitrary power of the pontiff alone, to dissolve the jurisdiction which kings and emperors had hitherto exercised over the various orders of the clergy, and to exclude them from the management or distribution of the revenues of the church. The outrageous pontiff even went farther, and impiously attempted to subject to his jurisdiction the emperors, kings, and princes of the earth, and to render their dominions tributary to the see of Rome. Such were the *pious* and *apostolic* exploits that employed the activity of Gregory VII. during his whole life, and which rendered his pontificate a continual scene of tumult and bloodshed. Were it necessary to bring farther proofs of his tyranny and arrogance, his fierce impetuosity and boundless ambition, we might appeal to those famous *sentences*, which are generally called, after him, the *dictates of* Hildebrand, and which show, in a lively manner, the spirit and character of this restless pontiff.[c]

X. Under the pontificate of Hildebrand, the face of the Latin church was entirely changed, its government subverted, and the most important and valuable of those rights and privileges that had been formerly vested in its councils, bishops, and sacred colleges, were usurped by the greedy pontiff. It is, however, to be observed, that the weight of this tyrannic usurpation did not fall equally

[a] Ferdin. Ughelli Italia Sacra, tom. ii. p. 166.—Jo. Jac. Mascovius, de Rebus Imperii sub Henrico IV. et V. lib. i. p. 7.—Franc. Pagi Breviar. Pontificum Roman. t. ii. p. 385.—Muratori, An. d'Italia, t. vi. p. 214.

[b] The writers who have given the most ample accounts of the life and exploits of Gregory VII. are enumerated by Casp. Sagittarius, in his Introd. ad Hist. Ecclesiast. tom. i p. 687, and by And. Schmidius, in his Supplement, tom. ii. p. 627.—See also the Acta Sanctor. tom. v. Maii ad d. xxv. p. 568, and Mabillon, Acta Sanctor. Ordin. Benedicti, Sæcul. VI. p. 406. Add to these the Life of Gregory VII. published at Frankfort in 1710, by Just. Christopher Dithmar, as also the authors who have written the history of the contests that arose between the empire and the hierarchy of Rome, and of the wars that were occasioned by the disputes concerning investitures.

[c] *Dictatus Hildebrandini.* By these are understood twenty-seven apothegms, or short sentences, relating to the supreme authority of the Roman pontiffs over the universal church and the kingdoms of the world, which are to be found in the second book of the Epistles of Gregory VII., between the fifty-fifth and fifty-sixth Epistle, under the title of *Dictates Papæ*, i. e. Dictates of the Pope. See Harduini Concilia, tom. vi. part i. p. 1304, and the various writers of Ecclesiastical History. Baronius, Lupus,* and other historians, who have signalized, upon all occasions, their vehement attachment to the Roman pontiffs, maintain, that these Dictates were drawn up by Gregory VII. and proposed as laws in a certain council; and hence the protestant writers have ventured to attribute them to Hildebrand. But the learned John Launoy, Natalis Alexander, Antony† and Francis Pagi‡, Elias Du-Pin, and other authors of note, affirm in the most positive manner that these sentences, or dictates, were a downright forgery imposed upon the world under the name of Gregory, by some perfidious impostor, who proposed thereby to flatter the Roman pontiffs in their ambitious pretensions. As a proof of this assertion, they observe, that while some of these sentences express indeed in a lively manner the ambitious spirit of Gregory, there are others which appear entirely opposite to the sentiments of that pontiff, as they are delivered in several parts of his Epistles. The French writers have important reasons (which it is not necessary to mention here) for affirming that no Roman pontiff ever presumed to speak of the papal power and jurisdiction in such arrogant terms as are here put into the mouth of Gregory. It may be easily granted, that these sentences, in their present form, are not the composition of this famous pontiff; for many of them are obscure, and they are all thrown together without the least order, method, or connexion, and it is not to be imagined, that a man of such genius, as Gregory discovered, would have neglected either perspicuity or precision in describing the authority, and fixing what he looked upon to be the rights and privileges of the bishops of Rome. But, notwithstanding all this, if we consider the *matter* of these sentences, we shall be entirely persuaded that they belonged originally to Hildebrand, since we find the greatest part of them repeated word for word in several places in his Epistles, and since such of them as appear inconsistent with some passages in these epistles, are not so in reality, but may be easily explained in perfect conformity with what they are said to contradict. The most probable account of the matter seems to be this: that some mean author extracted these sentences, partly from the extant epistles of Gregory, partly from those that have perished in the ruins of time, and published them in the form in which they now appear, without judgment or method.

* Lupus, in his Notæ et Dissertationes in Concilia, tom. vi. op. p. 164, has given us an ample commentary on the Dictates of Hildebrand, which he looks upon as both authentic and sacred.

† See Anton. Pagi Critica in Baronium.

‡ See Franc. Pagi Breviar. Pontif. Roman. tom. ii. p. 473.

upon all the European provinces; several of these provinces preserved some remains of their ancient liberty and independence, in the possession of which a variety of circumstances happily concurred to maintain them.

But, as we insinuated above, the views of Hildebrand were not confined to the erection of an absolute and universal monarchy in the church; they aimed also at the establishment of a civil monarchy equally extensive and despotic; and this aspiring pontiff, after having drawn up a system of ecclesiastical laws for the government of the church, would have introduced also a new code of political laws, had he been permitted to execute the plan he had formed. His purpose was to engage, in the bonds of fidelity and allegiance to St. Peter, i. e. to the Roman pontiffs, all the kings and princes of the earth, and to establish at Rome an annual assembly of bishops, by whom the contests that might arise between kingdoms or sovereign states were to be decided, the rights and pretensions of princes to be examined, and the fate of nations and empires to be determined. This ambitious project met, however, with the warmest opposition, particularly from the vigilance and resolution of the emperors, and also from the British and French monarchs.[a]

That Hildebrand had formed this audacious plan is undoubtedly evident, both from his own epistles, and also from other authentic records of antiquity. The nature of the oath which he drew up for the king or emperor of the Romans, from whom he demanded a profession of subjection and allegiance,[b] shows abundantly the arrogance of his pretensions. But his conduct toward the kingdom of France is worthy of particular notice. It is well known, that whatever dignity and dominion the popes enjoyed were originally derived from the French princes; and yet Hildebrand, or (as we shall hereafter entitle him) Gregory VII. pretended that the kingdom was tributary to the see of Rome, and commanded his legates to demand yearly, in the most solemn manner, the payment of that tribute;[c] their demands, however, were treated with contempt, and the tribute was never either acknowledged or offered. Nothing can be more insolent than the language in which he addressed himself to Philip I. king of France, to whom he recommended an humble and obliging carriage, from this consideration, that both his "kingdom and his soul were under the dominion of St. Peter (i. e. his vicar the Roman pontiff,) who had the power to bind and to loose him, both in heaven and upon earth."[d] Nothing escaped his all-grasping ambition; he pretended that Saxony was a fief holden in subjection to the see of Rome, to which it had been formerly yielded by Charlemagne as a pious offering to St. Peter. He also extended his pretensions to the kingdom of Spain, maintaining in one of his letters, that it was the property of the apostolic see from the earliest times of the church, yet acknowledging in another,[f] that the transaction by which the successors of St. Peter had acquired this property, had been lost among other ancient records. His claims, however, were more respected in Spain than they had been in France; for it is proved most evidently by authentic records, that the King of Arragon, and Bernard, count of Besalu, gave a favourable answer to the demands of Gregory, and paid him regularly an annual tribute;[g] and their example was followed by other Spanish princes, as we could show, were it necessary, by a variety of arguments. The despotic views of this lordly pontiff were attended with less success in England, than in any other country. William the Conqueror was a prince of great spirit and resolution, extremely jealous of his rights, and tenacious of the prerogatives he enjoyed as a sovereign and independent monarch; and accordingly, when Gregory wrote him a letter demanding the arrears of the *Peter-pence*,[h] and at the same time summoning him to do homage for the kingdom of England, as a fief of the apostolic see, William granted the former, but refused the latter[i] with a noble obstinacy, declaring that he held his kingdom of God only, and his own sword. Obliged to yield to the obstinacy of the English monarch, whose name struck terror into the boldest hearts, the restless pontiff addressed his imperious mandates where he imagined they would be received with more facility. He wrote circular letters to the most powerful of the German princes,[k] to Geysa, king of Hungary,[l] and Swein, king of Denmark,[m] soliciting them to make a solemn grant of their kingdoms and territories to the prince of the apostles, and to hold them under the jurisdiction of his vicar at Rome, as fiefs of the apostolic see. What success attended his demands upon these princes, we cannot say; but certain it is, that in several countries his efforts

☞ [a] The long note (g) in the original, which contains the ambitious exploits of Hildebrand, is inserted in the following paragraph, except the citations, which are thrown into notes.

[b] See the ninth book of his epistles, Epist. iii. The form of the oath runs thus: "Ab hac horâ et deinceps fidelis ero per rectam fidem B. Petro Apostolo, ejusque vicario Papæ Gregorio .... et quodcunque ipse Papa præceperit sub his videlicet verbis, per veram obedientiam, fideliter, sicut oportet Christianum, observabo. Et eo die, quando eum primitus videro, fideliter per manus meas miles Sancti Petri et illius efficiar." What is this but *a formal oath of allegiance?*

[c] Epist. lib. viii. ep. xxiii. in Harduin's Concilia, tom. vi. p. 1476. "Dicendumautem est omnibus Gallis et per veram obedientiam præcipiendum, ut unaquæque domus saltem unum denarium annuatim solvat Beato Petro, si eum recognoscant patrem et pastorem suum more antiquo." Every one knows that the demand made with the form, *per veram obedientiam*, was supposed to oblige indispensably.

[d] Lib. vii. epist. xx. in Harduin's Concilia, tom. vi. p. 1468. "Maxime enitere ut B. Petrum, in cujus potestate est regnum tuum et anima tua, qui te potest in cœlo et in terrâ ligare et absolvere, tibi facias debitorem."

[e] Lib. x. ep. vii. "Regnum Hispaniæ ab antiquo proprii juris S. Petri fuisse et soli apostolicæ sedi ex æquo pertinere."

[f] Lib. x. epist. xxviii.

[g] See Peter de Marca, Histoire de Bearn, liv. iv. p. 331.

☞ [h] The impost of *Peter-pence* (so called from its being collected on the festival of *St. Peter in Vinculis*,) was an ancient tax of a penny on each house, first granted, in 725, by Ina, king of the West Saxons, for the establishment and support of an English college at Rome, and afterwards extended, in 794, by Offa, over all Mercia and East Anglia. In process of time it became a standing and general tax throughout England; and, though it was for some time applied to the support of the English college according to its original design, the popes at length found means to appropriate it to themselves. It was confirmed by the laws of Canute, Edward the Confessor, William the Conqueror, &c. and was never totally abolished till the reign of Henry VIII.

[i] The letter of William is extant in the Miscellanea of Baluzius, tom. vii. p. 127; as also in Collier's Ecclesiastical History, in the Collection of Records, at the end of the first volume, p. 743, No. 12. "Hubertus legatus tuus (says the resolute monarch to the audacious pontiff,) admonuit me, quatenus tibi et successoribus tuis fidelitatem facerem, et de pecuniâ, quam antecessores mei ad ecclesiam mittere solebant, melius cogitarem. Unum admisi, alterum non admisi. Fidelitatem facere, nolui nec volo," &c."

[k] See, in Harduin's Concilia, his famous letter (lib. ix. epist. iii.) to the bishop of Padua, exhorting him to engage Welpho, duke of Bavaria, and other German princes, to submit themselves and their dominions to the apostolic jurisdiction. "Admonere te volumus (says the pontiff) ducem Welphonem, ut fidelitatem B. Petro faciat .... Illum enim totum in gremio Beati Petri collocare desideramus, et ad ejus servitium specialiter provocare; quam voluntatem si in eo, vel etiam in aliis potentibus viris, amore B. Petri ductis, cognoveris, ut perficiant, elabora."

[l] Lib. ii. ep. lxx.

[m] Lib. ii. ep. li.

were effectual, and his *modest* proposals were received with the utmost docility and zeal. The son of Demetrius, czar of the Russians, set out for Rome, in consequence of the pontiff's letter,[a] in order to "obtain, as a gift from St. Peter, by the hands of Gregory, after professing his subjection and allegiance to the prince of the apostles," the kingdom which was to devolve to him upon the death of his father; and his *pious request* was readily granted by the officious pope, who was extremely liberal of what did not belong to him. Demetrius Sninimer, duke of Croatia and Dalmatia, was raised to the rank and prerogatives of royalty by the same pontiff in 1076, and solemnly proclaimed king by his legate at Salona, on condition that he should pay an annual tribute of two hundred pieces of gold to St. Peter at every Easter festival.[b] This bold step was injurious to the authority of the emperors of Constantinople, who, before this time, comprehended the province of Croatia within the limits of their sovereignty. The kingdom of Poland became also the object of Gregory's ambition, and a favourable occasion was offered for the execution of his iniquitous views; for, when Boleslaus II. had assassinated Stanislaus, bishop of Cracow, the pontiff not only excommunicated him with all the circumstances of infamy that he could invent, but also hurled him from his throne, dissolved the oath of allegiance which his subjects had taken, and, by an express and imperious edict, prohibited the nobles and clergy of Poland from electing a new king without the pope's consent.[c] Many other examples might be alleged of the phrenetic ambition of Gregory; but those which have been already mentioned are sufficient to excite the indignation of every impartial reader. Had the success of that pontiff been equal to the extent of his insolent views, all the kingdoms of Europe would have been at this day tributary to the Roman see, and its princes the soldiers or vassals of St. Peter, in the person of his pretended vicar upon earth. But, though his most important projects were ineffectual, many of his attempts were crowned with a favourable issue; for, from the time of his pontificate, the face of Europe underwent a considerable change, and the prerogatives of the emperors and other sovereign princes were much diminished. It was particularly under the administration of Gregory, that the emperors were deprived of the privilege of ratifying, by their consent, the election of the pope; a privilege of no small importance, which they have never recovered.

XI. The zeal and activity which Gregory employed in extending the jurisdiction of the Roman see, and enriching the patrimony of St. Peter, met, in no part of Europe, with such remarkable success as in Italy. His intimate familiarity with Matilda, the daughter of Boniface, duke of Tuscany, and the most powerful and opulent princess in that country, (who found by experience that neither ambition nor grace had extinguished the tender passions in the heart of Gregory,) contributed much to this success; for he engaged that princess, after the death of her husband Godfrey, duke of Lorrain, and her mother Beatrix, which happened in the years 1076 and 1077, to settle all her possessions in Italy and elsewhere upon the church of Rome, and thus to appoint St. Peter and his pretended vicar the heirs of her immense treasures. This rich donation was, indeed, considerably invalidated by the second marriage, which Matilda contracted, in 1089, with Welph, or Guelph, the son of the Duke of Bavaria, not without the consent of pope Urban II. She, however, renewed it in a solemn manner in 1102, about seven years after her separation from her second husband, by which she became again sole mistress of her vast possessions.[d] But, notwithstanding this new act, the popes did not remain in the peaceful possession of this splendid inheritance. It was warmly and powerfully disputed, first by the emperor Henry V., and afterwards by several other princes; nor were the pontiffs so successful in this contest as to preserve the whole inheritance, though, after various struggles and efforts, they remained in the possession of a considerable part of it, which they still enjoy.[e]

XII. The plan that Gregory had formed for raising the church above all human authority, to a state of perfect supremacy and independence, had many kinds of opposition to encounter, but none more difficult to surmount than that which arose from the two reigning vices of concubi-

---

[a] Lib. ii. ep. lxxiv.

[b] See Du Mont. Corps Diplomatique, tom. i. n. 88, p. 53.—Jo. Lucius, de Regno Dalmatiæ, lib. ii. p. 85.

[c] Dlugossi Histor. Polon. tom. i. p. 295.

[d] The life and exploits of this heroic princess (who was one of the strongest bulwarks of the Roman church against the power of the emperors, and the most tender and obedient of all the *spiritual* daughters of Gregory VII.) have been written by Bened. Luchinus, Domin. Mellinus, Felix Contelorius, and Julius de Puteo, but more amply by Francis Maria of Florence, in his Records concerning the Countess Matilda, written in Italian, and Bened. Bacchinius, in his Historia Monasterii Podalironensis. The famous Leibnitz, in his Scriptores Brunsvic. tom. i. p. 629, and Lud. Ant. Muratori, in his Scriptores Rerum Italic. tom. v. p. 335, have published, with annotations, the ancient histories of the life of Matilda, composed by Donizo, and another writer, whose name is unknown, together with the copy of the second act of cession by which that princess confirmed her former grant to the church of Rome. We may add here, that nothing relating to this extraordinary woman is more worthy of perusal, than the accounts that we find of her and her second husband, in the Origines Guelphicæ, t. i. lib. iii. cap. v. et t. ii. lib. vi.

[e] Many learned men conclude from the very act by which this donation was confirmed to the see of Rome, that Matilda comprehended in the gift only her allodial possessions, and not the territories which she held as the fiefs of the empire, such as the marquisate of Tuscany, and the duchy of Spoleto. For the words of the act run thus: "Ego Mathildis .... dedi et obtuli ecclesiæ S. Petri .... omnia mea bona jure proprietario, tam quæ tunc habueram, quam ea quæ in antea acquisitura eram, sive jure successionis, sive alio quocunque jure ad me pertineant." See the Origines Guelphicæ, tom. i. lib. iii. p. 448. But it is much to be questioned, whether this distinction is so evident as is pretended; for the words *jure proprietario*, from which it is inferred that Matilda disposed of only her *allodial* possessions in favour of St. Peter, do not, in my opinion, relate to the possessions of the testatrix, but to the nature of the gift, and must be interpreted in conjunction with the preceding verbs, "dedi et obtuli." The princess does not say, "dedi omnia bona quæ jure proprietario possideo et habeo," i. e. "I have granted that part of my property which I hold by a supreme and independent right," in which case the opinion of the learned men above mentioned would be well founded; but she says, "dedi omnia bona mea ecclesiæ jure proprietario," i. e. "my will is, that the church shall possess as its own property the inheritance I have left to it." Besides, the following words manifestly show, that the opinion of these learned men is destitute of all foundation, since Matilda would not have added, "sive jure successionis, sive alio quocunque jure ad me pertineant," i. e. "I grant all my possessions, under whatever title I enjoy them, whether by right of succession, or by any other right," &c. had she intended to confine her donation to her allodial possessions. Certain it is, that in this ample grant she excepts no part of her property, but evidently comprehends in it her whole substance. If it be objected to this, that the pontiffs never affirmed that the fiefs of the empire, which Matilda possessed, were comprehended in this grant to their church, and that they only claimed her allodial and independent possessions, I answer, by questioning the fact, since many circumstances concur to prove, that they claimed the whole substance of Matilda, all her possessions without exception, as their undoubted right. But suppose for a moment that the case was otherwise, and that the Roman church had never made such an universal claim, this would, by no means, invalidate the opinion I here maintain, since the question under consideration is not, how far the pontiffs may have moderated their pretensions to the territories of Matilda, but what is the true and genuine sense of the words in which her donation is expressed.

nage and simony, that had infected the whole body of the European clergy. The pontiffs, from the time of Stephen IX., had combated with zeal and vehemence those monstrous vices,[a] but without success, as they had become too inveterate and too general to be extirpated without the greatest difficulty and the most extraordinary efforts. Accordingly Gregory, in the year 1074, which was the second of his pontificate, exerted himself with much more vigour than his predecessors had done in opposition to the vices already mentioned. For this purpose he assembled a council at Rome, in which all the laws of the former pontiffs against simony were renewed and confirmed, and the purchase or sale of ecclesiastical benefices prohibited in the strictest and severest manner. It was also decreed in the same council, that the sacerdotal order should abstain from marriage, and that such priests as already had wives or concubines, should immediately dismiss them, or quit their office. These decrees were accompanied with circular letters, written by the pontiff to all the European bishops, enjoining the strictest obedience to the decisions of this solemn council, under the severest penalties. Gregory did not stop here, but sent ambassadors into Germany to Henry VI., king of the Romans, in order to engage that prince to summon a council for the trial and punishment of such ecclesiastics as had been guilty of simoniacal practices.

XIII. These decrees, which were in part equitable and just, and which were, in every respect, conformable with the notions of religion that prevailed in this age, were looked upon by the people as highly salutary, since they rendered a free election, and not a mercenary purchase, the way to ecclesiastical promotion, and obliged the priests to abstain from marriage, which was absurdly considered as inconsistent with the sanctity of their office. Yet both these decrees were attended with the most deplorable tumults and dissensions, and were fruitful, in their consequences, of innumerable calamities. No sooner was the law concerning the celibacy of the clergy published, than the priests, in the several provinces of Europe, who lived in the bonds of marriage with lawful wives, or of lasciviousness with hired concubines,[b] complained loudly of the severity of this council, and excited dreadful tumults in the greatest part of the European provinces. Many of these ecclesiastics, especially the Milanese priests, chose rather to abandon their spiritual dignities than their sensual pleasures, and to quit their benefices that they might cleave to their wives. They went still farther: for they separated themselves entirely from the church of Rome, and branded with the infamous name of *Paterini*,[c] i. e. Manichæans, the pontiff and his adherents, who condemned so unjustly the conduct of such priests as entered into the bonds of a lawful and virtuous wedlock. The proceedings

[a] *Monstrous vices* we may justly call them; for, though it be true, that, in the methods Gregory took to extirpate these vices, he violated not only the laws of religion, but also the dictates of natural equity and justice, and, under the mask of a pious zeal, committed the most abominable enormities, yet it is certain, on the other hand, that these vices produced the most unhappy effects both in church and state, and that the suppression of them had now become absolutely necessary. There were, indeed, among the clergy several men of piety and virtue, who lived in the bonds of wedlock, and these Gregory ought to have spared. But there is no doubt that a prodigious number of ecclesiastics throughout Europe, not only of priests and canons, but also of monks, lived in the bonds of a criminal love; kept, under the title of wives, mistresses whom they dismissed, at pleasure, to enjoy the sweets of a licentious variety; and not only spent, in the most profuse and scandalous manner, the revenues and treasures of the churches and convents to which they belonged, but even distributed a great part of them among their bastards. As to the vice of simony, its general extent and its pernicious fruits appear evidently from those records which the Benedictine monks have published in several parts of their Gallia Christiana, not to mention a multitude of other ancient papers to the same purpose. One or two examples will be sufficient to give the reader an idea of this matter. We find in the first volume of the admirable work now mentioned, (in the Append. Document. p. 5,) a public act by which Bernard, a viscount, and Froterius bishop of Albi, grant, or rather sell, openly to Bernard Aimard and his son, the bishopric of Albi, reserving to themselves a considerable part of its revenues. This act is followed by another, in which count Pontius bequeaths to his wife the same bishopric of Albi in the following terms: "Ego Pontius dono tibi dilectæ sponsæ meæ episcopatum Albiensem—cum ipsâ ecclesiâ et cum omni adjacentiâ suâ—et medietatem de episcopatu Nemauso,—et medietatem de abbatiâ Sti. Ægidii—post obitum tuum remaneat ipsius alodis ad infantes qui de me erunt creati."—In the second volume of the same learned work, (in the Append. p. 173.) there is a letter of the clergy of Limoges, beseeching William, count of Aquitaine, not to sell the bishopric, but to give them a pastor, and not a devourer of the flock. "Rogamus tuam pietatem, ne propter mundale lucrum vendas Sti. Stepani locum, quia, si tu vendis episcopalia, ipse nostra manducabit communia.—Mitte nobis ovium custodem, non devoratorem." Ademar, viscount of Limoges, laments (tom. ii. p. 179,) that "he himself had formerly made traffic of the cure of souls by selling benefices to simoniacal abbots." The barefaced impudence of the sacerdotal orders, in buying and selling benefices, exceeded all measure, and almost all credibility; and they carried matters so far as to vindicate that abominable traffic, as may be seen in a remarkable passage in the Apologeticum of Abbo, which is added by Pithou to the Codex Can. Ecclesiæ Romanæ; this passage, which deserves to be quoted, is as follows: "Nihil pene ad ecclesiam pertinere videtur, quod ad pretium non largiatur, scilicet episcopatus, presbyteratus, diaconatus, et aliqui minores gradus, archidiaconatus quoque, decania, præpositura, thesauri custodia, baptisterium—et hujusmodi negotiatores subdolâ responsione solent astruere, non se emere benedictionem, quâ percipitur gratia spiritus sancti, sed res ecclesiarum vel possessiones episcopi." An acute distinction truly!

[b] All the historians who give an account of this century mention the tumults excited by such priests as were resolved to continue with their wives or concubines. For an account of the seditions which arose in Germany, upon this occasion, see Sigonius de Regno Italiæ, lib. ix. p. 557. tom. ii. as also Tengnagel's Collectio Veter. Monument. p. 45, 47, 54. Those which the priests excited in England, are mentioned by M. Paris, in his Hist. Maj. lib. i. The tumults occasioned by the same reason in the Belgic and Gallic provinces, are described in the Epistola Clericorum Cameracensium ad Remenses pro Uxoribus suis, published in Mabillon's Annal. Benedictin. tom. v. p. 634; and in the Epistola Noviomagensium Clericorum ad Cameracenses, published in Mabillon's Museum Italicum, tom. i. p. 128. Great was the flame which the laws of Gregory excited in Italy, and particularly in the province of Milan, of which we have an ample relation, given by Arnulph and Landulph, two Milanese historians, whose works were published with annotations by Muratori, in his Scriptores Rerum Italicarum, tom. iv. p. 36. Both these historians maintain, against Gregory and his successors, the cause of the injured priests, and the lawfulness of their marriages.

[c] *Paterinus* is one of the names by which the Paulicians or Manichæans (who came during this century from Bulgaria into Italy, and were also known by the title of *Cathari*, or *Pure*) were distinguished among the Italians. But, in process of time, the term *Paterinus* became a common name for all kinds of heretics, as we might show by many examples taken from the writers of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. There are various opinions concerning the origin of this word, the most probable of which is that which supposes it derived from a certain place called *Pataria*, in which the heretics held their assemblies; and it is well known, that a part of the city of Milan is, to this very day, called *Patara*, or *Contrada de Patari*. See Annotat. ad Arnulphum Mediolanensem in Muratori's Scriptores Rerum Italicar. tom. iv. p. 39; see also Saxius ad Sigonium de Regno Italiæ, lib. ix. p. 536. An opinion (of which, if I err not, Sigonius was the author) prevailed, that the name in question was given to the Milanese priests who separated from the church of Rome, and retained their wives in opposition to the laws of the pontiffs. But this opinion is without foundation; and it appears evidently from the testimony of Arnulph and other historians, that not the married priests, but the faction of the pontiffs, who condemned their conjugal bonds, were branded with the opprobrious name of *Paterini*. See Arnulph. lib. iii. c. x.—Anton. Pagi, Crit. in Ann. Bar. tom. iii. ad an. 1057, s. iii. Lud. Ant. Muratori Antiq. Ital. medii Ævi, t. v. p. 82, who have demonstrated this in the most ample, learned, and satisfactory manner. Nor need we, indeed, look any where else for the origin of this word. It is abundantly known, that the Manichæans, and their brethren the Paulicians, were extremely averse to marriage, which they looked upon as an institution invented by the evil principle: they, in consequence, who considered the marriages of the clergy as lawful, employed the ignominious name of *Paterini*, to show that the pontiffs, who prohibited these marriages, were followers of the odious doctrine of the Manichæans.

of Gregory appeared to the wiser part, even of those who approved the celibacy of the clergy, unjust and criminal in two respects: first, because his severity fell indiscriminately, and with equal fury, upon the virtuous husband and the licentious rake; and he dissolved, with a merciless hand, the chastest bonds of wedlock, and thus involved husbands and wives, with their tender offspring, in disgrace, perplexity, anguish, and want.[a] The second thing criminal in the measures taken by this pontiff was, that, instead of chastising the married priests with wisdom and moderation, and according to the laws of the ecclesiastical discipline, whose nature is wholly spiritual, he gave them over to the civil magistrate, to be punished as disobedient and unworthy subjects, with the loss of their substance, and with the most shocking marks of undeserved infamy and disgrace.[b]

XIV. This vehement contest excited great tumults and divisions, which, however, were gradually calmed by length of time, and also by the perseverance of the obstinate pontiff; nor did any of the European kings and princes concern themselves so much about the marriages of the clergy as to maintain their cause, and thereby to prolong the controversy. But the troubles which arose from the law that regarded the extirpation of simony were not so easily appeased; the tumults it occasioned became greater from day to day; the methods of reconciliation more difficult; and it involved both the church and state during several years in the deepest calamities, and in the most complicated scenes of confusion and distress.[c] Henry IV. received indeed graciously the legates of Gregory, and applauded his zeal for the extirpation of simony; but neither this prince, nor the German bishops, would permit these legates to assemble in council in Germany, or to proceed judicially against those who, in time past, had been chargeable with simoniacal practices. The pontiff, exasperated at this restraint in the execution of his designs, called another council to meet at Rome, in 1075, in which he pursued his adventurous project with greater impetuosity and vehemence than ever; for he not only excluded from the communion of the church several German and Italian bishops, and certain favourites of Henry, of whose counsels that prince was said to make use in the traffic of ecclesiastical dignities, but also pronounced, in a formal edict, an "Anathema against whoever received the investiture of a bishopric or abbacy from the hands of a layman, as also against those by whom the investiture should be performed."[d] This decree alarmed the emperors, kings, and princes of Europe, who, in consequence of a prevailing custom, had the right of conferring the more important ecclesiastical dignities, and the government of monasteries and convents, of which they disposed in a solemn manner by the well known ceremony of the ring, and the staff or crosier; which they presented to the candidate on whom their choice fell. This solemn investiture was the main support of that power of creating bishops and abbots, which the European princes claimed as their undoubted right, and the occasion of that corrupt commerce called simony, in consequence of which, ecclesiastical promotion was sold to the highest bidder; and hence arose the zeal and ardour of Gregory for the annulment of these investitures, that he might extirpate simony on the one hand, and diminish the power of princes in ecclesiastical matters on the other.

A short digression concerning Investitures.[e]

IT will not be improper to illustrate the custom now mentioned of investing bishops and abbots in their respective dignities by the ceremony of the ring and crosier, since this custom has been ill understood by some, and imperfectly explained by others. Even the learned cardinal Norris appears highly defective here; for though, in his History of Investitures,[f] there are some pertinent hints and remarks upon the reasons which engaged Gregory to prohibit investitures altogether, yet that learned prelate does not seem to have had a complete notion of this important matter, since he omits in his history certain points

[a] We must always remember that the priests, to whom their wives or mistresses were much dearer than the laws of the pontiffs, were not all of the same character; nor were such of them as might be justly deemed criminal, all criminal in the same degree. The better sort of these ecclesiastics (among which we may count the Belgic and Milanese clergy) desired nothing more than to live after the manner of the Greeks, maintaining that it was lawful for a priest, before his consecration, to marry one virgin, though a plurality of wives had been justly prohibited; and they grounded this their opinion upon the authority of St. Ambrose. See Jo. Petri Puricelli Dissertatio utrum S. Ambrosius Clero suo Mediolan, permiserit, ut Virgini semel nubere possent, republished by Muratori, in his Scriptores Italic. tom. iv. p. 123. Gregory and his successors ought to have dealt more gently with this kind of ecclesiastics (as the warmest admirers of the pontiffs acknowledge) than with those priests who were either the patrons of concubinage, or who pretended to justify their espousing of a plurality of wives. It was also unjust to treat, in the same manner, the monks, who, by the nature of their profession and vows, were necessarily excluded from the nuptial state; and the priests, who could not bear the thoughts of being torn from the chaste partners of their beds, whom they had espoused with virtuous sentiments and upright intentions, or from the tender offspring which were the fruit of virtuous love.

[b] Theodorici Verdunensis Epistola ad Gregorium VII. in Martenne's Thesaur. Anecdotorum, tom. i. p. 218.—"Faciem meam in eo vel maxime confusione perfundunt, quod legem de clericorum incontinentia per laicorum insanias cohibenda unquam susceperim—Nec putetis eos qui ita sentiunt....ecclesiasticorum graduum incontinentiam talibus defensionibus fovere velle. Honestam conversationem in desiderio habent, nec aliter, quam oportet, ecclesiasticæ ultionis censuram intentari gaudent."

[c] We have extant a great number both of ancient and modern writers, who have related the circumstances of this dispute concerning investitures, which was begun by Gregory VII., was carried on by him and his successors on the one side, and the emperors Henry IV. and V. on the other, and became a source of innumerable calamities to the greatest part of Europe. But few or none of these writers have treated this weighty subject with an entire impartiality. They all pleaded either the cause of the pontiffs, or that of the emperors, and decided the controversy, not by the laws then in being, (which ought, no doubt, to be principally consulted,) or by the opinions that generally prevailed at the time of this contest, but by laws of their own invention, and by the opinions of modern times. The famous Gretser, in his Apologia pro Gregorio VII. (which is published in the sixth volume of his works, and also separately,) has collected the principal of the ancient writers who maintained the cause of the pontiff: in opposition to whom, they who defended the cause of Henry IV. are collected by Melchior Goldastus, in his Replicatio contra Gretserum et Apologia pro Henrico IV., Hanov. 1611, 4to. Among the modern writers who have treated this subject, we may reckon the Centuriatores Magdeburgenses, Baronius, the German and Italian historians, and those who have written the life of the famous Matilda. But, besides these, it will be highly proper to consult Jo. Schilterus, de Libertate Ecclesiæ Germanicæ, lib. iv. p. 481.—Christ. Thomasius, Historia Contentionis inter Imperium et Sacerdotium—Hen. Meibomius, Lib. de Jure Investituræ Episcopalis, tom. iii. Scriptorum Rer. Germanic.—Just. Chris. Dithmarus, Historia Belli inter Imperium et Sacerdotium, and, above all, the famous cardinal Norris, who far surpasses in point of erudition those whom we have mentioned, and whose Istoria delle Investiture delle Dignita Ecclesiastiche, which was published at Mantua, after his death, in 1741, is a most learned work, though it be imperfect and probably maimed, and also extremely partial in favour of the pontiffs; which is not surprising from the pen of a cardinal. See also Jo. Jac. Mascovii Commentarii de Rebus Imperii Germanici sub Henrico IV. et V.

[d] Ant. Pagi Critica in Baronium, tom. iii. ad an. 1075—Hen. Norris, Hist. Investiturarum, p. 39.—Christ. Lupus, Scholia et Dissertation. ad Concilia, tom. vi. op. p. 39—44.

[e] Here the translator has placed the note (r) of the original in the text, under the form of a dissertation.

[f] Chap. iii. p. 56.

that are necessary to the proper knowledge of it. The investiture of bishops and abbots commenced, undoubtedly, at that period when the European emperors, kings, and princes, made grants to the clergy of certain territories, lands, forests, castles, &c. According to the laws of those times, (laws which still remain in force,) no persons were deemed as lawful possessors of the lands or tenements which they derived from the emperors or other princes, before they repaired to court, took the oath of allegiance to their respective sovereigns, as the supreme proprietors, and received from their hands a solemn mark, indicating a transfer of the property of their respective grants. Such was the manner in which the nobility, and those who had distinguished themselves by military exploits were confirmed in the possessions which they owed to the liberality of their sovereigns. But the custom of investing the bishops and abbots with the ring and the crosier, which are the ensigns of the sacred function, is of a much more recent date, and was then first introduced, when the European emperors and princes, annulling the elections that were made in the church according to the ecclesiastical laws which had been from the earliest times established for that purpose, assumed to themselves the power of conferring, on whom they pleased, the bishoprics and abbeys that became vacant in their dominions, and even of selling them to the highest bidder. This power, then, being once usurped by the kings and princes of Europe, they at first confirmed the bishops and abbots in their dignities and possessions, with the same forms and ceremonies that were used in investing the counts, knights, and others, with their feudal tenures, even by written contracts, and the ceremony of presenting them with a wand or bough.[a] And this custom of investing the clergy and the laity with the same ceremonies would have undoubtedly continued, had not the clergy, to whom the right of electing bishops and abbots originally belonged, artfully eluded the usurpation of the emperors and other princes by the following stratagem. When a bishop or abbot died, they who looked upon themselves as authorized to fill up the vacancy, elected immediately some one of their order in the place of the deceased, and were careful to have him consecrated without delay. The consecration being thus performed, the prince, who had proposed to himself the profit of selling the vacant benefice, or the pleasure of conferring it upon one of his favourites, was obliged to desist from his purpose, and to consent to the election, which the ceremony of consecration rendered irrevocable. Many examples of the success of this stratagem, which was practised both in chapters and monasteries, and which disappointed the liberality or avarice of several princes, might here be alleged; they abound in the records of the tenth century, to which we refer the curious reader. No sooner did the emperors and princes perceive this artful management, than they turned their attention to the most proper means of rendering it ineffectual, and of preserving the valuable privilege they had usurped. For this purpose they ordered, that, as soon as a bishop expired, his ring and crosier should be transmitted to the prince, to whose jurisdiction his diocese was subject; for it was by the solemn delivery of the ring and crosier of the deceased to the new bishop that his election was irrevocably confirmed, and this ceremony was an essential part of his consecration; so that, when these two badges of the episcopal dignity were in the hands of the sovereign, the clergy could not consecrate the person whom their suffrages had appointed to fill the vacancy. Thus their stratagem was defeated, as every election that was not confirmed by the ceremony of consecration might be lawfully annulled and rejected; nor was the bishop qualified to exercise any of the episcopal functions before the performance of that important ceremony. As soon, therefore, as a bishop drew his last breath, the magistrate of the city in which he had resided, or the governor of the province, seized his ring and crosier, and sent them to court.[b] The emperor or prince conferred the vacant see upon the person whom he had chosen, by delivering to him these two badges of the episcopal office; after which the new bishop, thus invested by his sovereign, repaired to his metropolitan, to whom it belonged to perform the ceremony of consecration, and delivered to him the ring and crosier which he had received from his prince, that he might receive them again from his hands, and be thus doubly confirmed in his sacred function. It appears, therefore, from this account, that each new bishop and abbot received twice the ring and the crosier; once from the hands of the sovereign, and once from those of the metropolitan bishop, by whom they were consecrated.[c]

It is very uncertain by what prince this custom was originally introduced. If we may believe Adam of Bremen,[d] this privilege was exercised by Louis the Debonnaire, who, in the ninth century, granted to the new bishops the use and possession of the episcopal revenues, and confirmed this grant by the ceremony now under consideration. But the accuracy of this historian is liable to suspicion; and it is probable that he attributed to the transactions of ancient times the same form that accompanied similar transactions in the eleventh century, in which he lived; for it is certain that, in the ninth century, the greatest part of the European princes made no op-

[a] This appears from a passage in cardinal Humbert's third book, adversus Simoniacos, which was composed before Gregory had set on foot the dispute concerning investitures, and which is published in Martenne's Thesaur. Aneed. tom. v. p. 787. The passage is as follows: "Potestas secularis primo ambitiosis ecclesiasticarum dignitatum vel possessionum cupidis favebat prece, dein minis, deinceps verbis concessivis; in quibus omnibus cernens sibi contradictorem neminem, nec qui moveret pennam, vel aperiret os et ganniret, ad majora progreditur, et jam sub nomine investituræ dare primo tabellas vel qualescumque porrigere virgulas, dein baculos. -Quod maximum nefas sic inolevit ut id solum canonicum credatur, nec quæ sit ecclesiastica regula sciatur aut attendatur."

[b] We see this fact confirmed in the following passage in Ebbo's Life of Otho, bishop of Bamberg, lib. i. sect. 8, 9, in Actis Sanctor. mensis Julii, tom. i. p. 426. "Nec multo post annulus cum virgâ pastorali Bremensis episcopi ad aulam regiam translata est. Eo siquidem tempore ecclesia liberam electionem non habebat. . . . sed cum quilibet antistes viam universæ carnis ingressus fuisset, mox capitanei civitatis illius annulum et virgam pastoralem ad Palatium transmittebant, sicque regiâ auctoritate, communicato cum aulicis consilio, orbatæ plebi idoneum constituebat præsulem . . . . Post paucos vero dies rursum annulus et virga pastoralis Babenbergensis episcopi domino imperatori transmissa est: quo audito, multi nobiles—ad aulam regiam confluebant, qui alteram harum prece vel pretio sibi comparare tentabant."

[c] This appears from a variety of ancient records. See particularly Humbert, lib. iii. *contra Simoniacos*, cap. vi. in Martenne's Thesaur Anecdot. tom. v. p. 779, in which we find the following passage: "Sic encœniatus (i. e. the bishop invested by the emperor) violentus invadit clerum, plebem er ordinem prius dominaturus, quam ab eis cognoscatur, quæratur, aut petatur. Sic metropolitanum aggreditur, non ab eo judicandus, sed ipsum judicaturus.—Quid enim sibi jam pertinet aut prodest baculum et annulum, quos portat, reddere? Numquid quia à laicâ personâ dati sunt? Cur redditur quod habetur, nisi ut aut denuo res ecclesiastica sub hac specie jussionis vel donationis vendatur, aut certe ut præsumptio laicæ ordinationis pallietur colore et velamento quodam disciplinæ clericalis?

[d] In his Historia Ecclesiastica, lib. i. cap. xxxii. p. 10, xxxix. p. 12, published among the Scriptores Septentrionales of Lindenbrogius.

position to the right of electing the bishops, which was both claimed and exercised by the clergy and the people; and consequently, there was then no occasion for the investiture mentioned by Adam of Bremen.[a] We therefore choose to adopt the supposition of cardinal Humbert,[b] who places the commencement of the custom now under consideration in the reign of Otho the Great; for, though this opinion has not the approbation of Louis Thomassin and Natalis Alexander, yet these learned men, in their deep researches into the origin of investitures,[c] have advanced nothing sufficient to prove it erroneous. We learn also from Humbert,[d] that the emperor Henry III., the son of Conrad II. was desirous of abrogating these investitures, though a variety of circumstances concurred to prevent the execution of his design; but he represents Henry I., king of France, in a different point of light, as a turbulent prince, who turned all things into confusion, and indulged himself beyond all measure in simoniacal practices; and he therefore loads him with the bitterest invectives.

In this method of creating bishops and abbots, by presenting to them the ring and crosier, there were two things that gave particular offence to the Roman pontiffs. One was, that by this the ancient right of election was totally changed, and the power of choosing the rulers of the church was usurped by the emperors and other sovereign princes, and was confined to them alone. This indeed was the most plausible reason of complaint, when we consider the religious notions of those times, which were by no means favourable to the conduct of the emperors in this affair. Another circumstance that grievously distressed the pretended vicars of St. Peter, was, to see the ring and crosier, the venerable badges of spiritual authority and distinction, delivered to the bishop elect by the profane hands of unsanctified laymen; an abuse which they looked upon as little better than sacrilege. Humbert, who, as we previously stated, wrote his book against simony before the contest between the emperor and Gregory had commenced, complains[e] heavily of this supposed profanation, and shudders to think, that the *staff* which denotes the ghostly shepherd, and the *ring* which seals the mysteries of heaven,[f] deposited in the bosoms of the episcopal order, should be polluted by the unhallowed touch of a civil magistrate; and that emperors and princes, by presenting them to their favourites, should thereby usurp the prerogatives of the church, and exercise the pastoral authority and power. This complaint was entirely consistent, as we have already observed, with the opinions of the times in which it was made; for, as the ring and crosier were generally esteemed the marks and badges of pastoral power and spiritual authority, so he who conferred these sacred badges was supposed to confer and communicate with them the spiritual authority of which they were the emblems.

All these things being duly considered, we shall immediately perceive what it was that rendered Gregory VII. so averse to the pretensions of the emperors, and so zealous in depriving them of the privilege they had assumed of investing the bishops with the ceremony of the ring and crosier. In the first council which he assembled at Rome, he made no attempt, indeed, against investitures, nor did he aim at any thing farther than the abolition of simony, and the restoration of the sacerdotal and monastic orders to their ancient right of electing their respective bishops and abbots. But, when he afterwards found that the affair of investiture was inseparably connected with the pretensions of the emperors, who seemed to consider it as empowering them to dispose of the higher ecclesiastical dignities and benefices, he was persuaded that simony could not be extirpated as long as investitures were in being: and, therefore, to pluck up the evil by the root, he opposed the latter custom with the utmost vehemence. All this shows the true rise of the war that was carried on between the pontiff and the emperor with such bitterness and fury.

And to understand still more clearly the merits of this cause, it will be proper to observe, that it was not investiture, generally considered, that Gregory opposed with such keenness and obstinacy, but that particular species which prevailed at this time. He did not pretend to hinder the bishops from swearing allegiance to kings and emperors, or even from becoming their *vassals;* and so far was he from prohibiting that kind of investiture which was performed by a verbal declaration or by a written deed, that, on the contrary, he allowed the kings of England and France to invest in this manner, and probably consented to the use of the sceptre in this ceremony, as did also after him Calixtus II. But he could not bear the ceremony of investiture that was performed with the ensigns of the sacerdotal order, much less could he endure the performance of the ceremony before the solemn rite of consecration; but what rendered *investitures* most odious to this pontiff was their destroying entirely the free elections of bishops and abbots. It is now time to resume the thread of our history.

XV. The severe law that had been enacted against investitures, by the influence and authority of Gregory, made very little impression upon Henry. He acknowledged, indeed, that in exposing ecclesiastical benefices to sale, he had acted improperly, and he promised amendment in that respect; but he remained inflexible against all attempts that were made to persuade him to resign his power of creating bishops and abbots, and the right of investiture, which was intimately connected with this important privilege. Had the emperor been seconded by the German princes, he might have maintained this refusal with dignity and success; but this was far from being the case; a considerable number of these princes, and among others the states of Saxony, were the secret or declared enemies of Henry; and this furnished Gregory with an

[a] Add to this the refutation of Adam of Bremen, by Daniel Papebroch, in the Acta Sanctorum, tom. i. Febr. p. 557.

[b] Humbert, lib. iii. contra Simoniacos, cap. vii. p. 780. and cap. xi. p. 787.

[c] See Ludov. Thomassini Disciplina Eccles. circa Benef. tom. ii. lib. ii. p. 431; and Natal. Alexander, Select. Histor. Eccles. Capit. Sæc. XI. XII. Diss. iv. p. 725.

[d] Lib. iii. cap. vii.

[e] See Humbert, lib. iii. contra Simoniac. cap. vi. p. 779, 795. His words are, "Quid ad laicas pertinet personas sacramenta ecclesiastica et pontificalem seu pastoralem gratiam distribuere, camyros scilicet baculos et annulos, quibus præcipue perficitur, militat et innititur tota episcopalis consecratio? Equidem in camyris baculis—designatur, quæ eis committitur cura pastoralis.—Porro annulus signaculum secretorum cœlestium indicat, prædicatores, ut secretam Dei sapientiam eum apostolo dissignent. Quicunque ergo his duobus aliquem initiant, procul-dubio omnem pastoralem auctoritatem hoc præsumendo sibi vendicant."

[f] Humbert mistook the spiritual signification of this holy ring, which was the emblem of a nuptial bond between the bishop and his see.

opportunity of extending his authority, and executing his ambitious projects. This was by no means neglected; the imperious pontiff took occasion, from the discords that divided the empire, to insult and depress its chief; he sent, by his legates, an insolent message to the emperor at Goslar, ordering him to repair immediately to Rome, and clear himself, before the council that would be assembled there, of the various crimes that were laid to his charge. The emperor, whose high spirit could not brook such arrogant treatment, was filled with the warmest indignation at the view of that insolent mandate; and, in the vehemence of his just resentment, convoked without delay a council of the German bishops at Worms. In that assembly, Gregory was charged with several flagitious practices, and deposed from the pontificate, of which he was declared unworthy; and orders were given for the election of a new pontiff. Gregory opposed violence to violence; for no sooner had he received, by the letters and ambassadors of Henry, an account of the sentence that had been pronounced against him, than, in a fit of vindictive phrensy, he thundered his anathemas at the head of that prince, excluded him both from the communion of the church and from the throne of his ancestors, and impiously dissolved the oath of allegiance which his subjects had taken to him as their lawful sovereign. Thus war was declared on both sides; and the civil and ecclesiastical powers were divided into two great factions, of which one maintained the rights of the emperor, while the other seconded the ambitious views of the pontiff. No terms are sufficient to express the complicated scenes of misery that arose from this deplorable schism.

XVI. At the entrance upon this war, the Suabian chiefs, with duke Rodolph at their head, revolted from Henry; and the Saxon princes, whose former quarrels with the emperor had been lately terminated by their defeat and submission,[a] followed their example. These united powers, being solicited by the pope to elect a new emperor, if Henry should persist in his disobedience to the orders of the church, met at Tribur in 1076, to take counsel together concerning a matter of such high importance. The result of the deliberation was far from being favourable to the emperor; for they agreed, that the determination of the controversy between him and them should be referred to the pope, who was to be invited for that purpose to a congress at Augsburg in the following year, and that, in the mean time, Henry should be suspended from his royal dignity, and live in the obscurity of a private station; to which rigorous conditions they also added, that he was to forfeit his kingdom, if, within the space of a year, he should not be restored to the bosom of the church, and delivered from the anathema that lay upon his head. When things were come to this desperate extremity, and the faction, which was formed against this unfortunate prince, grew more formidable from day to day, his friends advised him to go into Italy, and implore in person the clemency of the pontiff. The emperor yielded to this ignominious counsel, without, however, obtaining from his voyage the advantages he expected. He passed the Alps, amidst the rigour of a severe winter, and arrived, in February, 1077, at the fortress of Canusium, where the *sanctimonious* pontiff resided at that time with the young Matilda, countess of Tuscany, the most powerful patroness of the church, and the most tender and affectionate of all the spiritual daughters of Gregory. Here the suppliant prince, unmindful of his dignity, stood, during three days, in the open air at the entrance of this fortress, with his feet bare, his head uncovered, and with no other raiment than a wretched piece of coarse woollen cloth thrown over his body to cover his nakedness. On the fourth day, he was admitted to the presence of the lordly pontiff, who with difficulty granted him the absolution he demanded; but, as to his political restoration, he refused to determine that point before the approaching congress, at which he made Henry promise to appear, forbidding him, at the same time, to assume, during this interval, the title of king, or to wear the ornaments or exercise the functions of royalty. This opprobrious convention justly excited the indignation of the princes and bishops of Italy, who threatened Henry with all sorts of evils, on account of his base and pusillanimous conduct, and would undoubtedly have deposed him, had not he allayed their resentment by violating the convention into which he had been forced to enter with the imperious pontiff, and resuming the title and other marks of royalty which he had been obliged to relinquish. On the other hand, the confederate princes of Suabia and Saxony were no sooner informed of this unexpected change in the conduct of Henry, than they assembled at Forcheim in March, 1077, and unanimously elected Rodolph, duke of Suabia, emperor in his place.[b]

XVII. This rash step kindled a terrible flame in Germany and Italy, and involved, for a long time, those unhappy lands in the calamities of war. In Italy, the Normans, who were masters of the lower parts of that country, and the armies of the powerful and valiant Matilda, maintained successfully the cause of Gregory against the Lombards, who espoused the interests of Henry; while this unfortunate prince, with all the forces he could assemble, carried on the war in Germany against Rodolph and the confederate princes. Gregory, considering the events of war as extremely doubtful, was at first afraid to declare for either side, and therefore observed, during a certain time, an appearance of neutrality; but encouraged by the battle of Fladenheim, in which Henry was defeated by the Saxons, in 1080, he excommunicated anew that vanquished prince, and, sending a crown to the victor Rodolph, declared him lawful king of the Germans. The injured emperor did not suffer this new insult to pass unpunished. Seconded by the suffrages of several of the Italian and German bishops, he deposed Gregory a second time in a council which met at Mentz, and, in a synod that was soon after assembled at Brixen, in the province of Tirol, he raised to the pontificate Guibert, archbishop of Ravenna, who assumed the title of Clement III., when he was consecrated at Rome, in 1084, four years after his election.

XVIII. This election was soon followed by an occurrence which gave an advantageous turn to the affairs of

☞ [a] This same Rodolph had, the year before this revolt, vanquished the Saxons, and obliged them to submit to the emperor. Beside the Suabian and Saxon chiefs, the dukes of Bavaria and Carinthia, the bishops of Wurtzburg and Worms, and several other eminent personages, were concerned in this revolt.

[b] The ancient and moderm writers of Italian and German history have given ample relations of all these events, though not all with the same fidelity and accuracy. In the brief account I have given of the events, I have followed the genuine sources, and those writers whose testimonies are the most respectable and sure, such as Sigonius, Pagi, Muratori, Mascovius, Norris, &c. who, though they differ in some minute circumstances, yet agree in those matters which are of the most importance.

Henry: this event was a bloody battle fought upon the banks of the river Elster, where Rodolph received a mortal wound, of which he died at Mersburg. The emperor, freed from this formidable enemy, marched into Italy, in the following year (1081,) with a design to crush Gregory and his adherents, whose defeat he imagined would contribute effectually to put an end to the troubles in Germany. Accordingly he made several campaigns, with various success, against the valiant troops of Matilda; and, after having raised twice the siege of Rome, he resumed with alacrity that bold enterprise, and became, in 1084, master of the greatest part of that city. His first step after this success was to place Guibert in the papal chair: he then received the imperial crown from the hands of the new pontiff, was saluted emperor by the Roman people, and laid close siege to the castle of St. Angelo, whither his determined enemy, Gregory, had fled for safety. He was, however, forced to raise this siege by the valour of Robert Guiscard, duke of Apulia and Calabria, who brought Gregory in triumph to Rome; but, not thinking him safe there, conducted him afterwards to Salernum. Here the famous pontiff ended his days in the succeeding year, and left Europe involved in those calamities which were the fatal effects of his boundless ambition. He was certainly a man of extensive abilities, endowed with a most enterprising genius, and an invincible firmness of mind; but it must, at the same time, be acknowledged, that he was the most arrogant and audacious pontiff that had hitherto filled the papal chair. The Roman church worships him as a saint, though it is certain that he was never placed in that order by a regular canonization. Paul V., about the beginning of the seventeenth century, appointed the twenty-fifth day of May, as a festival sacred to the memory of this pretended saint;[a] but the emperors of Germany, the kings of France, and other European princes, have always opposed the celebration of this festival, and have thus effectually prevented its becoming universal. In our times, the zeal of Benedict XIII. to secure to Gregory the saintly honours, occasioned a contest, the result of which was by no means favourable to his superstitious views.[b]

XIX. The death of Gregory neither restored peace to the church, nor tranquillity to the state; the tumults and divisions which he had excited still continued, and they were augmented from day to day by the same passions to which they owed their origin. Clement III., who was the emperor's pontiff,[c] was master of the city of Rome, and was acknowledged as pope by a great part of Italy. Henry carried on the war in Germany against the confederate princes. The faction of Gregory, supported by the Normans, chose for his successor, in 1086, Dideric, abbot of Mount-Cassin, who adopted the title of Victor III., and was consecrated in the church of St. Peter, in 1087, when that part of the city was recovered by the Normans from the dominion of Clement. But this new pontiff was of a character quite opposite to that of Gregory; he was modest and timorous, and also of a mild and gentle disposition; and finding the papal chair beset with factions, and the city of Rome under the dominion of his competitor, he retired to his monastery, where he soon after ended his days in peace. But, before his abdication, he held a council at Benevento, where he confirmed and renewed the laws that Gregory had enacted for the abolition of investitures.

XX. Otho, monk of Clugni, and bishop of Ostia, was, by Victor's recommendation, chosen to succeed him. This new pontiff was elected at Terracina, in 1088, and assumed the name of Urban II. Inferior to Gregory in fortitude and resolution, he was, however, his equal in arrogance and pride, and surpassed him greatly in temerity and imprudence.[d] The commencement of his pontificate had a fair aspect, and success seemed to smile upon his undertakings; but on the emperor's return into Italy, in 1090, the face of affairs was totally changed; victory crowned the arms of that prince, who, by redoubled efforts of valour, at length defeated Guelph, duke of Bavaria, and the famous Matilda, who were the formidable heads of the papal faction. The abominable treachery of his son Conrad, who, yielding to the seduction of his father's enemies, revolted against him, and, by the advice and assistance of Urban and Matilda, usurped the kingdom of Italy, revived the drooping spirits of that faction, who hoped to see the laurels of the emperor blasted by this odious and unnatural rebellion. The consequences, however, of this event were less mischievous to Henry, than his enemies expected. In the mean time the troubles of Italy still continued; nor could Urban, with all his efforts, reduce Rome under his lordly yoke. Finding all his ambitious measures disconcerted, he assembled a council at Placentia, in 1095, where he confirmed the laws and the anathemas of Gregory; and afterwards undertook a journey into France, where he held the famous council of Clermont, and had the pleasure of kindling a new war against the infidel possessors of the holy land. In this council, instead of endeavouring to terminate the tumults and desolations that the dispute concerning *investitures* had already produced, this unworthy pontiff added fuel to the flame, and so exasperated matters by his imprudent and arrogant proceedings, as to render an accommodation between the contending parties more difficult than ever. Gregory, notwithstanding his insolence and ambition, had never carried matters so far as to forbid the bishops and the rest of the clergy to take the oath of allegiance to their respective sovereigns. This rebellious prohibition was reserved for the audacious arrogance of Urban, who published it as a law in the council of Clermont.[e] After this *noble* expedition, the restless pontiff returned into Italy, where he made himself master of the castle of St. Angelo, and soon after ended his days, in 1099; he was not long survived by his antagonist Cle-

[a] See the Acta Sanctor. Antwerp. ad d. xxv. Maii, and Mabillon, Acta Sanct. Ord. Benedict. Sæc. VI. part ii.

[b] The reader will find an ample and curious account of this matter in a French book published in Holland, in 1743, under the following title: L'Avocat du Diable, ou Memoires Historiques et Critiques sur la Vie et sur la Legende du Pape Gregoire VII.

[c] This pontiff died in 1100, as appears evidently from the Chronicon Beneventanum, published by Muratori, in his Antiq. Ital. tom. i. p. 262. See also Rubei Historia Ravennat. lib. v. p. 307.

[d] We find in the Posthumous Works of Mabillon, tom. iii. the Life of Urban II. composed by Theod. Ruinart, with much learning and industry, but with too little impartiality and fidelity, as we may naturally suppose even from the name of its author, since it is known that no monkish writer durst attempt to paint the pontiffs in their true colours.—See also, for an account of Urban, the Hist. Lit. de la France, tom. viii. p. 514.

[e] To the fifteenth canon of this council the following words were added "Ne episcopus vel sacerdos regi vel alicui laico in manibus ligiam fidelitatem faciat," i. e. "It is enacted, that no bishop or priest shall promise upon oath liege obedience to any king or any layman." They are entirely in an error, who affirm that Gregory prohibited the bishops from taking oaths of allegiance to their respective sovereigns, as cardinal Norris has sufficiently demonstrated in his Istoria delle Investiture, chap. x. p. 279.

ment III. who died in the following year, and thus left Raynier (a Benedictine monk, who was chosen successor to Urban, and assumed the name of Pascal II.) sole possessor of the papal chair at the conclusion of this century.

XXI. Among the eastern monks in this century, there happened nothing worthy of being consigned to the records of history, while those of the west were concerned immediately in transactions of great consequence, and which deserve the attention of the curious reader. The western monks were remarkable for their attachment to the Roman pontiffs. This connexion had been long formed, and it was originally occasioned by the avarice and violence of both bishops and princes, who, under various pretexts, were constantly encroaching upon the possessions of the monks, and thus obliged them to seek for security against these invasions of their property in the protection of the popes. This protection was readily granted by the pontiffs, who seized, with avidity, every occasion of enlarging their authority; and the monks, in return, engaged themselves to pay an annual tribute to their ghostly patrons. But in this century things were carried still farther; and the pontiffs (more especially Gregory VII. who was eagerly bent upon humbling the bishops, and transferring their privileges to the Roman see,) enlarged their jurisdiction over the monks at the expense of the episcopal order. They advised and exhorted the monks to withdraw themselves and their possessions from the jurisdiction of the bishops, and to place both under the inspection and dominion of St. Peter.[a] Hence, from the time of Gregory, the number of monasteries that had received immunities, both from the temporal authority of the sovereign, and the spiritual jurisdiction of the bishops, increased beyond measure throughout Europe; and the rights of princes, together with the interests and privileges of the episcopal order, were violated and trampled upon, or rather engrossed, to swell the growing despotism of the all-grasping pontiffs.[b]

XXII. All the writers of this age complain of the ignorance, licentiousness, frauds, debaucheries, dissensions, and enormities, that dishonoured the greatest part of the monastic orders, not to mention the numerous marks of their profligacy and impiety that have been handed down to our times.[c] However astonished we may be at such gross irregularities among a set of men whose destination was so sacred, and whose profession was so austere, we shall still be more surprised to learn that this degenerate order, far from losing aught of their influence and credit on account of their licentiousness, were promoted, on the contrary, to the highest ecclesiastical dignities, and beheld their opulence and authority increasing from day to day. Our surprise, indeed, will be diminished, when we consider the gross ignorance and superstition, and the unbounded licentiousness and corruption of manners, that reigned in this century among all ranks and orders of men.[d] Ignorance and corruption pervert the taste and judgment even of those who are not void of natural sagacity, and often prevent their being shocked at the greatest inconsistencies. Amidst this general depravation of sentiment and conduct, amidst the flagitious crimes that were daily perpetrated, not only by the laity, but also by the various orders of the clergy, both secular and regular, all such as respected the common rules of decency, or preserved in their external demeanour the least appearance of piety and virtue, were looked upon as saints of the highest rank, and considered as the peculiar favourites of heaven. This circumstance was, no doubt, favourable to many of the monks who were less profligate than the rest of their order, and might contribute more or less to support the credit of the whole body. Besides, it often happened, that princes, dukes, knights, and generals, whose days had been consumed in debauchery and crimes, and distinguished by nothing but the violent exploits of unbridled lust, cruelty, and avarice, felt at the approach of old age, or death, the inexpressible anguish of a wounded conscience, and the gloomy apprehensions and terrors it excites. In this dreadful condition, what was their resource? What were the means by which they hoped to disarm the uplifted hand of divine justice, and render the governor of the world propitious? They purchased, at an enormous price, the prayers of the monks to screen them from judgment, and devoted to God and to the saints a large portion of the fruits of their rapine, or entered into the monastic order, and bequeathed their possessions to their new brethren. And thus it was that monkery perpetually received new accessions of opulence and credit.

XXIII. The monks of Clugni in France surpassed all the other religious orders in the renown they had acquired, from a prevailing opinion of their eminent sanctity and virtue. Hence their discipline was universally respected, and hence also their rules were adopted by the founders of new monasteries, and the reformers of those that were in a state of decline. These famous monks arose, by degrees, to the highest summit of worldly prosperity, by the presents which they received from all quarters; and their power and credit grew, with their opulence, to such a height, that, toward the conclusion of this century, they were formed into a separate society, which still subsists, under the title of the Order, or Congregation of Clugni.[e] And no sooner were they thus established, than they extended their spiritual dominion on all sides, reducing, under their jurisdiction, all the monasteries which they had reformed by their counsels. The famous Hugo, sixth abbot of Clugni, who was in high credit at the court of Rome, and had acquired the peculiar protection and esteem

[a] A specimen of this may be seen in the seventh Epistle of Gregory, in which he reduces the monks of Redon under the jurisdiction of the Roman see, by a mandate conceived in terms that had never been used before his time: see Martenne's Thesaur. Anecdot. tom. i. p. 204. We may add to this, several similar mandates of Urban II. and the succeeding pontiffs, which are to be found in the collection now cited, and in others of that kind.

[b] There is not, perhaps, in Germany, a single instance of this pernicious *immunity* before the time of Gregory VII.

[c] See Jo. Launoi, Assert. in Privileg. S. Medardi, cap. xxvi. sect. vi. op. t. iii. part II. p. 499; and Simon, Bibl. Critique, t. iii. cap. xxxii. p. 331.

[d] For an account of the astonishing corruption of this age, see Blondel, de Formulâ, regnante Christo, p. 14.—Boulainvilliers, de l'Origine et des Droits de la Noblesse, in Molet's Memoires de Literature et d'Histoire, tom. ix. part i. p. 63. The corruption and violence that reigned with impunity in this horrid age, gave occasion to the institutions of chivalry or knighthood, in consequence of which, a certain set of equestrian heroes undertook the defence of the poor and feeble, and particularly of the fair sex, against the insults of powerful oppressors and ravishers. This order of knights errant certainly became very useful in these miserable times, when the majesty of laws and government had fallen into contempt, and when they who bore the titles of sovereigns and magistrates, had neither resolution nor power to maintain their authority, or to perform the duties of their stations.

[e] For a particular account of the rapid and monstrous strides which the order of Clugni made to opulence and dominion, see Steph. Baluze, Miscellan. tom. v. p. 343, and tom. vi. p. 426, as also Mabillon, Annal. Benedict. tom. v. *passim.*

of several princes, laboured with such success, in extending the power and jurisdiction of his order, that, before the end of this century, he saw himself at the head of five-and-thirty of the principal monasteries in France, beside a considerable number of smaller convents that acknowledged him as their chief. Many other religious societies, though they refused to enter into this new order, and continued to choose their respective governors, yet showed such respect for the abbot of Clugni, or the Arch-Abbot, as he styled himself, that they regarded him as their spiritual chief.[c] This enormous augmentation of opulence and authority was, however, fruitful of many evils; it increased the arrogance of these aspiring monks, and contributed much to the propagation of the several vices that dishonoured the religious societies of this licentious and superstitious age. The monks of Clugni soon degenerated from their primitive sanctity, and were distinguished by nothing but the peculiarities of their discipline, from the rest of the monastic orders.

XXIV. The example of these monks excited several pious men to erect particular monastic fraternities, or congregations, like that of Clugni, the consequence of which was, that the Benedictine order, which had been hitherto one great and compact body, was now divided into separate societies, which, though they were subject to one general rule, differed from each other in various circumstances, both of their dicipline and manner of living, and rendered their division still more conspicuous by reciprocal exertions of animosity and hatred. In 1023, Romuald, an Italian fanatic, retired to Camaldoli,[b] on the mount Apennine, and, in that solitary retreat, founded the order, or Congregation of the Camaldolites, which still remains in a flourishing state, particularly in Italy. His followers were distinguished into two classes, the Cœnobites and the Eremites. Both observed a severe discipline; but the Cœnobites gradually degenerated from their primitive austerity.[c] Some time after this, Gualbert, a native of Florence, founded at Val-Ombroso, amidst the Apennines, a congregation of Benedictine monks, who quickly propagated their discipline in several parts of Italy.[d] To these two Italian monasteries we may add that of Hirsauge in Germany,[e] erected by William, an eminent abbot, who had reformed many ancient convents, and was the founder of several new establishments. It is, however, to be observed, that this monastery was rather a branch of the congregation of Clugni, whose laws and manner of living it had adopted, than a new fraternity.

XXV. Toward the conclusion of this century,[f] Robert, abbot of Molesme in Burgundy, having in vain employed his most zealous efforts to revive the decaying piety and discipline of his convent, and to oblige his monks to observe, with greater exactness, the rule of St. Benedict, retired, with about twenty monks, who had not been infected with the dissolute turn of their brethren, to Citeaux, in the diocese of Chalons. In this retreat, which was at that time a miserable desert, covered on all sides with brambles and thorns, but which bears, at present, a quite different aspect, Robert laid the foundations of the famous order, or, Congregation of Cistertians, which, like that of Clugni, made a most rapid and astonishing progress, was propagated through the greatest part of Europe in the following century, and was not only enriched with the most liberal and splendid donations, but also acquired the form and privileges of a spiritual republic, and exercised a sort of dominion over all the monastic orders.[g] The great and fundamental law of this new fraternity, was the rule of St. Benedict, which was to be solemnly and rigorously observed; to this were added several other institutions and injunctions, which were designed to maintain the authority of this rule, to ensure its observance, and to defend it against the dangerous effects of opulence, and those restless efforts of human corruption which render the best establishments imperfect. These injunctions were excessively austere, and grievous to nature, but pious and laudable in the esteem of a superstitious age. They did not, however, secure the sanctity of this holy congregation; for the seductive charms of opulence, that corrupted the monks of Clugni much sooner than was expected, produced the same effect among the Cistertians, whose zeal in the rigorous observance of their rule began gradually to diminish, and who, in process of time, became as negligent and dissolute as the rest of the Benedictines.[h]

XXVI. Beside these convents, that were founded upon the principles, and might be considered as branches of the Benedictine order, several other monastic societies were formed, which were distinguished by peculiar laws, and by rules of discipline and obedience, which they had drawn up for themselves. To many of those gloomy and fanatical monks, whose austerity was rather the fruit of a bad habit of body, than the result of a religious principle, the rule of Benedict appeared too mild; to others it seemed incomplete and defective, and not sufficiently accommodated to the exercise of the various duties we owe to the Supreme Being. Hence, Stephen, a nobleman of Auvergne (who is called by some Stephen de Muret, from the place where he first erected the convent of his order,) obtained from Gregory VII., in 1073, the privilege of instituting a new species of monastic discipline. His first design was to subject his fraternity to the rule of St. Benedict; but he changed his intention, and composed a code which was to be their rule of life, piety, and manners. In his laws there were many injunctions, that showed the excessive

[a] Mabillon, Præf. Acta SS. Ord. Bened. Sæc. V.—Hist. Gen. de Bourgogne par les Moines Benedictins, t. i. p. 151, Paris, 1739.—Hist. Liter. de la France, t. ix. p. 470. [b] Otherwise called Campo-Malduli.

[c] The writers, who have given any satisfactory accounts of the order of the Camaldolites, are enumerated by Jo. Alb. Fabricius in his Bibliotheca Lat. medii Ævi, tom. i. p. 895.—Add to these Romualdi Vita, in Actis Sanctor. Februar. tom. ii. p. 101, and in Mabillon's Act. Sanctor. Ord. Bened. Sæc. VI. part i p. 247.—Helyot, Hist. des Ordres, tom. v. p. 236.—Mabillon, Annal. Ord. Bened. tom. v. p. 261.—Magnoaldi Zeigelbauer, Centifolium Camaldulense, sive Notitia Scriptor. Camaldulensium, published at Venice in 1750.

[d] See the life of Gualbert in Mabillon's Acta Sanctor. Ord. Bened. Sæc. VI. part ii. p. 273. See also Helyot's Hist. des Ordres, tom. v. p. 298. Many interesting circumstances relating to the history of this order have been published by the learned Lami, in the Deliciæ Eruditorum, tom. ii. where the ancient laws of the order are enumerated.

[e] See Mabillon, part ii. p. 716.—Helyot, tom. v. p. 332.

[f] In the year 1098.

☞ [g] In about a hundred years after its first establishment, this order boasted of 1800 abbeys, and had become so powerful, that it governed almost all Europe, both in spirituals and temporals.

[h] The principal historian of the Cistertian order, is Ang. Manriques, whose Annales Cistertienses (an ample and learned work) were published in four volumes folio, at Lyons, in the year 1642. After him we may place Pierre le Nain, whose Essai de l'Histoire de l'Ordre des Citeaux, was printed in the year 1696, at Paris, in nine volumes in 8vo. The other historians, who have given accounts of this famous order, are enumerated by Fabricius, in his Biblioth. Latina medii Ævi, tom. i. p. 1066. Add to these Helyot's Hist. des Ordres, tom. v. p. 341. and Mabillon, who, in the fifth and sixth volumes of his Annales Benedictini, has given a learned and accurate account of the origin and progress of the Cistertians.

austerity of their author. Poverty and obedience were the two great points which he inculcated with the warmest zeal, and all his regulations were directed to promote and secure them in this new establishment. For this purpose it was solemnly enacted that the monks should possess no lands beyond the limits of their convent; that the use of flesh should be allowed to none, not even to the sick and infirm; and that none should be permitted to keep cattle, that they might not be exposed to the temptation of violating their frugal regimen. To these severe precepts many others of equal rigour were added; for this gloomy legislator imposed upon his fraternity the solemn observance of a profound and uninterrupted silence, and insisted so much upon the importance and necessity of solitude, that none but a few persons of the highest eminence and authority were permitted to pass the threshold of his monastery. He prohibited all intercourse with the female sex, and, indeed, excluded his order from all the comforts and enjoyments of life. His followers were divided into two classes, one of which comprehended the *clerks*, and the other what he called the *converted brethren*. The former were totally absorbed in the contemplation of divine things, while the latter were charged with the care and administration of whatever related to the concerns and necessities of the present life. Such were the principal circumstances of the new institution founded by Stephen, which arose to the highest pitch of renown in this and the following century, and was regarded with the most profound veneration as long as its laws and discipline were observed: but two things contributed to its decline, and at length brought on its ruin; the first was, the violent contest which arose between the clerks and the converts, on account of the pre-eminence which the latter pretended over the former; and the second was, the gradual diminution of the rigour and austerity of Stephen's rule, which was softened and mitigated from time to time, both by the heads of the order and by the pontiffs. This once famous monastic society was distinguished by the title of the Order of Grandmontains, as Muret, where they were first established, was situated near Grammont, in the province of Limoges.[a]

XXVII. In the year 1084,[b] was instituted the famous order of Carthusians, so called from Chartreux, a dismal and wild spot of ground near Grenoble, surrounded with barren mountains and craggy rocks. The founder of this monastic society, which surpassed all the rest in the extravagant austerity of its manners and discipline, was Bruno, a native of Cologne, and canon of the cathedral of Rheims. This zealous ecclesiastic, who had neither power to reform, nor patience to bear, the dissolute manners of his archbishop Manasse, retired from his church with six of his companions, and, having obtained the permission of Hugh, bishop of Grenoble, fixed his residence in the miserable desert already mentioned.[c] He at first adopted the rule of St. Benedict, to which he added a considerable number of severe and rigorous precepts; his successors however, went still farther, and imposed upon the Carthusians new laws, much more intolerable than those of their founder,—laws which inculcated the highest degrees of austerity that the most gloomy imagination could invent.[d] Yet it may be affirmed, (and the fact is remarkable,) that no monastic society degenerated so little from the severity of its primitive institution and discipline as this of the Carthusians. The progress of the order was indeed less rapid and its influence less extensive in the different countries of Europe, than the progress and influence of those monastic establishments, whose laws were less rigorous, and whose manners were less austere. It was a long time before the tender sex could be engaged to submit to the savage rules of this melancholy institution; nor had the Carthusian order ever reason to boast of a multitude of females subjected to its jurisdiction; it was too forbidding to captivate a sex which, though susceptible of the seductions of enthusiasm, is of a frame too delicate to support the severities of a rigorous self-denial.[e]

XXVIII. Toward the conclusion of this century,[f] the order of St. Antony of Vienne, in Dauphine, was instituted for the relief and support of such as were seized with grievous disorders, and particularly with the disease called St. Antony's fire. All who were infected with that pestilential disorder repaired to a cell built near Vienne by the Benedictine monks of Grammont, in which the body of St. Antony was said to repose, that, by the prayers and intercessions of this eminent saint, they might be miraculously healed. Gaston, an opulent nobleman, and his son Guerin, pretended to have experienced, in their complete

[a] The origin of this order is related by Bernard Guidon, whose treatise on that subject is published in the Bibliotheca Manuscriptorum Phil. Labbei, tom. ii. p. 275. For an account of the history of this celebrated society, see Mabillon, Annal. Bened. tom. v. p. 65, s. p. 99; tom. vi. p. 116; and Præf. ad Acta SS. Ord. Bened. Sæc. VI. part ii. 340; Helyot, tom. vii. p. 409.—Gallia Christ. Monachor. Bened. tom. ii. p. 645.—Baluzii, Vitæ Pontif. Avenionens. tom. i. p. 158. et Miscellanea, tom. vii. p. 486.—☞The life and spiritual exploits of the founder of this order, are recorded in the Acta Sanctorum, tom. ii. Febr.

[b] Some place the institution of this order in 1080, and others in 1086.

[c] The learned Fabricius mentions, in his Bibl. Lat. medii Ævi, tom. ii. p. 784, several writers who have composed the history of Bruno and his order; but his enumeration is incomplete, since there are yet extant many histories of the Carthusians, that have escaped his notice. See Innocent. Massoni Annales Carthus. published in 1687;—Petri Orlandi Chronicon Carthusianum, and the elegant, though imperfect history of the order in question, which is to be found in Helyot's Hist. des Ordres, tom. vii. Many important illustrations of the nature and laws of this famous society have been published by Mabillon, in his Annales Benedict. tom. vi. and a particular and accurate account of Bruno has been given by the Benedictine monks in their Hist. Liter. de la France, tom. ix. It was a current report in ancient times, that the occasion of his retreat was the miraculous restoration of a certain priest to life, who, during the performance of the funeral service, raised himself up and said, "By the just judgment of God I am damned," and then expired anew. This story is looked upon as fabulous by the most respectable writers, even of the Romish church, especially since it has been refuted by Launoy, in his treatise de Causâ Secessus Brunonis in Desertum. Nor does it seem to preserve its credit among the Carthusians, who are more interested than others in this pretended miracle. Such of them, at least, as affirm it, do it with a good deal of modesty and diffidence. The arguments on both sides are candidly and accurately enumerated by Cæs. Egasse du Boulay, in his Histor. Academ. Paris. tom. i. p. 467.

[d] See Mabillon, Præf. ad Sæc. VI. part ii. Actor. SS. Ord. Bened.

[e] The Carthusian nuns have not sufficiently attracted the attention of the authors who have written of this famous order; and several writers have even gone so far as to maintain, that there was not in this order a single convent of nuns. This notion, however, is highly erroneous, as there were formerly several convents of Carthusian virgins, of which, indeed, the greatest part have not subsisted to our times. In the year 1368, an extraordinary law was enacted, by which the establishment of any more female Carthusian convents was expressly prohibited. Hence there remain only five at this day; four in France, and one at Bruges in Flanders. See the Varietés Historiques, Physiques, et Literaires, tom. i. p. 80, published in 1752. Certain it is, that the rigorous discipline of the Carthusians is quite inconsistent with the delicacy and tenderness of the female sex; and, therefore, in the few female convents of this order that still subsist, the austerity of that discipline has been diminished, as well from necessity as from humanity and wisdom; it was more particularly found necessary to abrogate those severe injunctions of *silence* and *solitude*, that are so little adapted to the known character and genius of the sex.

[f] In the year 1095.

recovery, the marvellous efficacy of the saint's intercession, and, in consequence thereof, devoted themselves and their possessions, from a principle of pious gratitude, to his service, and to the performance of generous and charitable offices toward all such as were afflicted with the miseries of poverty and sickness. Their example was followed, at first, only by eight persons; their community, however, was afterwards considerably augmented. They were not bound by particular vows like the other monastic orders, but were consecrated, in general, to the service of God, and lived under the jurisdiction of the monks of Grammont. In process of time, growing opulent and powerful by the multitude of pious donations which they received from all parts, they withdrew themselves from the dominion of the Benedictines, propagated their order in various countries, and at length obtained, in 1297, from Boniface VIII. the dignity and privileges of an independent congregation, under the rule of St. Augustin.[a]

XXIX. The licentiousness and corruption which had infected all the other ranks and orders of the clergy, were also remarkable among the canons, who composed a middle sort of order between the monks and secular priests, and whose first establishment was in the eighth century. In certain provinces of Europe, the canons were corrupt in a very high degree, and surpassed, in the profligacy of their manners, all the other ecclesiastical and monastic orders. Hence several pious and virtuous persons exerted their zeal for the reformation of this degenerate body; some pontiffs appeared in this good cause, and more especially Nicolas II., who, in a council holden at Rome, in 1059, abrogated the ancient rule of the canons, which had been drawn up at Aix-la-Chapelle, and substituted another in its place.[b] These laudable attempts were attended with considerable success; and a much better rule of discipline was established in almost all the canonical orders, than that which had been formerly in use. It was not, however, possible to regulate them all upon the same footing, and to subject them to the same degree of reformation and discipline; nor indeed was this necessary. Accordingly, a certain number of these canonical colleges were erected into communities, the respective members of which had one common dwelling, and a common table, which was the point chiefly insisted upon by the pontiffs, as this alone was sufficient to prevent the canons from entering into the bonds of matrimony. It did not, however, exclude them from the possession or enjoyment of private property; for they reserved to themselves the right of appropriating the fruits and revenues of their benefices, and of employing them as they thought expedient. Other canonical congregations subjected themselves to a rule of life less agreeable and commodious, in consequence of the zealous exhortations of Ivo, bishop of Chartres, renouncing all their worldly possessions and prospects, all private property, and living in a manner that resembled the austerity of the monastic orders. Hence arose the well-known distinction between the secular and the regular canons; the former of which observed the decree of Nicolas II., while the latter, more prone to mortification and self-denial, complied with the directions and jurisdictions of Ivo; and, as this austere prelate imitated St. Augustin[c] in the manner of regulating the conduct of his clergy, his canons were called, by many, "the regular canons of St. Augustin."[d]

XXX. The most eminent Greek writers in this century, were,

Theophanes Cerameus, i. e. the potter, of whom there is yet extant a volume of Homilies, not altogether contemptible;

Nilus Doxopatrius, who was remarkable for his knowledge in matters relating to ecclesiastical polity;

Nicetas Pectoratus, who was a most strenuous defender of the religious sentiments and customs of the Greek church;

Michael Psellus, whose vast progress in various kinds of learning and science procured him a most distinguished and shining reputation;

Michael Cerularius, bishop or patriarch of Constantinople, who imprudently revived the controversy between the Greeks and Latins, which had been for some time happily suspended;

Simeon, the Younger, author of a book of Meditations on the Duties of the Christian Life, which is yet extant;

Theophylact, a Bulgarian, whose illustrations of the

[a] See Acta Sanctor. tom. ii. Januarii, p. 160.—Helyot, tom. ii. p. 108.—Gabr. Penot, Histor. Canonicorum regular. lib. ii. cap. 70.—Jo. Erh. Kapii Diss. de Fratribus S. Anton. From an account of the present state of the principal hospital, or residence of this order where the abbot remains, see Martenne and Durand, Voyage Liter. de deux Benedictins de la Congreg. de St. Maur, tom. i. p. 260.

[b] This decree, by which the primitive rule of the canons was changed, is published by Mabillon among the papers which serve as proofs to the fourth volume of his Annales Bened. and also in the annals themselves.

[c] St. Augustin committed to writing no particular rule for his clergy; but his manner of ruling them may be learned from several passages in his Epistles.

[d] See Mabillon, Annal. Bened. tom. iv. p. 586, et Opera Posthuma, tom. ii. p. 102, 115.—Helyot, tom. ii. p. 11.—Lud. Thomassini Disciplina Ecclesiæ circa Beneficia, tom. i. part i. l. iii. c. xi. p. 657.—Muratori, Antiq. Ital. medii Ævi, tom. v. p. 257. In the Gallia Christiana of the Benedictine monks, we find frequent mention made both of this reformation of the canons, and also of their division into seculars and regulars. The regular canons are much displeased with all the accounts that render the origin of their community so recent; they are extremely ambitious of appearing with the venerable character of an ancient establishment, and therefore trace back their rise, through the darkness of remote ages, to Christ himself, or, at least, to St. Augustin. But the arguments and testimonies, by which they pretend to support this imagined antiquity of their order, are proofs of the weakness of their cause and the vanity of their pretensions, and are therefore unworthy of serious refutation. It is true, the title of canon is undoubtedly of much more ancient date than the eleventh century, but not as applied to a particular order or institution; for at its rise it was used in a very vague general sense, (see Claud. de Vert, Explication des Ceremonies de la Messe, tom. i.,) and therefore the mere existence of the title proves nothing. At the same time, it is evident, beyond all possibility of contradiction, that we find not the least mention made of the division of the canons into regular and secular before the eleventh century; and it is equally certain that those canons who had nothing in common but their dwelling and table, were called secular, while those who had divested themselves of all private property, and had every thing, without exception, in common with their fraternity, were distinguished by the title of regular canons.

To Dr. Mosheim's account of the canons, it may not be improper to add a few words concerning their introduction into England, and their progress and establishment among us. The order of regular canons of St. Augustin was brought into England by Adelwald, confessor to Henry I., who first erected a priory of his order at Nostel in Yorkshire, and had influence enough to have the church of Carlisle converted into an episcopal see, and given to regular canons, invested with the privilege of choosing their bishop. This order was singularly favoured and protected by Henry I., who gave them, in the year 1107, the priory of Dunstable; and by queen Matilda, who erected for them, the year following the priory of the Holy Trinity in London, the prior of which was always one of the twenty-four aldermen. They increased so prodigiously, that, beside the noble priory of Merton, which was founded for them in the year 1117, by Gilbert, an earl of the Norman blood, they had, under the reign of Edward I., fifty-three priories, as appears by the catalogue presented to that prince, when he obliged all the monasteries to receive his protection, and to acknowledge his jurisdiction.

sacred writings were received with universal approbation and esteem.[a]

XXXI. The writers who distinguished themselves most among the Latins, were the following:

Fulbert, bishop of Chartres, eminent for his love of letters, and his zeal for the education of youth; as also for various compositions, particularly his epistles; and famous for his excessive and enthusiastic attachment to the Virgin Mary;[b]

Humbert, a cardinal of the Roman church, who far surpassed all the Latins, both in the vehemence and learning which appeared in his controversial writings against the Greeks;[c]

Petrus Damianus, who, on account of his genius, candour, probity, and various erudition, deserves to be ranked among the most learned and estimable writers of this century, though he was not altogether untainted with the reigning prejudices and defects of the times:[d]

Marianus Scotus, whose Chronicle and other compositions are yet extant;

Anselm, archbishop of Canterbury, a man of great genius and subtlety, deeply versed in the dialectics of this age, and most illustriously distinguished by his profound and extraordinary knowledge in theology;[e]

Lanfranc, also archbishop of Canterbury, who acquired a high degree of reputation by his Commentary upon the Epistles of St. Paul, as also by several other productions,[f] which, considering the age in which he lived, discover an uncommon measure of sagacity and erudition;[g]

Bruno of Mount-Cassin, and the other famous ecclesiastic of that name, who founded the monastery of the Carthusians;

Ivo, bishop of Chartres, who was so eminently distinguished by his zeal and activity in maintaining the rights and privileges of the church;

Hildebert, archbishop of Tours, who was a philosopher and a poet, as well as a divine, without being either eminent or contemptible in any of these characters;[h] but, upon the whole, a man of considerable learning and capacity;

Gregory VII., that imperious and arrogant pontiff, of whom we have several productions, beside his Letters.

CHAPTER III.

Concerning the Doctrine of the Christian Church during this Century.

I. IT is not necessary to draw at full length the hideous portrait of the religion of this age. It may easily be imagined, that its features were full of deformity, when we consider that its guardians were equally destitute of knowledge and virtue, and that the heads and rulers of the Christian church, instead of exhibiting models of piety, held forth in their conduct scandalous examples of the most flagitious crimes. The people were sunk in the grossest superstition, and employed all their zeal in the worship of images and relics, and in the performance of a trifling round of ceremonies, imposed upon them by the tyranny of a despotic priesthood. The more learned, it is true, retained still some notions of the truth, which, however, they obscured and corrupted by a wretched mixture of opinions and precepts, of which some were ludicrous, others pernicious, and most of them equally destitute of truth and utility. There were, no doubt, in several places, judicious and pious men, who would have willingly lent a supporting hand to the declining cause of true religion; but the violent prejudices of a barbarous age rendered all such attempts not only dangerous, but even desperate: and those chosen spirits, who had escaped the general contagion, lay too much concealed, and had therefore too little influence, to combat with success the formidable patrons of impiety and superstition, who were very numerous, in all ranks and orders, from the throne to the cottage.

II. Notwithstanding all this, we find, from the time of Gregory VII., several proofs of the zealous efforts of those who are generally called, by the Protestants, the *witnesses of the truth;* by whom are meant such pious and judicious Christians as adhered to the pure religion of the Gospel, and remained uncorrupted amidst the growth of superstition; who deplored the miserable state to which Christianity was reduced, by the alteration of its divine doctrines, and the vices of its profligate ministers; who opposed, with vigour, the tyrannic ambition, both of the lordly pontiff and the aspiring bishops; and in some provinces privately, in others openly, attempted the reformation of a corrupt and idolatrous church, and of a barbarous and superstitious age. This was, indeed, bearing witness to the truth in the noblest manner; and it was principally in Italy and France that the marks of this heroic piety were exhibited. [☞ Nor is it at all surprising that the reigning superstition of the times met with this opposition; it is astonishing, on the contrary, that this opposition was not much greater and more general, and that millions of Christians suffered themselves to be hood-winked with such a tame submission, and closed their eyes upon the light with so little reluctance.] For, notwithstanding the darkness of the times, and the general ignorance of the true religion, that prevailed in all ranks and orders, yet the very *fragments* of the Gospel (if we may use that term) which were still read and explained to the people, were sufficient, at least, to convince the most stupid and illiterate, that the religion,

---

[a] For a more ample account of these Greek writers, the reader may consult the Bibliotheca Græca of Fabricius.

[b] For a farther account of this eminent man, see the Hist. Liter. de la France, tom. vii. p. 261.

[c] See Martenne, Thesaurus Anecdot. tom. v. p. 629.—Hist. Liter. de la France, tom. vii. p. 527.

[d] See the Acta Sanctor. Febr. tom. iii. p. 406. General Dictionary, at the article Damien.—Casim. Oudini Diss. in tom. ii. Comm. de Scriptor. Eccles. p. 686.

[e] See the Hist. Literaire de la France, tom. ix. p. 398.—Rapin Thoyras, Hist. d'Angleterre, tom. ii. p. 65, 166, de l'ed. en 4to.—Colonia, Hist. Liter. de Lyon, tom. ii. p. 210.—We have already given a more ample account of the eminent abilities and learned productions of Anselm.

☞ [f] Among these productions we may reckon Lanfranc's Letters to pope Alexander II., to Hildebrand, while archdeacon of Rome, and to several bishops in England and Normandy; as also a Commentary upon the Psalms, a Treatise concerning Confession, an Ecclesiastical History, which is not extant, and a remarkable Dissertation concerning the Body and Blood of Christ in the Eucharist. In this last performance, Lanfranc endeavours to prove, against Berenger, the reality of a corporal presence in the eucharist, though it is manifest that this opinion was not the docrine of the church of England at the conclusion of the tenth, or the commencement of the following century. See Collier's Eccles. History of Great Britain, vol. i. p. 260, 263.

[g] Hist. Liter. de la France, tom. viii. p. 260.

[h] The Benedictine monks published in folio, at Paris, in the year 1708, the Works of Hildebert, illustrated by the observations of Beaugendre.

which was now imposed upon them, was not the true religion of Jesus; that the discourses, the lives and morals of the clergy, were directly opposite to what the divine Saviour required of his disciples, and to the rules he had laid down for the direction of their conduct; that the pontiffs and bishops abused, in a scandalous manner, their power and opulence; and that the favour of God, and the salvation exhibited in his blessed Gospel, were not to be obtained by performing a round of external ceremonies, by pompous donations to churches and priests, or by founding and enriching monasteries, but by real sanctity of heart and manners.

III. It must, indeed, be acknowledged, that they who undertook, with such zeal and ardour, the reformation of the church, were not, for the most part, equal to this arduous and important enterprise, and that, by avoiding, with more vehemence than circumspection, certain abuses and defects, they rushed unhappily into the opposite extremes. They all perceived the abominable nature of those inventions with which superstition had disfigured the religion of Jesus; but they had also lost sight of the true nature and genius of that celestial religion, which lay thus disfigured in the hands of a superstitious and dissolute priesthood. They were shocked at the absurdities of the established worship; but few of them were sufficiently acquainted with the sublime precepts and doctrines of genuine Christianity, to substitute in the place of that superstitious worship a rational service. Hence their attempts of reformation, even where they were not wholly unsuccessful, were very imperfect, and produced little more than a motley mixture of truth and falsehood, of wisdom and indiscretion; of which we might allege a multitude of examples. Observing, for instance, that the corruption and licentiousness of the clergy were, in a great measure, occasioned by their excessive opulence and their vast possessions, they rashly conceived the highest ideas of the salutary effects of indigence, and looked upon voluntary poverty as the most eminent and illustrious virtue of a Christian minister. They had also formed to themselves a notion, that the primitive church was to be the standing and perpetual model, according to which the rites, government, and worship of all Christian churches, were to be regulated in all the ages of the world; and that the lives and manners of the holy apostles were to be rigorously followed, in every respect, by all the ministers of Christ. [☞These notions, which were injudiciously taken up, and blindly entertained, (without any regard to the difference of times, places, circumstances, and characters; without considering that the provident wisdom of Christ and his apostles left many regulations to the prudence and piety of the governors of the church,) were productive of many pernicious effects, and threw these good reformers, whose zeal was not always according to knowledge, from the extreme of superstition into the extreme of enthusiasm.] Many well-meaning persons, whose intentions were highly laudable, fell into great errors in consequence of these ill-grounded notions. Justly incensed at the conduct of the superstitious multitude, who placed the whole of religion in external services, and hoped to secure their salvation by the performance of a laborious round of unmeaning rites and ceremonies, they rashly maintained, that true piety was to be strictly confined to the inward motions and affections of the soul, and to the contemplation of spiritual and divine things. In consequence of this specious, yet erroneous principle, they treated with the utmost contempt all the external parts of religious worship, and even aimed at the total suppression of sacraments, churches, religious assemblies of every kind, and Christian ministers of every order.

IV. Of the Greek and Latin writers of this age, many employed their learned and pious labours in the exposition and illustration of the Scriptures. Among the Latins, Bruno wrote a commentary on the Book of Psalms, Lanfranc upon the Epistles of St. Paul, Berenger upon the Revelations of St. John, Gregory VII. upon the Gospel of St. Matthew, and others upon other parts of the sacred writings. But all these expositors, in compliance with the prevailing custom of the times, either copied the explanations of the ancient commentators, or made such whimsical applications of certain passages of Scripture, both in explaining the doctrines, and inculcating the duties of religion, that it is often difficult to peruse their writings without indignation or disgust. The most eminent Grecian expositor was Theophylact, a native of Bulgaria; though he also is indebted to the ancients, and in a particular manner to St. Chrysostom, for the greatest part of his most judicious observations.[a] Nor must we pass in silence either the commentary upon the Book of Psalms and the Song of Solomon, that was composed by the learned Michael Psellus, or the chain of commentaries upon the Book of Job, which we owe to the industry of Nicetas.

V. All the Latin doctors, if we except a few Hibernian divines, who blended, with the beautiful simplicity of the Gospel, the perplexing subtleties of an obscure philosophy, had hitherto derived their system of religion, and their explications of divine truth, either from the Scriptures alone, or from these sacred oracles explained by the illustrations, and compared with the theology, of the ancient doctors. But in this century certain writers, and, among others, the famous Berenger,[b] went much farther, and employed the rules of logic and the subtleties of metaphysical discussion, both in explaining the doctrines of Scripture, and in proving the truth of their own particular opinions. Hence Lanfranc, the antagonist of Berenger, and afterwards archbishop of Canterbury, introduced into the field of religious controversy the same philosophical arms, and seemed, in general, desirous of employing the dictates of reason to illustrate and confirm the truths of religion. His example, in this respect, was followed by Anselm, his disciple and successor in the see of Canterbury, a man of a truly metaphysical genius, and capable of giving the greatest air of dignity and importance to the *first philosopher*. Such were the beginnings of that philosophical theology, which grew afterwards, by degrees, into a cloudy and enormous system, and, from the public schools in which it was cultivated,

[a] For an account of Theophylact, see Rich. Simon's Hist. Critique des principaux Commentateurs du N. T. ch. xxviii. p. 390. Critique de la Bibliotheque des Auteurs Ecclesiastiques, par Du-Pin, tom. i. p. 310, where he also speaks largely of Nicetas and Œcumenius.

☞ [b] Otherwise called Berengarius, and famous for the noble opposition he made to the doctrine of Transubstantiation, which Lanfranc so absurdly pretended to support upon philosophical principles. The attempt of the latter to introduce the rules of logic into religious controversy would have been highly laudable, had not he perverted this respectable science to the defence of the most monstrous absurdities.

acquired the name of *scholastic divinity*.[a] It is, however, necessary to observe, that the eminent divines, who first set on foot this new species of theology, and thus laudably maintained that most noble and natural connexion of faith with reason, and of religion with philosophy, were much more prudent and moderate than their followers, in the use and application of this conciliatory scheme. They kept, for the most part, within bounds, and wisely reflected upon the limits of reason; their language was clear; the questions they proposed were instructive and interesting; they avoided all discussions that were only proper to satisfy a vain and idle curiosity; and, in their disputes and demonstrations, they made, generally speaking, a wise and sober use of the rules of logic, and of the dictates of philosophy.[b] [☞Their followers, on the contrary, ran with a metaphysical phrensy into the greatest abuses, and, by the most unjustifiable perversion of a wise and excellent method of searching after, and confirming truth, they banished evidence from religion, common sense from philosophy, and erected a dark and enormous mass of pretended science, in which words passed for ideas, and sounds for sense.]

VI. No sooner was this new method introduced, than the Latin doctors began to reduce all the doctrines of religion into one permanent and connected system, and to treat theology as a science; an enterprise which had hitherto been attempted by none but Taio of Saragossa, a writer of the seventh century, and the learned Damascenus, who flourished among the Greeks in the following age. The Latin doctors had hitherto confined their theological labours to certain branches of the Christian religion, which they illustrated only on certain occasions. The first production which looked like a general system of theology, was that of the celebrated Anselm; this, however, was surpassed by the complete and universal body of divinity, which was composed, toward the conclusion of this century, by Hildebert, archbishop of Tours, who seems to have been regarded both as the first and the best model in this kind of writing, by the innumerable legions of system-makers, who arose in succeeding times.[c] This learned prelate demonstrated first the doctrines of his system by proofs drawn from the Scriptures, and also from the writings of the ancient fathers of the church; and in this he followed the custom that had prevailed in the preceding ages; but he went yet farther, and answered the objections which might be brought against his doctrine, by arguments drawn from reason and philosophy: this part of his method was entirely new, and peculiar to the age in which he lived.[d]

VII. The moral writers of this century, who undertook to unfold the obligations of Christians, and to delineate the nature, the extent, and the various branches of true virtue and evangelical obedience, treated this most excellent of all sciences in a manner quite unsuitable to its dignity and importance. We find sufficient proofs of this in the moral writings of Peter Damian,[e] and even of the learned Hildebert.[f] The moralists of this age generally confined themselves to a jejune explication of, what are commonly called, the four cardinal virtues, to which they added the ten Commandments, to complete their system. Anselm, the famous prelate of Canterbury, surpassed, indeed, all the moral writers of his time; the books which he composed with a design to promote practical religion, and more especially his Book of Meditations and Prayers, contain many excellent remarks, and some happy thoughts expressed with much energy and unction. [☞ Nor did the mystic divines satisfy themselves with penetrating, by ecstatic thought and feeling, into the sublime regions of beauty and love; they conceived and brought forth several productions that were destined to diffuse the pure delights of union and communion through enamoured souls.] Johannes Johannellus, a Latin mystic, wrote a treatise concerning Divine Contemplation;[g] and Simeon the younger, who was a Grecian sage of the same visionary class, composed several discourses upon subjects of a like nature.

VIII. In the controversial writings of this century, we observe the effects of the scholastic method that Berenger and Lanfranc had introduced into the study of theology. We see divines entering the lists armed with syllogisms which they manage awkwardly, and aiming rather to confound their adversaries by the subtleties of logic, than to convince them by the power of evidence; while those who were unprovided with this philosophical armour, made a still more wretched and despicable figure, fell into the grossest and most perverse blunders, and seem to have written without either thinking of their subject, or of the

[a] See Chr. August. Heumanni Præfat. ad Tribbechovii Librum de Doctoribus Scholasticis, p. 14. The sentiments of the learned, concerning the first author or inventor of the scholastic divinity, are collected by Jo. Franc. Buddeus, in his Isagoge ad Theolog. tom. i. p. 38.

[b] We shall here transcribe a passage from the works of Lanfranc, who is considered by many as the father of the scholastic system, that the reader may see how far the first schoolmen surpassed their disciples and followers in wisdom, modesty, and candour. We take this passage from that prelate's book concerning the Body and Blood of Christ,* and it is as follows: "Testis mihi Deus est et conscientia mea, quia in tractatu divinarum literarum nec proponere nec ad propositas respondere cuperem dialecticas quæstiones, vel earum solutiones. Et si quando materia disputandi talis est, ut hujus artis regulis valeat enucleatius explicari, in quantum possum, per æquipollentias propositionum tego artem, ne videar magis arte, quam veritate sanctorumque patrum auctoritate, confidere." Lanfranc here declares, in the most solemn manner, even by an appeal to God and his conscience, that he was so far from having the least inclination to propose or to answer logical questions in the course of his theological labours, that, on the contrary, when he was forced to have recourse to the dialectic science, in order the better to illustrate his subject, he concealed the succours he thence derived with all possible care, lest he should seem to place more confidence in the resources of art than in the simplicity of truth, and the authority of the holy fathers. These last words show plainly the two sources from which the Christian doctors had hitherto derived all their tenets, and the arguments by which they maintained them, viz. from the Scriptures, which Lanfranc here calls the truth, and from the writings of the ancient fathers of the church. To these two sources of theology and argumentation, a third was added in this century, even the science of logic, which, however, was only employed by the managers of controversy to repulse their adversaries, who came armed with syllogisms, or to remove difficulties which were drawn from reason and from the nature of things. But, in succeeding times, the two former sources were either entirely neglected or sparingly employed, and philosophical demonstration (or, at least, something that bore that name,) was regarded as a sufficient support to the truths of religion.

[c] This body of divinity, which was the first complete theological system that had been composed among the Latins, is inserted in the works of Hildebert, published by Beaugendre, who shows evidently, in his preface, that Peter Lombard, Pullus, and the other writers of theological systems, did no more than servilely follow the traces of Hildebert.

[d] It may not be improper to place here a passage which is taken from a treatise written by Anselm, entitled, *Cur Deus homo?* since this passage was respected, by the first scholastic divines, as an immutable law in theology; "Sicut rectus ordo exigit," says the learned prelate, "ut profunda fidei Christianæ credamus, priusquam ea præsumamus ratione discutere, ita negligentia mihi videtur, si, postquam confirmati sumus in fide, non studemus quod credimus intelligere:" which amounts to this, That we must first believe without examination, but must afterwards endeavour to understand what we believe.

[e] See Petrus Damianus, de Virtutibus.

[f] See Hildeberti Philosophia Moralis, et Libellus de IV. Virtutibus honestæ Vitæ.

[g] See the Histoire Literaire de la France, tom. viii. p. 48.

* Cap. vii. p. 236. Op. ed. Luc. Dacherii.

manner of treating it with success. Damianus, already mentioned, defended the truth of Christianity against the Jews; but his success was not equal either to the warmth of his zeal, or to the uprightness of his intentions. Samuel, a convert from Judaism to Christianity, wrote an elaborate treatise against those of his nation, which is still extant. But the noblest champion that appeared at this period in the cause of religion, was the famous Anselm, who attacked the enemies of Christianity, and the audacious contemners of all religion, in an ingenious work,[a] which was perhaps, by its depth and acuteness, above the comprehension of those whom it was designed to convince of their errors. [☞ For it happened, no doubt, in these earlier times, as it frequently does in our days, that many gave themselves out for unbelievers, who knew not the first principles of reasoning, and whose incredulity was the fruit of ignorance and presumption, nourished by licentiousness and corruption of heart.]

IX. The famous contest between the Greek and Latin churches, which, though not decided, had however been suspended for a considerable time, was imprudently revived, in 1053, by Michael Cerularius, patriarch of Constantinople, a man of a restless and turbulent spirit, who blew the flame of religious discord, and widened the fatal breach by new invectives and new accusations. The pretexts that were employed to justify this new rupture, were, zeal for the truth, and an anxious concern about the interests of religion; but its true causes were the arrogance and ambition of the Grecian patriarch and the Roman pontiff. The latter was constantly forming the most artful stratagems to reduce the former under his imperious yoke; and for this purpose, he left no means unemployed to gain over to his side the bishops of Alexandria and Antioch, by withdrawing them from the jurisdiction of the see of Constantinople. The tumultuous and unhappy state of the Grecian empire, was apparently favourable to his aspiring views, as the friendship of the Roman pontiff was highly useful to the Greeks in their struggles with the Saracens and the Normans, who were settled in Italy. On the other hand, the Grecian pontiff was not only determined to refuse obstinately the least mark of submission to his haughty rival, but was also laying schemes for extending his dominion, and for reducing all the Oriental patriarchs under his supreme jurisdiction. Thus the contending parties were preparing for the field of controversy, when Cerularius began the charge by a warm letter written in his own name, and in the name of Leo, bishop of Acrida, who was his chief counsellor, to John, Bishop of Trani, in Apulia; in which he publicly accused the Latins of various errors.[b] Leo IX., who was then in the papal chair, answered this letter in a most imperious manner; and, not satisfied with showing his high indignation by mere words, he assembled a council at Rome, in which the Greek churches were solemnly excommunicated.[c]

X. Constantine, surnamed Monomachus, who was now at the head of the Grecian empire, endeavoured to stifle this controversy in its birth, and, for that purpose, desired the Roman pontiff to send legates to Constantinople, to concert measures for restoring and confirming the tranquillity of the church. Three legates were accordingly sent from Rome to that imperial city, who took with them letters from Leo IX. not only to the emperor, but also to the Grecian pontiff. These legates were cardinal Humbert, a man of a high and impetuous spirit, Peter, archbishop of Amalfi, and Frederic, archdeacon and chancellor of the church of Rome. The issue of this congress was unhappy in the highest degree, notwithstanding the propensity which the emperor, for political reasons,[d] discovered to the cause of the bishop of Rome. The arrogance of Leo IX., and his insolent letters, excited the highest indignation in the breast of Cerularius, and produced a personal aversion to this audacious pontiff, which inflamed, instead of healing, the wounds of the church; while, on the other hand, the Roman legates gave many and evident proofs, that the design of their embassy was not to restore peace and concord, but to establish among the Greeks the supreme authority and the ghostly dominion of the Roman pontiff. Thus all hopes of a happy conclusion of these miserable divisions entirely vanished; and the Roman legates, finding their efforts ineffectual to overcome the vigorous resistance of Cerularius, very imprudently and insolently excommunicated, in the church of St. Sophia, in 1054, the Grecian patriarch, with Leo of Acrida, and all their adherents; and leaving a written act of their inhuman imprecations and anathemas upon the grand altar of that temple, they *shook the dust off their feet*, and thus departed. This violent step rendered the evil incurable, which it was before not only possible, but perhaps easy, to remedy. The Grecian patriarch imitated the vehemence of the Roman legates, and did from resentment what they had perpetrated from a principle of ambition and arrogance. He excommunicated these legates with all their adherents and followers in a public council, and procured an order of the emperor for burning the act of excommunication which they had pronounced against the Greeks.[e] These vehement measures were followed on both sides by a multitude of controversial writings, that were filled with the most bitter and irritating invectives, and served no other purpose than to add fuel to the flame.

XI. Cerularius added new accusations to the ancient charges adduced by Photius against the Latin churches; of which the principal was, that they used unleavened bread in the celebration of the Lord's supper. This accusation (such were the times!) was looked upon as a matter of the most serious nature, and of the highest consequence; it was, therefore, debated between the Greeks and Latins with the utmost vehemence, nor did the Grecian and Roman pontiffs contend with more fury and bitterness about the extent of their power, and the limits of their jurisdiction, than the Greek and Latin churches disputed about the use of unleavened bread. The other heads of

[a] This work was entitled, Liber adv. insipientem, i. e. The fool refuted.

[b] See an account of those errors, sect. xi.

[c] These letters of Cerularius and Leo are published in the Annals of Baronius, ad annum 1053.—The former is also inserted by Canisius in his Lection. Antiq. tom. iii. p. 281, ed. nov.—Leonis Concilia, &c.

☞ [d] He stood greatly in need of the assistance of the Germans and Italians against the Normans, and hoped to obtain it by the good offices of the pope, who was in high credit with the emperor Henry III.

[e] Beside Baronius and other writers, whose accounts of this period of time are generally known, and not always exact, see Mabillon, Annal. Bened. tom. v. lib. lx. ad. an. 1053, et Præf. ad Sæc. VI. Actor. SS. Benedicti, part ii. p. 1.—Leo Allatius, de libris Græcor. Ecclesiast. Diss. ii. p. 160, ed. Fabricii, et de perpetuâ Eccles. Orient. et Occident. Consensione, lib. ii. cap. ix. p. 614.—Mich. le Quien, Oriens Christianus, tom. i. p. 260, et Diss. Damascena prima, sect. xxxi. p. 16.—Hermanni Historia Concertationum de pane azymo et fermentato, p. 59, published at Leipsic in the year 1739.—Jo. Bapt. Cotelerius, Monum. Ecclesiæ Græcæ, tom. ii. p. 108.

accusation that were brought against the Latins by the Grecian pontiff, discovered rather a malignant and contentious spirit, and a profound ignorance of genuine Christianity, than a generous zeal for the cause of truth. He complains, for instance, in the heaviest manner, that the Latins did not abstain from the use of blood, and of things strangled; that their monks used to eat lard, and permitted the use of flesh to such of the brethren as were sick or infirm; that their bishops adorned their fingers with rings, as if they were bridegrooms; that their priests were beardless; and that in the ceremony of baptism they confined themselves to one immersion.[a] Such were the miserable and trifling objects that excited a fatal schism, and kindled a furious war between the Greeks and Latins, who carried their animosities to the greatest lengths, and loaded each other with reciprocal invectives and imprecations. The attentive reader will hence form a just idea of the deplorable state of religion both in the eastern and western world at this period, and will see, in this dreadful schism, the true origin of the various sects that multiplied the different forms of superstition and error in these unhappy times.

XII. This vehement dispute, which the Greeks had to carry on against the Latin church, was nearly followed by a fatal division among themselves. Amidst the straits and difficulties to which the empire was now reduced by the expenses of war, and the calamities of the times, Alexias not only employed the treasures of the church, in order to answer the exigencies of the state, but ordered also the plates of silver, and the figures of that metal that adorned the portals of the churches, to be taken down and converted into money. This measure excited the indignation of Leo, bishop of Chalcedon, a man of austere morals, and of an obstinate spirit, who maintained that the emperor, in this step, was guilty of sacrilege; and, to prove this charge, he published a treatise, in which he affirmed, that in the images of Jesus Christ, and of the saints, there resided a certain kind of inherent sanctity, that was a proper object of religious worship; and that, therefore, the adoration of Christians ought not to be confined to the persons represented by these images, but extended also to the images themselves. This new controversy excited various tumults and seditions among the people; to suppress which, the emperor assembled a council at Constantinople, in which the question was terminated by the following decisions: "That the images of Christ, and of the saints, were to be honoured only with a relative worship,[b] which was to be offered, not to the substance or matter of which these images were composed, but to the form and features of which they bore the impression; that the representations of Christ, and of the saints, whether in painting or sculpture, did in no sense partake of the nature of the divine Saviour, or of those holy men, though they were enriched with a certain communication of divine grace; and, lastly, that invocation and worship were to be addressed to the saints, only as the servants of Christ, and on account of their relation to him, as their master." These decisions, absurd and superstitious as they were, were not sufficiently so for Leo, the idolatrous bishop of Chalcedon, who maintained his monstrous system with obstinacy, and was, for that reason, sent into banishment.[c]

XIII. The famous dispute concerning the *presence* of Christ's body and blood in the eucharist was revived about the middle of this century in the Latin church. Hitherto the disputants on both sides had proposed their jarring opinions with the utmost freedom, unrestrained by the despotic voice of authority, since no council had given a definitive sentence upon this matter, or prescribed a rule of faith to terminate all inquiry and debate.[d] Hence it was, that, in the beginning of this century, Leutheric, archbishop of Sens, affirmed, in opposition to the general opinion of the times, that none but the sincere and upright Christian, none but saints and real believers, received the body of Christ in the holy sacrament. This opinion, which was broached in 1004, seemed likely to excite commotions among the people; but these its natural effects were happily prevented by the influence of Robert, king of France, and the wise counsels of some prudent friends, who hindered the fanatical prelate from disseminating this whimsical invention.[e] It was not so easy to extinguish the zeal, or to stop the mouth of the famous Berenger, principal of the public school at Tours, and afterwards archbishop of Angers, a man of a most acute and subtle genius, and highly renowned both on account of his extensive learning, and the exemplary sanctity of his life and manners.[f] This eminent ecclesiastic maintained publicly, in 1045, the doctrine of Johannes Scotus; opposed warmly the monstrous opinions of Paschasius Radbert, which were adapted to captivate a superstitious multitude by exciting their astonishment, and persevered with a noble obstinacy in teaching, that the bread and wine were not changed into the body and blood of Christ in the eucharist, but preserved their natural and essential qualities, and were no more than figures and external symbols of the body and blood of the divine Saviour. This wise and rational doctrine was no sooner published, than it was opposed by certain doctors in France and Germany. The pontiff Leo IX. attacked it with peculiar vehemence and fury, in 1050; and, in two councils, one assembled at Rome, and the other at Vercelli, had the doctrine of Berenger solemnly condemned, and the book of Scotus, from which it was drawn, committed to the flames. This example was followed by the council of Paris, which was summoned in the same year by Henry I, and in which Berenger, and his numerous adherents, were menaced with all sorts of evils, both spiritual and temporal. These threats were executed, in part, against

[a] See Cerularii Epistola ad Johannem Tranensem in Canisii Lection. Antiq. tom. iii. p. 281, where the reader will also find the refutation of this letter by cardinal Humbert.—See likewise Cerularii Epistola ad Petrum Antiochens. in Cotelerii Monumentis Ecclesiæ Græc. tom. ii. p. 138; add to these Martenne, Thesaur. Anecdot. tom. v. p. 847.

[b] Σχετικῶς προσκυνῆμεν, ὑ λατρευτικῶς, τὰς εἰκόνας.

[c] An ample account of this whole matter is given by Anna Comnena, in her Alexias, lib. v. p. 104, lib. vii. p. 158, edit. Venet. The acts of this council, the very mention of which is omitted by several historians of considerable note, are published by Montfaucon, in his Bibliotheca Coisliniana, p. 103.

[d] The various opinions concerning the sacrament of the Lord's supper, that were embraced during this century, are collected by Martenne from an ancient manuscript, and published in his Voyage Literaire de deux Benedictins de la Congregation de S. Maur, tom. ii. p. 126.

[e] See Du Boulay, Histor. Acad. Paris. tom. i. p. 354.

[f] See the Life of Berenger in the Works of Hildebert, archdeacon of Mans, p. 1324.—See also Histoire Literaire de la France, tom. viii. p. 197.—Boulay, Hist. Acad. Paris. tom. i. p. 304, and the authors mentioned by Fabricius, Biblioth. Lat. medii Ævi, tom. i. p. 570. It is probably by an error of the press, that Hildebert is styled archbishop instead of archdeacon, by Paris, Hist. lib. i. p. 10, edit. Watts.

this unhappy prelate, whom Henry deprived of all his revenues; but neither threats, nor fines, nor synodical decrees, could shake the firmness of his mind, or engage him to renounce the doctrine he had embraced.

XIV. After these proceedings, the controversy was for some years happily suspended, and Berenger, whose patrons were as numerous as his enemies were formidable,[a] enjoyed, for a while, the sweets of liberty and peace. His enemies, however, after the death of Leo IX. rekindled the flame of religious discord, and persuaded his successor Victor II. to examine anew the doctrine of Berenger. The pontiff complied, and sent his legates to two different councils, that were assembled at Tours, in 1054,[b] for that purpose. In one of these councils the famous Hildebrand, who was afterwards pontiff under the title of Gregory VII., appeared in the character of legate, and opposed the new doctrine with the utmost vehemence. Berenger was also present at this assembly, and, overpowered with threats, rather than convinced by reason and argument, he not only abandoned his opinions, but (if we may believe his adversaries, to whose testimony we are confined in this matter) abjured them solemnly, and, in consequence of this humiliating step, made his peace with the church. This abjuration, however, was far from being sincere, and the docility of Berenger was no more than an act of dissimulation; for, soon after this period, he again taught, though with more circumspection and prudence, the opinions he had formerly professed. That this conduct appears mean and dishonest, is indeed evident; but we are not sufficiently acquainted with the transactions of these councils to fix precisely the degree of his guilt.

XV. The account of Berenger's perfidy being brought to Nicolas II., the exasperated pontiff summoned him to Rome, in 1058, and in the council which he held there the following year, so terrified the archdeacon, that he declared his readiness to embrace and adhere to the doctrines which that venerable assembly should think proper to impose upon his faith. Humbert was accordingly appointed unanimously by Nicolas and the council to draw up a confession of faith for Berenger, who signed it publicly, and confirmed his adherence to it by a solemn oath. In this confession there was, among other tenets equally absurd, the following declaration, that "the bread and wine, after consecration, were not only a sacrament, but also the real body and blood of Jesus Christ; and that this body and blood were handled by the priests and consumed by the faithful, not merely in a sacramental sense, but in reality and truth, as other sensible objects are." This doctrine was so monstrously nonsensical, and was such an impudent insult upon the very first principles of reason, that it could have nothing alluring to a man of Berenger's acute and philosophical turn; nor could it become the object of his serious belief, as appeared soon after this odious act of dissimulation; for no sooner had he returned into France, than, taking refuge in the countenance and protection of his ancient patrons, he expressed the utmost detestation and abhorrence of the doctrines he had been obliged to profess at Rome, abjured them solemnly both in his discourse and in his writings, and returned zealously to the profession and defence of his former, which had always been his real opinion. Alexander II. employed the seducing influence of soft and friendly expostulation to engage Berenger to dissemble anew, or, in other words, to return from his pretended apostacy; but his remonstrances were ineffectual, chiefly because this rebellious son of a superstitious church was powerfully supported in the maintenance of his opinions. Hence the controversy was prolonged, during many years, by a multitude of writings on both sides of the question, and the number of Berenger's followers daily increased.

XVI. Gregory VII., whose enterprising spirit no difficulties or opposition could discourage, was no sooner raised to the pontificate than he undertook to terminate this important controversy, and, for that purpose, sent an order to Berenger, in 1078, to repair to Rome. If we consider the natural character of this pontiff, we shall be inclined to admit that his conduct in this affair was highly laudable, and discovered a degree of impartiality and candour, which his proceedings on other occasions gave little reason to expect. He seems to have had a high esteem for Berenger; and, in the particular points in which he was obliged to oppose him, he did it with all possible mildness, and with a tenderness which showed that he acted rather from a forced compliance with the clamours of his adversaries, than from inclination or principle. In the council which he held at Rome toward the conclusion of the year 1078, he permitted Berenger to draw up a new confession of his faith, and to renounce that which had been composed by Humbert, though it had been solemnly approved and confirmed by Nicolas II. and a Roman council. The sagacious pontiff perceived clearly the absurdity of Humbert's confession, and therefore revoked it, though it had been rendered sacred by papal authority.[c] In consequence of this, the persecuted archdeacon made a second declaration, confirmed by an oath, that he would adhere for the future to the following propositions: That "the bread deposited upon the altar became, after consecration, the true body of Christ, which was born of the Virgin, suffered on the cross, and now sits at the right hand of the Father: and that the wine placed upon the altar became, after consecration, the true blood, which flowed from the side of Christ." The pontiff was satisfied with this declaration, which was far from producing the same effect upon the enemies of Berenger; they showed that it was ambiguous, and so it was in reality; and they insisted that Berenger should be obliged not only to sign a declaration less vague and equivocal, but should also be required to prove his sincerity by the fiery trial. Gregory absolutely refused the latter demand, and would have equally refused the other, had not his favourable intentions towards Berenger yielded to the importunate clamours of his enemies and persecutors.

XVII. The pontiff, therefore, granted that part of their demand which related to a new declaration; and in a council convoked at Rome, in 1079, procured from the members a third confession of faith, less absurd than the first, though more harsh than the second; and to this creed Berenger, after reading and subscribing it in the

[a] Lanfranc, archbishop of Canterbury, was his most formidable rival and enemy.

[b] Other historians mention but one council, and place it in 1055.

[c] It is worthy of observation, that Gregory, whose zeal in extending the jurisdiction, and exalting the authority of the Roman pontiffs, surpassed that of all his predecessors, acknowledged, at least tacitly, by this step, that a pope and council might err, and had erred in effect. How otherwise could he allow Berenger to renounce a confession of faith that had been solemnly approved and confirmed by Nicolas II. in a Roman council?

midst of the assembly, was obliged to declare his assent by a solemn oath. By this assent, he professed to believe, "That the bread and wine, by the mysterious influence of the holy prayer, and the words of our Redeemer, were substantially changed into the true, proper, and vivifying body and blood of Jesus Christ:" and to remove all grounds of suspicion, to dispel all doubt about the reality of his attachment to this ridiculous system, he added to his second confession[a] a solemn declaration, that "the bread and wine, after consecration, were converted into the real body and blood of Christ, not only in quality of external signs and sacramental representations, but in their essential properties, and in substantial reality." No sooner had Berenger made this strange declaration, than the pontiff redoubled the marks of esteem which he had formerly shown him, and sent him back to his country loaded with the most honourable testimonies of liberality and friendship. The double-minded doctor did not, however, think himself bound by this declaration, solemn as it was; and therefore retracted publicly, upon his return to his residence, what he had subscribed as his real sentiments in the council of Rome, and went even so far as to compose an elaborate refutation of the doctrine to which he had been engaged to profess his assent. This new change excited a warm and vehement controversy, in which Lanfranc and Guitmund endeavoured to perplex Berenger with their sophistry, and to overwhelm him with their invectives. Gregory, to whose papal thunder the affronted council looked with impatience, seemed neither surprised nor offended at the inconstancy of Berenger; nor did he take any step which could testify the smallest mark of resentment against this pretended apostate. Hence it appears more than probable, that the second confession had entirely satisfied the pontiff, and that the violent imposition of the third was by no means agreeable to one who seems to have adopted, in a great measure, (if not wholly,) the sentiments of Berenger.[b]

XVIII. Amidst the clamours of his incensed adversaries, Berenger observed a profound silence, and was so prudent as to return no answer to their bitter and repeated invectives. Fatigued with a controversy, in which the first principles of reason were so impudently insulted, and exhausted by an opposition which he was unable to overcome, he abandoned all his worldly concerns, and retired to the isle of St. Cosme, in the neighbourhood of Tours, where he spent the remainder of his days in fasting, prayer, and pious exercises. In the year 1088, death put an end to the affliction he suffered in his retirement, from a bitter reflection upon the dissimulation he had been guilty of at Rome, and to the penitential acts of mortification and austerity, to which he seems to have submitted with a view of expiating the enormity of his criminal compliance, and the guilt of his perjury.[c] He left in the minds of the people a deep impression of his extraordinary sanctity, and his followers were as numerous as his fame was illustrious.[d] There have been disputes among the learned about the real sentiments of this eminent man: yet, notwithstanding the art which he sometimes used to conceal his opinions, and the ambiguity that is often remarkable in his expressions, whoever examines with impartiality and attention such of his writings as are yet extant, will immediately perceive that he looked upon the bread and wine in the sacrament as no more than the signs or symbols of the body and blood of the divine Saviour.[e] In this opinion Berenger persevered to the last; nor have we any authentic proof of his having departed

[a] Mentioned in the preceding section.

[b] A remarkable treatise of Berenger's composition, which has been published by Martenne in his Thesaur. Anecdot. tom. iv. p. 99, 109, will contribute to throw a satisfactory light upon this whole affair, and will fully unfold the real sentiments of Gregory concerning the eucharist. For from this piece it is undoubtedly evident; 1stly, That Berenger was esteemed and favoured in a singular manner by Gregory; 2dly, That this pontiff was of the same opinion with Berenger respecting the eucharist; it is certain, at least, that he was for adhering to the words of Scripture in this matter, and was eager in suppressing all curious researches and all positive decisions concerning the manner of Christ's presence in the holy sacrament. This appears from the following words which he addressed to Berenger before the meeting of the last council of Rome, and in which he speaks of his design to consult the Virgin Mary upon the conduct which it was proper for him to observe in the course of this controversy: "Ego plane te" (says the pontiff in the 108th page of the work, cited in the beginning of this note) "de Christi sacrificio secundum Scripturas bene sentire non dubito: tamen quia consuetudinis mihi est, ad B. Mariam de his quæ movent recurrere—imposui religioso cuidam amico—a B. Mariâ obtinere, ut per eum mihi non taceret, sed verbis commendaret, quorsum me de negotio quod in manibus habebam de Christi sacrificio reciperem, in quo immotus persisterem." We see here plainly, that Gregory expresses a strong propensity to the sentiments of Berenger, not, however, without some hesitation concerning the manner in which he was to conduct himself, and also concerning the precise doctrines, which it was necessary to embrace in relation to the presence of Christ in the eucharist. It was this hesitation which led him to consult the Virgin Mary, whose answer the pontiff gives in the following words: "B. Maria audivit et ad me retulit, nihil de sacrificio Christi cogitandum, nihil esse tenendum, nisi quod tenerent authenticæ Scripturæ, contra quas Berengarius nihil habebat. Hoc tibi manifestare volui, ut securiorem ad nos fiduciam et alacriorem spem habeas." Here we see an answer of the Virgin pronouncing, that it was necessary to adhere to the express declarations of Scripture concerning the presence of Christ in the sacrament; and whether Gregory was fanatic enough to confide in this answer as real, or rogue enough to forge it, it is still certain, that he confined his belief respecting the point in debate to the language of Scripture, and held that the true body and blood of Christ were exhibited in the sacrament of the Lord's supper, though it was neither necessary nor expedient to inquire into the nature or manner of this mysterious presence. 3dly, It appears manifest, from the treatise already mentioned, that the assembling of the second council, and the imposition of another confession of faith upon the conscience of Berenger, were measures into which Gregory was forced by the enemies of that ecclesiastic. "Dejectus est," says Berenger, speaking of that pontiff, "importunitate Paduani scurræ, non episcopi, et Pisani non episcopi, sed antichristi . . . ut permitteret calumniatoribus veritatis in posteriori quadragesimali concilio scriptum a se firmatum in priori mutari." 4thly, We see here the true reason why Gregory showed not the smallest mark of resentment against Berenger, when, upon his return to his own country, he violated the promise by which he had so solemnly bound himself at the last council, and refuted the confession to which he had sworn his assent. For the pontiff was very far from adopting the sentiments of those who had drawn up or suggested that monstrous confession, and deemed it sufficient to believe with Berenger, that the body and blood of Jesus Christ were exhibited to Christians in the eucharist. Hence he suffered the violent adversaries of his persecuted friend to murmur, scribble, bawl, and refute, while he himself observed a profound silence, and persisted in his resolution to put that unhappy man to no farther trouble. It is, however, proper to observe, that, in the same book from which these particulars are taken, we find Berenger addressing himself, with the utmost humility, to the divine mercy, for the pardon of the crime of dissimulation and perjury he had committed at Rome, and confessing that the fear of death had extorted from him oaths and declarations diametrically opposite to his real sentiments, and engaged him to subscribe to a set of tenets which he abhorred. "Deus omnipotens," says he, "miserere, fons misericordiarum, tantum sacrilegium agnoscenti."

[c] This will appear evident to such as peruse the treatise of his composition, which we have mentioned in the preceding note, as published in Martenne's Thesaur. Anecdot. tom. iv.

[d] The canons of the cathedral of Tours continue to honour the memory of Berenger by an annual procession, in which they perform a solemn service at his tomb in the isle of St. Cosme. See Moleon, Voyages Liturgiques, p. 130.

[e] Mabillon and other Roman catholic writers, as also a few Lutheran divines, are of opinion that Berenger denied only the doctrine of Transubstantiation, while he maintained, at the same time, the real presence of the body and blood of Christ in the eucharist; and this opinion will, indeed, appear plausible to such as consider only the declaration he signed in the first council at Rome, to which he was summoned by Gregory

from it before his death, as some of the Romish writers vainly pretend.[a]

XIX. It is not rare to find, in the history of the church, the most trifling objects exciting the warmest and most vehement controversies. Such was the dispute that arose in France, in 1023, between the priests and monks of Limoges, concerning the place that was to be assigned in the public liturgy to Martial, the first bishop of that diocese. One party, headed by Jordan, bishop of Limoges, were for placing him among the confessors, while Hugo, abbot of the monastery of St. Martial, maintained, that the prelate in question was to be ranked among the apostles, and branded, with the opprobrious and heretical title of Ebionites, all such as adhered to the proposal of Jordan. This *momentous* affair was debated, first, in a council holden at Poictiers, in 1023, and in another assembled at Paris the year following; in which latter it was determined that Martial was to be honoured with the title of an apostle, and that all who refused him this eminent rank were to be considered as Ebionites, who, as is well known, confined the number of the apostles to twelve, that they might exclude St. Paul from that sacred order. The decree, however, of this council did not produce the effects that were expected from it; for it exasperated, instead of calming, the zeal and animosity of the contending parties, so that this miserable dispute became daily more general, and spread like a contagion through all the provinces of France. The matter was at length brought before the tribunal of the Roman pontiff, John XIX., who decided it in favour of the monks, and, in a letter addressed to Jordan and the other bishops of the nation, pronounced Martial worthy of the title and honours of an apostle. This decision produced the most substantial and permanent effects: for in a council assembled at Limoges, in 1029, Jordan declared his acquiescence in the papal sentence; in a provincial council at Bourges, two years after, Martial was associated to the company of the apostles with great solemnity, in consequence of the decision of the Roman see; and about the same time this controversy was completely and finally terminated in a numerous council convoked at Limoges, in which the prayers that had been consecrated to the memory of the apostle Martial, by the zealous pontiff, were publicly recited.[b] The warm contenders for the apostleship of Martial asserted,

VII. and which he never retracted, without comparing this declaration with the rest of his writings. On the other hand, Usher, Basnage, and almost all the writers of the reformed church, maintain, that the doctrine of Berenger was exactly the same with that which Calvin afterwards adopted; and I cannot help joining with them in this opinion, when I peruse attentively the following words of his Letter to Almannus, published in Martenne's Thesaur. tom. iv. "Constat," says Berenger in express terms, "verum Christi corpus in ipsâ mensâ proponi, *sed spiritualiter interiori homini verum* in eâ Christi corpus ab his duntaxat, qui Christi membra sunt, incorruptum, intaminatum, inattritumque *spiritualiter manducari.*" These words demonstrate so clearly, that, by the *presence of* Christ's body in the eucharist, Berenger meant no more than a *spiritual presence*, as to dispel all doubt about his real sentiments, though, upon other occasions, he concealed these sentiments under dubious expressions, to deceive his adversaries.

[a] It is well known what laborious efforts the Roman catholic writers have employed to persuade us, that Berenger, before his death, abandoned the opinion he had so long and so warmly defended, and returned to the doctrine of the church of Rome concerning the corporal presence of Christ in the eucharist. But when we inquire into the reasons on which this assertion is founded, we shall immediately perceive their weakness and insufficiency. They allege, in the first place, that Berenger gave an account of his doctrine and belief in the council of Bourdeaux, in 1087; and add to this, that the ancient writers applaud his penitential sentiments, and affirm that he died in the catholic faith. In all this, however, we see no proof of Berenger's retraction. He adhered, indeed, to the confession of faith, which he had subscribed and adopted in the first of the two Roman councils, to which he had been summoned by Gregory, and which that pontiff judged sufficient to clear him from the imputation of heresy; and they who confined their attention to the *literal sense* of the words of that confession, without considering their *spirit*, and the different meanings of which they were susceptible, might easily imagine that Berenger's confession was agreeable to the doctrine of the church. Gregory, in order to pacify matters, confirmed them in this notion; and though he was well informed of Berenger's having retracted the confession which he had signed in the last Roman council before which he appeared, and of his opposing, with the utmost warmth, the opinion he had there so solemnly professed, yet he suffered the inconstant doctor to remain unmolested, and thereby tacitly acquitted him of the crime and the error that were laid to his charge.

It is of the utmost importance to observe here, that the Roman church had not come in this century, to a fixed determination concerning the nature and manner of Christ's presence in the eucharist. This appears most evidently from the three confessions which Berenger signed by the order of three councils; which confessions differed from each other, not only in the terms and the turn of expression, but also in the opinions and doctrines they contained. Pope Nicolas II. and the council he assembled at Rome, in 1059, obliged him to subscribe, as the true and orthodox doctrine of the church, the first of these confessions, or that which cardinal Humbert had composed. This confession was, however, rejected, not only as harsh in point of expression, but also as erroneous and unsound, by Gregory and the two Roman councils, which he had expressly summoned to inquire into that matter; for, had Humbert's declaration appeared to the pontiff to be a just expression of the doctrine and sense of the church concerning the eucharist, neither he nor the succeeding councils would have permitted other forms of doctrine to be substituted in its place. Gregory, as we have already seen, was of opinion, that it was highly improper to pry with too much curiosity into the mysteries of the eucharist, and that, laying aside all disputes concerning the manner of Christ's presence in that holy institution, it was safest to adhere to the plain words of Scripture; and as this was also the opinion of Berenger, and was plainly expressed in his confession of faith, the judicious pontiff pronounced him innocent. But a following council departed from this equitable sentence of Gregory, who, though with much reluctance, was induced to confirm their rigorous decision; and hence arose a third confession, which was extremely different from the two preceding ones. We may remark, by the bye, that in this controversy the councils seem plainly to have swayed the pontiffs, since we see the obstinate, the invincible Gregory, yielding, against his will, to one of these clamorous assemblies. Berenger had no sooner gotten out of the hands of his enemies, than he returned to the second confession, which the pontiff had approved, and publicly declaimed against that which had been imposed upon him in the last Roman council before which he had appeared, without receiving the least mark of disapprobation from Gregory. From this it was natural to conclude, that although he opposed the decree of that council, he adopted the opinion of the pope and of the church.

In the account which I have here given of this memorable controversy, I have not only consulted the ancient records relating to that matter, which have been made public, (for several of them lie yet in manuscript in the cabinets of the curious,) but have also been assisted by the labours of those among the learned, who have treated that important branch of ecclesiastical history in the most accurate and ample manner: such as, first, Franc. de Roye's book, published at Angers, in 1656; "Ad. Can. Ego Berengarius 41. de consecrat. distinct. 2. Ubi vita, hæresis, et pœnitentia Berengarii Andegavensis Archidiaconi, et ad Josephi locum de Christo," (a book which is extremely curious, and very little known.) Mabillon's Præf. ad tom. ix. Act. SS. ord. Bened. seu Sæc. VI. part ii. p. 4. et Dissert. de multiplici damnatione, fidei professione et lapsu, which is published in his Analecta veteris Ævi, tom. ii. p. 456. De Boulay, Histor. Acad. Paris. tom. i. p. 404. tom. ii. p. 452. The authors of the reformed church, whom I have followed in this controversy, are, archbishop Usher, de Successione Ecclesiar. Christianar. in occidente, cap. vii. sect. 24. p. 195. Basnage, Hist. des Eglises Reformées, tom. i. p. 105, and Hist. de l'Eglise, tom. ii. p. 1391.—Cas. Oudin, Dissert. de Doctrinâ et Scriptis Berengarii in Comment. de Scriptor. Ecclesiast. tom. ii. p. 624. There appears, more or less, a certain spirit of partiality in all these writers; but this spirit is particularly notorious among those of the church of Rome.

[b] See Boulay, tom. i. p. 372, 101.—J. Longueval, Histoire de l'Eglise Gallicane, tom. vii. p. 188, 189, 231.—The Benedictine monks, in their Gallia Christiana, tom. ii. Append. Documentor. p. 162, have published the letter of Jordan to Pope Benedict VIII. against the Apostleship of Martial. The decrees of the councils of Bourges and Limoges concerning this matter are published by Labbe, in his Biblioth. Nova Manuscriptor. tom. ii. p. 766. Mabillon has given an ample account of Ademar, a monk of St. Cybar, the first promoter of this ridiculous controversy, in his Annal. Ord. S. Benedict. tom. iv. p. 318, and, among the original papers subjoined to that volume, has published a letter written by that monk in favour of the apostleship of Martial. See also the Histoire Literaire de la France, tom. vii. p. 301.

that he was one of the seventy disciples of Christ; whence they concluded, that he had an equal title with Paul and Barnabas to the honour of an apostle.

CHAPTER IV.

Concerning the Rites and Ceremonies used in the Church during this Century.

I. THE form of public worship, which was established at Rome, had not yet been received in all the western provinces. This was looked upon by the imperious pontiffs as an insult upon their authority, and therefore they used their utmost efforts to introduce universally the Roman ceremonies, and to promote a perfect uniformity of worship in every part of the Latin world. Gregory VII. employed all his diligence, activity, and zeal, in this enterprise, as appears from several passages in his letters; and he alone, perhaps, was equal to the execution of such an arduous attempt. The Spaniards had long distinguished themselves above all other nations, by their noble and resolute resistance to the despotic attempts of the popes upon this occasion; for they adhered to their ancient Gothic liturgy[a] with great obstinacy, and could not be brought to change it for the method of worship established at Rome. Alexander II. had indeed proceeded so far, in 1068, as to persuade the inhabitants of Arragon into his measures,[b] and to conquer the aversion which the Catalonians had discovered for the Roman worship. But the honour of finishing this difficult work, and bringing it to perfection, was reserved for Gregory, who, without interruption, exhorted, threatened, admonished, and entreated Sanchez and Alphonso, the kings of Arragon and Castile, until, fatigued with the importunity of this restless pontiff, they consented to abolish the Gothic service in their churches, and to introduce the Roman in its place. Sanchez was the first who complied with the request of the pontiff; and, in 1080, his example was followed by Alphonso. The methods which the nobles of Castile employed to decide the matter were very extraordinary. First, they chose two champions, who were to determine the controversy by single combat, the one fighting for the Roman liturgy, the other for the Gothic. This first trial ended in favour of the latter; for the Gothic hero proved victorious. Recourse was next had to the fiery trial for the decision of the dispute: the Roman and Gothic liturgies were committed to the flames, which, as the story goes, consumed the former, while the latter remained unblemished and entire. Thus were the Gothic rites crowned with a double victory, which, however, was not sufficient to maintain them against the authority of the pope, and the influence of the queen Constantia, who determined Alphonso in favour of the Roman service.[c]

II. The zeal of the Roman pontiffs for introducing uniformity of worship into the western churches may be, in some measure, justified; but their not permitting every nation to celebrate divine worship in their mother tongue was absolutely inexcusable. While, indeed, the Latin language was in general use amongst the western nations, or at least, was unknown only to a very small number there was no reason why it should not be employed in the public service of the church. But when the decline of the Roman empire drew on by degrees the extinction of its language in several places, and its decay in all the western provinces, it became just and reasonable that each people should serve the Deity in the language they understood, and which was peculiar to them. This reasoning, however evident and striking, had no sort of influence upon the Roman pontiffs, who, neither in this nor in the following centuries, could be persuaded to change the established custom, but persisted, on the contrary, with the most senseless obstinacy, in retaining the use of the Latin language in the celebration of divine worship, even when it was no longer understood by the people.[d] This strange conduct has been variously accounted for by different writers, who have tortured their inventions to find out its secret reasons, and have imagined many that seem extremely improbable and far-fetched. A superstitious and extravagant veneration for whatever carried the hoary aspect of a remote antiquity, was undoubtedly the principal reason that rendered the pontiffs unwilling to abolish the use of the Latin language in the celebration of divine worship. The same absurd principle produced a similar effect in the eastern churches; thus the Egyptian Christians perform their religious service in the language of the ancient Copts, the Jacobites and the Nestorians in the Syriac, and the Abyssinians in the old Ethiopic, though all these languages have been long since obsolete, and are consequently unintelligible to the multitude.[e]

III. It would be tedious to enumerate, in a circumstantial manner, the new inventions that were imposed upon Christians, in this century, under the specious titles of piety and zeal, by the superstitious despotism of an imperious clergy. It is also unnecessary to mention the additions that were made to former inventions, the multiplication, for example, of the rites and ceremonies that were used in the worship of saints, relics, and images, and the new directions that were administered to such as undertook pilgrimages, or other superstitious services of that nature. We shall only observe, that during the whole of this century, all the European nations were most diligently employed in rebuilding, repairing, and adorning their churches.[f] Nor will this appear surprising, when we consider, that, in the preceding century, all Europe was alarmed with a dismal apprehension that the day of judgment was at hand, and that the world was approaching to its final dissolution; for, among the other effects of this panic terror, the churches and monasteries were suffered to fall into ruin, or at least to remain without repair, from an idea that they would soon be involved in the general fate of all sublunary things. But, when these apprehensions were removed, affairs immediately assumed a new aspect; the tottering temples were rebuilt; and the greatest zeal, attended with the richest and most liberal donations, was employed in restoring the sacred edifices to their former lustre, or rather in giving them new degrees o magnificence and beauty.

---

[a] See Mabillon, de Liturgiâ Gallicanâ, lib. i. cap. ii. p. 10.—Jo. Bona, Res Liturg. lib. i. cap. xi. p. 220, op.—Pet. Le Brun, Explication des Ceremonies de la Messe, tom. ii. Diss. v. p. 272.

[b] Pet. de Marca, Histoire de Bearn, liv. ii. cap. ix.

[c] Bona, Res Liturg. lib. i. cap. xi. p. 216.—Le Brun, tom. ii. p. 292.—Jo. de Ferreras, Historia de Espana, tom. iii.

[d] Usserii Historia Dogmatica de Scripturis et Sacris Vernaculis, ab Hen. Whartono edita et aucta, Londini, 1690, in 4to.

[e] See Euseb. Renaudot, Dissertat. de Liturgiarum Orientalium origine et antiquitate, cap. vi. p. 40.

[f] Glab. Rodolph. Hist. lib. iii. cap. iv. in Duchesne's Scriptor. Franc. tom. iv. p. 217. "Infra millesimum tertio jam fere imminente anno con-

CHAPTER V.

Concerning the Divisions and Heresies that troubled the Church during this Century.

I. THE state of the ancient sects, and particularly of the Nestorians and Monophysites, who resided in Asia and Egypt, under the Mohammedan government, was now much the same as it had been in the preceding century, neither extremely prosperous, nor absolutely miserable. The case of the Manichæans, or Paulicians, whom the Grecian emperors had banished from the eastern provinces into Bulgaria and Thrace, was much more unhappy on account of the perpetual conflicts they had to sustain with the Greeks, who persecuted and oppressed them with much keenness and animosity. The Greeks, as usually happens on the like occasions, laid the blame of their violent measures upon the Manichæans, whom they represented as a turbulent, perfidious, and sanguinary faction, and as the declared and inveterate enemies of the Grecian empire.[a] This, however, is by no means to be received as an impartial state of the case; at least, it appears from many circumstances, that, if the Manichæans were exasperated against the Greeks, their resentment was in some measure justified by the violent and injurious treatment which they had received from them. The Grecian pontiffs and clergy were far from being destitute of the odious spirit of persecution; and it is certain that the emperors, instigated by them, had exhausted the patience of the Paulicians by repeated vexations and cruelties, and alienated their affections by inflicting upon them, without interruption, a variety of punishments, such as banishment, confiscation of goods, and other marks of severity and violence.

Alexias Comnenus, who, by his learning, was an ornament to the imperial sceptre, perceiving that the Manichæans were not to be vanquished, without the greatest difficulty, by the force of arms, and observing also that their numbers increased from day to day both in Thrace and in the adjacent provinces, had recourse to the power of reason and argument to conquer their obstinacy, and spent whole days at Philippopolis, in disputing with the principal doctors of that pernicious sect. Many of them yielded to the victorious arguments of this royal disputant, and his learned associates; nor is this to be wondered at, since their demonstrations were accompanied and enforced by rewards and punishments. Such of the Manichæans as retracted their errors, and returned to the bosom of the Greek church, were loaded with gifts, honours, and privileges, according to their respective stations, while such as stood firm against the reasoning of the emperor, were inhumanly condemned to perpetual imprisonment.[b]

II. Many of the Paulicians, either from a principle of zeal for the propagation of their opinions, or from a desire of relieving themselves from the persecution and oppression they suffered under the Grecian yoke, retired from Bulgaria and Thrace, and formed settlements in other countries. Their first migration was into Italy; whence, in process of time, they sent colonies into almost all the other provinces of Europe, and formed gradually a considerable number of religious assemblies, who adhered to their doctrine, and were afterwards persecuted with the utmost vehemence by the Roman pontiffs.[c] It is difficult to fix the precise period when the Paulicians began to take refuge in Europe; it is, however, certain, from the most authentic testimonies, that a considerable number of that sect were, about the middle of this century, settled in Lombardy, Insubria, and principally at Milan, and that many of them led a wandering life in France, Germany, and other countries, where they captivated the esteem and admiration of the multitude, by their sanctimonious looks, and the uncommon air of piety, which they put on with much affectation. In Italy they were called Paterini and Cathari, or rather Gazari, which latter appellation the Germans have preserved, with a small alteration only, which was proper to adapt it to the genius of their language.[d] In France they were called Albigenses[e] from the town of Albi, and Bulgarians because they came from Bulgaria, and because the head of their sect resided in that country; as also *Publicans*, which was probably a corrupt pronunciation of *Paulicians*, and *boni homines*, or 'good men,' with several other titles and epithets.[f]

---

tigit in universo pene terrarum orbe, præcipue tamen in Italiâ et in Galliis, innovari ecclesiarum basilicas."

[a] See the Alexias of Anna Comnena, lib. v. p. 105; lib. vi. p. 124, 145.

[b] There is an ample and circumstantial account of this controversy between the emperor and the Manichæans in the work mentioned in the preceding note, lib. xiv. p. 357.

[c] See Muratori, Antiquitat. Ital. medii Ævi, tom. v. p. 83.—Limborch, Historia Inquisitionis, p. 31.—Riccinii Dissertatio de Catharis, prefixed to the Summa B. Monetæ contra Catharos. We might also refer, upon this occasion, to Glab. Rodulph. Histor. lib. iii. cap. viii. to Matth. Paris, and other ancient writers. Certain Italian authors, and among others Riccini, seem unwilling to acknowledge that the Paulicians arrived first in Italy, and proceeded thence into the other provinces of Europe; and maintain, on the contrary, that their first settlement was in France, whence they repaired to Italy. These writers look upon it as ignominious to their country, to be considered as the first European nation which fostered such a pernicious and impious sect in its bosom. Be that as it may, their hypothesis is favoured by Peter de Marca himself, a Frenchman, who, in his Histoire de Bearn, livr. viii. cap. xiv. declares it as his opinion, that the Paulicians joined themselves to the Gallic armies that returned from the holy war by the province of Bulgaria, and were thus conducted into France. But that learned author alleges no proof to support this opinion: it appears, on the contrary, from the records of the Inquisition of Toulouse, published by Limborch, and from other authentic pieces, that the Paulicians settled first in Sicily, Lombardy, Liguria, and the Milanese, and thence sent many doctors and missionaries into France. See the Codex Tolosanus, passim. We learn also from the Code of Toulouse, that the French Paulicians, who were called Albigenses, had no bishop to consecrate their *Anciani*, (such was the title they gave to their presbyters,) so that such of them as were desirous of being placed in the order of presbyters, were obliged to repair to Italy, in order to their being regularly installed.

[d] The title of Paterini, which was given to this sect in Italy, has been already explained in the second chapter of the second part of this century, sect. 13, note [c.] As to the term Catharus, it was undoubtedly, when applied to the Paulicians, the same with Gazarus, as I have elsewhere demonstrated. See Histor. Ord. Apostol. p. 367. The country which bore, in this century, the name of Gazaria, was what we now call the Minor Tartary.

[e] That the Paulicians were called Albigenses in France, and were a sect entirely distinct from the Waldenses and other heretics, appears evidently from the Codex Inquisitionis Tolosanæ. They received this name from a town in Aquitaine, called Albigia, or Albi, where their errors were condemned in a council which met in 1176. See Chatel's Memoires de l'Histoire de Languedoc, p. 305. It is, therefore, a mistake to consider the Albigenses as a sect so called from Albi's being the place of their birth, their residence, or the seat of their principal assembly, since that name was given them for no other reason than their having been condemned in a council holden in that town. There were, indeed, several Paulicians among the various sects of dissenters from the church of Rome, that inhabited the country about Albi; and it is also true, that the title of Albigenses is usually extended to all the heretics, of whatever sect or denomination they were, who dwelt in those parts.

[f] The learned Du Fresne, in his Glossarium Latin. medii Ævi, tom. i. p. 1338, has proved, in an ample manner, that the Paulicians were called in France Bulgares, and (by a corrupt pronunciation of that word) Bougres. The same author, in his Observationes ad Villeharduini Histo-

THE TWELFTH CENTURY.

PART I.

THE EXTERNAL HISTORY OF THE CHURCH.

CHAPTER I.

Concerning the prosperous Events that happened to the Church, during this Century.

I. A CONSIDERABLE part of Europe lay yet involved in pagan darkness, which reigned more especially in the northern provinces. It was, therefore, in these regions of gloomy superstition, that the zeal of the missionaries was principally exerted in this century; though their efforts were not all equally successful, nor the methods they employed for the propagation of the Gospel equally prudent. Boleslaus, duke of Poland, having conquered the Pomeranians, offered them peace, upon condition that they would receive the Christian teachers, and permit them to exercise their ministry in that vanquished province. This condition was accepted; and Otho, bishop of Bamberg, a man of eminent piety and zeal, was sent, in the year 1124, to inculcate and explain the doctrines of Christianity, among that superstitious and barbarous people. Many were converted to the faith by his ministry, while great numbers stood firm against his most vigorous efforts, and persisted, with an invincible obstinacy, in the religion of their idolatrous ancestors. Nor was this the only mortification which that illustrious prelate received, in the execution of his pious enterprise; for, upon his return into Germany, many of those whom he had engaged in the profession of Christianity, apostatized in his absence, and relapsed into their ancient prejudices: this obliged Otho to undertake a second voyage into Pomerania, A. D. 1126, in which, after much opposition and difficulty, his labours were crowned with a happier issue, and contributed much to enlarge the bounds of the rising church, and to establish it upon solid foundations.[a] From this period, the Christian religion seemed daily to acquire new degrees of stability among the Pomeranians, who had hitherto refused to permit the settlement of a bishop among them. They now received Adalbert, or Albert, in that character, who was accordingly the first bishop of Pomerania.

II. Of all the northern princes of this century, none appeared with a more distinguished lustre than Waldemar I., king of Denmark, who acquired an immortal name by the glorious battles he fought against the pagan nations, such as the Sclavonians, Venedi, Vandals, and others, who either by their incursions or by revolt, drew upon them the weight of his victorious arm. He unsheathed his sword, not only for the defence and happiness of his people, but also for the propagation and advancement of Christianity; and wherever his arms were successful, he pulled down the temples and images of the gods, destroyed their altars, laid waste their sacred groves, and substituted in their place the Christian worship, which deserved to be propagated by better means than the sword, by the authority of reason, rather than by the despotic voice of power. The island of Rugen, which lies in the neighbourhood of Pomerania, submitted to the victorious arms of Waldemar, A. D. 1168; and its fierce and savage inhabitants, who were, in reality, no more than a band of robbers and pirates, were obliged, by that prince, to hear the instructions of the pious and learned doctors that followed his army, and to receive the Christian worship. This salutary work was brought to perfection by Absalom, archbishop of Lunden, a man of a superior genius, and of a most excellent character in every respect, whose eminent merit raised him to the summit of power, and engaged Waldemar to place him at the head of affairs.[b]

III. The Finlanders received the Gospel in the same manner in which it had been propagated among the inhabitants of the isle of Rugen. They were also a fierce and savage people, who lived by plunder, and infested Sweden in a terrible manner by their perpetual incursions, until, after many bloody battles, they were totally defeated by Eric IX., styled after his death the Saint, and reduced under the Swedish yoke. Historians differ about the precise time when this conquest was completed;[c] but they are all unanimous in their accounts of its effects. The Finlanders were commanded to embrace the religion of the conqueror, which the greatest part of them did, though with the utmost reluctance.[d] The founder (and ruler) of this new church was Henry, archbishop of Upsal, who accompanied the victorious monarch in that bloody campaign. This prelate, whose zeal was not sufficiently tempered with the mild and gentle spirit of the

[a] See Henr. Canisii Lectiones Antiquæ, tom. iii. part ii. p. 34, where we find the life of Otho, who, A. D. 1189, was canonized by Clement III. See the Acta Sanctor. Mensis Julii, tom. i. p. 349. Dan. Crameri Chronicon Eccles. Pomeraniæ, lib. i. as also a learned Dissertation concerning the conversion of the Pomeranians by the ministry of Otho, written in the German language, by Christopher Schotgen, and published at Stargard, in the year 1724. Add to these Mabillon, Annal. Benedict. tom. vi. p. 123, 146, 323.

[b] Saxo-Grammaticus, Histor. Danic. lib. xiv. p. 239.—Helmoldus, Chron. Sclavorum, lib. ii. cap. xii. p. 234, and Henr. Bangertus, ad h. l. —Pontoppidani Annales Ecclesiæ Danicæ, tom. i. p. 404.

☞ Beside the historians here mentioned by Dr. Mosheim, we refer the curious reader to an excellent history of Denmark, written in French, by M. Mallet, professor at Copenhagen. In the first volume of this history, the ingenious and learned author has given a very interesting account of the progress of Christianity in the northern parts of Europe, and a particular relation of the exploits of Absalom, who was, at the same time, archbishop, general, admiral, and prime minister, and who led the victorious Danes to battle, by sea and land, without neglecting the cure of souls, or in the least diminishing his pious labours in the propagation of the Gospel abroad, and its maintenance and support at home.

[c] Most writers, with Baronius, place this event in the year 1151. Different, however, from this is the chronology of Vastovius and Oernhielmius, the former placing it in 1150, and the latter in 1157.

[d] Oernhielmii Histor. Eccles. Gentis Suecorum, lib. iv. cap. iv. sect. 13.—Jo. Loccenii Histor. Suecica, lib. iii. p. 76, ed. Francof.—Erlandi Vita Erici Sancti, cap. vii.—Vastovii Vitis Aquilonia, p. 65.

religion he taught, treated the new converts with great severity, and was assassinated at last, in a cruel manner, on account of the heavy penance he imposed upon a person of great authority, who had been guilty of homicide. This melancholy event procured Henry the honours of saintship and martyrdom, which were solemnly conferred upon him by pope Adrian IV.[a]

IV. The propagation of the Gospel among the Livonians was attended with much difficulty, and also with horrible scenes of cruelty and bloodshed. The first missionary, who attempted the conversion of that savage people, was Mainhard, a regular canon of St. Augustin, in the monastery of Segeberg, who, toward the conclusion of this century,[b] travelled to Livonia, with a company of merchants of Bremen, and improved this opportunity of spreading the light of the Gospel in that barbarous region of superstition and darkness. The instructions and exhortations of this zealous apostle were little attended to, and produced little or no effect upon that uncivilized nation; whereupon he addressed himself to the Roman pontiff, Urban III., who consecrated him bishop of the Livonians, and, at the same time, declared a holy war against that obstinate people. This war, which was at first carried on against the inhabitants of the province of Esthonia, was continued with still greater vigour, and rendered more general, by Berthold, abbot of Lucca, who left his monastery to share the labours and laurels of Mainhard, whom he accordingly succeeded in the see of Livonia. The new bishop marched into that province at the head of a powerful army which he had raised in Saxony, preached the Gospel sword in hand, and proved its truth by blows instead of arguments. Albert, canon of Bremen, became the third bishop of Livonia, and followed, with a barbarous enthusiasm, the same military methods of conversion that had been practised by his predecessor. He entered Livonia, A. D. 1198, with a fresh body of troops drawn out of Saxony, and, encamping at Riga, instituted there, by the direction of pope Innocent III., the military order of the knight's sword-bearers,[c] who were commissioned to dragoon the Livonians into the profession of Christianity, and oblige them by force of arms to receive the benefits of baptism.[d] New legions were sent from Germany to second the efforts, and add efficacy to the mission of these booted apostles; and they, in concert with the knights sword-bearers, so cruelly oppressed, slaughtered, and tormented this wretched people, that, exhausted at length, and unable longer to stand firm against the arm of persecution, strengthened still by new accessions of power, they abandoned the statues of their pagan deities, and substituted in their places the images of the saints. But, while they received the blessings of the Gospel, they were deprived of all earthly comforts; for their lands and possessions were taken from them, with the most odious circumstances of cruelty and violence, and the knights and bishops divided the spoil.[e]

V. None of the northern nations had a more rooted aversion to the Christians, or a more obstinate antipathy to their religion, than the Sclavonians, a rough and barbarous people, who inhabited the coast of the Baltic sea. This excited the zeal of several neighbouring princes, and of a multitude of pious missionaries, who united their efforts, in order to conquer the prejudices of this people and to open their eyes upon the light of the Gospel. Henry, duke of Saxony, surnamed the Lion, distinguished himself in a particular manner, by the ardour which he discovered in the execution of this pious design, as well as by the wise methods he employed to render it successful. Among other measures that were proper for this purpose, he restored from their ruins, and endowed richly, three bishopricks[f] that had been ravaged and destroyed by these barbarians, namely, the bishopricks of Ratzburg and Schwerin, and that of Oldenburg, which was afterwards transplanted to Lubeck. The most eminent of the Christian doctors, who attempted the conversion of the Sclavonians, was Vicelinus, a native of Hamelen, a man of extraordinary merit, who surpassed almost all his contemporaries in genuine piety and solid learning, and who, after having presided many years in the society of the regular canons of St. Augustin at Falderen, was at length consecrated bishop of Oldenburg. This excellent man employed the last thirty years of his life,[g] amidst numberless vexations, dangers, and difficulties, in instructing the Sclavonians, and exhorting them to comply with the invitations of the Gospel of Christ; and, as his pious labours were directed by true wisdom, and carried on with the most indefatigable industry and zeal, so were they attended with much fruit, even among that fierce and intractable people. Nor was his ministry among the Sclavonians the only circumstance that redounds to the honour of his memory; the history of his life and actions in general furnishes proofs of his piety and zeal, sufficient to transmit his name to the latest generations.[h]

VI. It is needless to repeat here the observation we have so often had occasion to make upon such conversions as these, or to intimate to the reader that the savage nations, who were thus dragooned into the church, became the disciples of Christ, not so much in reality, as in outward appearance. [☞They professed, with an inward reluctance, a religion which was inculcated by violence and bloodshed, which recalled to their remembrance no-

[a] Vastovii Vitis Aquilon. seu Vitæ Sanctorum Regni Sucogothici, p. 62. Eric. Benzelii Monumenta Ecclesiæ Sueogothicæ, part i. p. 33.

[b] In the year 1186.

[c] Equestris Ordo Militum Ensiferorum.

[d] See Henr. Leonardi Schurtzfleischii Historia Ordinis Ensiferorum Equitum, Wittenberg. 1701, 8vo.

[e] See the Origines Livoniæ, seu Chronicon vetus Livonicum, published in folio, at Francfort, in the year 1740, by Jo. Daniel Gruberus, and enriched with ample and learned observations and notes, in which the laborious author enumerates all the writers of the Livonian history, and corrects their mistakes.

☞[f] Dr. Mosheim's account of this matter is very different from that which is given by Fleury, who asserts, that it was Hartwick, archbishop of Bremen, who restored the three ruined sees, and consecrated Vicelinus bishop of Oldenburg; and that, as he had done this without addressing himself to Henry, the duke seized the tithes of Vicelinus, until a reconciliation was afterwards brought about between the offended prince and the worthy bishop. See Fleury, Hist. Eccles. liv. lxix. p. 665, 668. edit. Bruxelles. Fleury, in this and other parts of his history, shows, that he is but indifferently acquainted with the history of Germany, and has not drawn from the best sources. The authorities which Dr. Mosheim produces for his account of the affair, are the Origines Guelphicæ, tom. iii. p. 16, 19, 34, 55, 61, 63, 72, 82, with the celebrated preface of Scheidius, sect. xiv. p. 41. Ludewig's Reliquiæ Manuscriptorum, tom. vi. p. 230. Jo. Ern. de Westphalen, Monumenta inedita Rerum Cimbricarum et Megapolens. tom. ii. p. 1998.

[g] That is, from the year 1124 to the year 1154, in which he died.

[h] There is a particular and ample account of Vicelinus in the Cimbria Literata of Mollerus, tom ii. p. 910, and in the Res Hamburg. of Lambecius, lib. ii. p. 12. See also upon this subject the Origines Neomonaster. et Bordesholmens. of the most learned and industrious Joh. Ern. de Westphalen, which are published in the second tome of the Monumenta inedita Cimbrica, p. 2344, and the Preface to this tome, p. 33. There is in this work a print of Vicelinus well engraven.

thing but scenes of desolation and misery; and which, indeed, when considered in the representations that were given of it by the greatest part of the missionaries, was but a few degrees removed from the absurdities of paganism.] The pure and rational religion of the Gospel was never presented to these unhappy nations in its native simplicity; they were only taught to appease the Deity, and to render him propitious, by a senseless round of trifling ceremonies and bodily exercises, which, in many circumstances, resembled the superstitions they were obliged to renounce, and might have been easily reconciled with them, had it not been that the name and history of Christ, the sign of the cross, and some diversity between certain rites and ceremonies of the two religions, opposed this coalition. Besides, the missionaries, whose zeal for imposing the name of Christians upon this people was so vehement and even furious, were extremely indulgent in all other respects, and opposed their prejudices and vices with much gentleness and forbearance. They permitted them to retain several rites and observances that were in direct opposition to the spirit of Christianity, and to the nature of true piety. The truth of the matter seems to have been this, that the leading views of these Christian heralds, and propagators of the faith, a smaller number excepted, were rather turned toward the advancement of their own interests, and the confirming and extending the dominion of the Roman pontiffs, than toward the true conversion of these savage Pagans; that conversion which consists in the removal of ignorance, the correction of error, and the reformation of vice.

VII. A great revolution in Asiatic Tartary, which borders upon Cathay, changed the face of things in that distant region about the commencement of this century, and proved, by its effects, extremely beneficial to the Christian cause. Toward the conclusion of the preceding century, died Koiremkhan, otherwise called Kenkhan, the most powerful monarch that was known in the eastern regions of Asia; and, while that mighty kingdom was deprived of its chief, it was invaded with such uncommon valour and success, by a Nestorian priest, whose name was John, that it fell before his victorious arms, and acknowledged this warlike and enterprising presbyter as its monarch. This was the famous Prester John, (as he was called,) whose territory was, for a long time, considered by the Europeans as a second paradise, as the seat of opulence and complete felicity. As he was a presbyter before his elevation to the royal dignity, many continued to call him Presbyter John, even when he was seated on the throne;[a] but his kingly name was Unkhan. The high notions which the Greeks and Latins generally entertained of the grandeur and magnificence of this royal presbyter, were principally produced by the letters he wrote to the Roman emperor, Frederick I., and to Emanuel, emperor of the Greeks, in which, puffed up with prosperity, and flushed with success, he vaunted his victories over the neighbouring nations that disputed his passage to the throne; described, in the most pompous and extravagant terms, the splendour of his riches, the grandeur of his state, and the extent of his dominions; and exalted himself far above all other earthly monarchs All this was easily believed; and the Nestorians were extremely zealous in confirming the boasts of their vain glorious prince. He was succeeded by his son, or, as others think, his brother, whose name was David, though, in common discourse, he was also called Prester John, as his predecessor had been. The reign of David was far from being happy, nor did he end his days in peace; Genghiz Khan, the great and warlike emperor of the Tartars, invaded his territories toward the conclusion of this century, and deprived him both of his life and his dominions.

VIII. The new kingdom of Jerusalem, which had been erected by the holy warriors of France, near the close of the preceding century, seemed to flourish considerably at the beginning of this, and to rest upon firm and solid foundations. This prosperous scene was, however, but transitory, and was soon succeeded by the most terrible calamities and desolation. For, when the Mohammedans saw vast numbers of those who had engaged in this holy war returning into Europe, and the Christian chiefs that remained in Palestine divided into factions, and every one advancing his private interest, without any regard to the public good, they resumed their courage, recovered from the terror and consternation into which they had been thrown by the amazing valour and rapid success of the European legions, and, gathering troops and soliciting succours from all quarters, they harassed and exhausted the Christians by invasions and wars without interruption. The Christians, on the other hand, sustained these efforts with their usual fortitude, and maintained their ground during many years; but when Atabeck Zenghi,[b] after a long siege, made himself master of the city of Edessa,

[a] The account I have here given of this famous Presbyter, commonly called Prester John, who was, for a long time, considered as the greatest and happiest of all earthly monarchs, is what appeared to me the most probable among the various relations that have been given of the life and adventures of that extraordinary man. This account is moreover confirmed by the testimonies of contemporary writers, whose knowledge and impartiality render them worthy of credit; such as William of Tripoli, (see Dufresne's Adnot. ad Vitam Ludovici Sti. à Joinvillio scriptam, p. 89.) as also a certain bishop of Gabala mentioned by Otto Frising. Chronic. lib. vii. cap. xxxii. See also Guillaume Rubruquis, Voyage, cap. xviii. p. 36, in the Antiqua in Asiam Itinera, collected by father Bergeron, and Alberic in Chronico, ad A. 1165, and 1170, in Leibnitzii Accessionibus Historicis, tom. ii. p. 345, 355. It is indeed surprising, that such authentic records as these should have escaped the observation of the learned, and that so many different opinions should have been advanced concerning Prester John, and the place of his residence. But it is too generally the fate of learned men, to overlook those accounts that carry the plainest marks of evidence, and, from a passion for the marvellous, to plunge into the regions of uncertainty and doubt. In the fifteenth century, John II., king of Portugal, employed Pedro Covilliano in a laborious inquiry into the real situation of the kingdom of Prester John. The curious voyager undertook this task, and, for information in the matter, travelled with a few companions into Abyssinia; and observing in the emperor of the Abyssinians, or Ethiopians, many circumstances that resembled the accounts which, at that time, prevailed in Europe concerning Prester John, he persuaded himself that he had fulfilled his commission, and found out the residence of that extraordinary monarch, who was the object of his researches. His opinion easily gained credit in Europe, which had not yet emerged out of its ignorance and barbarism. See Morinus, de Sacris Eccles. Ordinationibus, part ii. p. 367. But a new light was cast upon this matter in the seventeenth century, by the publication of several pieces, which the industry of the curious drew forth from their obscurity, and by which a great number of learned men were engaged to abandon the Portuguese opinion, and were convinced that Prester John reigned in Asia, though they still continued to dispute about the situation of his kingdom, and other particular circumstances. There are, notwithstanding all this, some men of the most eminent learning in our times, who maintain, that John was emperor of the Abyssinians, and thus prefer the Portuguese opinion, though destitute of authentic proofs and testimonies, to the other above mentioned, though supported by the strongest evidence, and the most unquestionable authorities. See Euseb. Renaudot, Hist. Patriarch. Alexandr. p. 223, 337. Jos. Franc. Lafitau, Hist. des Decouvertes des Portugais, tom. i. p. 58, and tom. iii. p. 57. Henr. le Grand, Dis. de Johanne Presbytero in Lobo's Voyage d'Abyssinie, tome i. p. 295.

[b] Atabeck was a title of honour given by the sultans to the viceroys or

and threatened Antioch with the same fate, their courage began to fail, and a diffidence in their own strength obliged them to turn their eyes once more toward Europe. They accordingly implored, in the most lamentable strain, the assistance of the European princes; and requested that a new army of cross-bearing champions might be sent to support their tottering empire in the Holy Land. Their entreaties were favourably received by the Roman pontiffs, who left no method of persuasion unemployed, that might engage the emperor and other Christian princes to undertake a new expedition into Palestine.

IX. This new expedition was not, however, resolved upon with such unanimity and precipitation as the former had been; it was the subject of long deliberation, and its expediency was keenly debated both in the cabinets of princes, and in the assemblies of the clergy and the people. Bernard, the famous abbot of Clairval, a man of the boldest resolution and of the greatest authority, put an end to those disputes under the pontificate of Eugenius III., who had been his disciple, and who was wholly governed by his counsels. This eloquent and zealous ecclesiastic preached the cross, i. e. the crusade, in France and Germany, with great ardour and success; and in the grand parliament assembled at Vezelai, A. D. 1146, at which Louis VII., king of France, his queen, and a prodigious concourse of the principal nobility, were present, Bernard recommended this holy expedition with such a persuasive power, and declared with such assurance that he had a divine commission to foretell its glorious success, that the king, the queen, and all the nobles, immediately put on the military cross, and prepared themselves for the journey into Palestine. Conrad III. emperor of Germany, was, for some time, unmoved by the exhortations of Bernard; but he was at length gained over by the urgent solicitations of the fervent abbot, and followed the example of the French monarch. The two princes, each at the head of a numerous army, set out for Palestine, to which they were to march by different roads. But, before their arrival in the Holy Land, the greatest part of their forces perished miserably, some by famine, some by the sword of the Mohammedans, some by shipwreck, and a considerable number by the perfidious cruelty of the Greeks, who looked upon the western nations as more to be feared than the infidels themselves. Louis VII. left his kingdom A. D. 1147, and, in the month of March of the following year, he arrived at Antioch, with the wretched remains of his army, dejected and exhausted by a series of hardships. Conrad set out also in the year 1147, in the month of May; and, in November following, he arrived at Nice, where he joined the French army, after having lost the greatest part of his own by calamities of various kinds. From Nice, the two princes proceeded to Jerusalem, A. D. 1148; whence they led back into Europe, the year following, the miserable handful of troops, which had survived the disasters of the expedition. Such was the unhappy issue of this second crusade, which was rendered ineffectual by a variety of causes, but more particularly by the jealousies and divisions that reigned among the Christian chiefs in Palestine. Nor was it more ineffectual in Palestine than it was detrimental to Europe, by draining the wealth of its fairest provinces, and destroying a prodigious number of its inhabitants.[a]

X. The unhappy issue of this second expedition was not, however, sufficient, when considered alone, to render the affairs of the Christians in Palestine entirely desperate. Had their chiefs and princes relinquished their animosities and contentions, and attacked the common enemy with their united force, they would have soon repaired their losses, and recovered their glory. But this was far from being the case. A fatal corruption of sentiments and manners reigned among all ranks and orders. Both the people and their leaders, and more especially the latter, abandoned themselves without reluctance, to all the excesses of ambition, avarice, and injustice; they indulged themselves in the practice of all sorts of vices; and by their intestine quarrels, jealousies, and discords, they weakened their efforts against the enemies that surrounded them, and consumed their strength by thus unhappily dividing it. Saladin viceroy or rather sultan of Egypt and Syria,[b] and the most valiant chief of whom the Mohammedan annals boast, took advantage of these lamentable divisions. He waged war against the Christians with the utmost valour and success; took prisoner Guy of Lusignan, king of Jerusalem, in a fatal battle fought near Tiberias, A. D. 1187; and, in the course of the same year, reduced Jerusalem itself under his dominion.[c] The carnage and desolation that accompanied this dreadful campaign, threw the affairs of the Christians in the east into a deplorable condition, and left them no glimpse of hope, but what arose from the unexpected succours of the European princes. Succours were obtained for them by the Roman pontiffs with much difficulty, in consequence of repeated solicitations and entreaties. But the event, as we shall soon see, was by no means answerable to the deep schemes that were concerted, or to the pains that were employed, for the support of the tottering kingdom of Jerusalem.

XI. The third expedition was undertaken, A. D. 1189, by Frederic I. surnamed Barbarossa, emperor of Germany, who, with a prodigious army, marched through several Grecian provinces, where he had innumerable difficulties and obstacles to overcome, into Asia Minor, whence, after having defeated the sultan of Iconium, he penetrated into Syria. His valour and conduct promised successful and glorious campaigns to the army he commanded, when, by an unhappy accident, he lost his life in the river Saleph,[d] which runs through Seleucia. The manner of his death is not

lieutenants, whom they intrusted with the government of their provinces. The Latin authors, who have written the history of this holy war, and of whom Bongarsius has given us a complete list, call this Atabeck Zenghi, Sanguinus. See Herbelot, Biblioth. Orient. at the word Atabeck, p. 142.

[a] Beside the historians enumerated by Bongarsius, see Mabillon, Annal. Benedict. tom. vi. p. 399, 404, 407, 417, 451. Jac. Gervasii, Histoire de l' Abbé Suger, tom. iii. p. 104, 128, 173, 190, 239. This was the famous Suger, abbot of St. Denys, who had seconded the exhortations of Bernard in favour of the *crusade*, and whom Louis appointed regent of France during his absence. Vertot, Histoire des Chevaliers de Malte, tom. i. p. 86. Joh. Jac. Mascovius, de Rebus Imperii sub Conrado III.

☞ [b] Saladin, so called by the western writers, Salaha'ddin by the Orientals, was no longer vizir or viceroy of Egypt, when he undertook the siege of Jerusalem, but had usurped the sovereign power in that country, and had also added to his dominions, by right of conquest, several provinces of Syria.

[c] See the Life of Saladin by Bohao'ddin Ebn Sheddad, an Arabian writer, whose history of that warlike sultan was published at Leyden in the year 1732, by the late celebrated professor Albert Schultens, and accompanied with an excellent Latin translation. See also Herbelot, Biblioth. Orient. at the article Salah-a'ddin, p. 742, and Marigny's Histoire des Arabes, tome iv. p. 289. ☞ But, above all, see the learned History of the Arabians in the modern part of the Universal History.

☞ [d] Maimbourg, in his Histoire des Croisades, and Marigny, in his Hist. du xii^me^. Siecle, say, that Frederic perished in the Cydnus, a river

known with certainty; the loss, however, of such an able chief dejected the spirits of his troops, so that considerable numbers of them returned into Europe. Those who remained continued the war under the command of Frederic, son of the deceased emperor; but the greatest part of them perished miserably by a pestilential disorder, which raged with extraordinary violence in the camp, and swept off vast numbers every day. The new general died of this terrible disease, A. D. 1191; those who escaped its fury were dispersed, and few returned to their own country.[a]

XII. The example of Frederic Barbarossa was followed, in the year 1190, by Philip Augustus, king of France, and the lion-hearted Richard, king of England. These two monarchs set out from their respective dominions with a considerable number of ships of war and transports;[b] arrived in Palestine in the year 1191, each at the head of a separate army; and were pretty successful in their first encounters with the infidels. After the reduction of the strong city of Acre, or Ptolemais, which had been defended by the Moslems with the most obstinate valour, the French monarch returned into Europe, in the month of July, 1191, leaving, however, a considerable part of the army which he had conducted into Palestine. After his departure the king of England pushed the war with the greatest vigour, gave daily marks of his heroic intrepidity and military skill, and not only defeated Saladin in several engagements, but also made himself master of Jaffa[c] and Cæsarea. Deserted, however, by the French and Italians, and influenced by other motives and considerations of the greatest weight, he concluded, A. D. 1192, with Saladin, a truce of three years, three months, and as many days, and evacuated Palestine with his whole army.[d] Such was the issue of the third expedition against the infidels, which nearly exhausted England, France, and Germany, both of men and money, without bringing any solid advantage, or giving even a favourable turn, to the affairs of the Christians in the Holy Land.

XIII. These bloody wars between the Christians and the Mohammedans gave rise to three famous military orders, whose office it was to destroy the robbers that infested the public roads, to harass the Moslems by perpetual inroads and warlike achievements, to assist the poor and sick pilgrims, whom the devotion of the times conducted to the holy sepulchre, and to perform other services that tended to the general good.[e] The first order was that of the Knights of St. John of Jerusalem, who derived their name, and particularly that of Hospitalers, from an hospital in that city, dedicated to St. John the Baptist, in which certain pious and charitable brethren were constantly employed in relieving and refreshing with necessary supplies the indigent and diseased pilgrims, who were daily arriving at Jerusalem. When this city became the metropolis of a new kingdom, the revenues of the hospital were so highly augmented by the liberality of several princes, and the pious donations of such opulent persons as frequented the holy places, that they far surpassed the wants of those whom they were designed to cherish and relieve. Hence it was that Raymond du Puy, who was the ruler of this charitable house, offered to the king of Jerusalem to make war upon the Mohammedans at his own expense, seconded by his brethren, who served under him in this famous hospital. Baldwin II., to whom this proposal was made, readily accepted it, and the enterprise was solemnly approved and confirmed by the authority of the Roman pontiff. Thus was the world surprised with the strange transformation of a devout fraternity, who had lived remote from the noise and tumult of arms, in the performance of works of charity and mercy, into a valiant and hardy band of warriors. The whole order was upon this occasion divided into three classes: the first contained the knights, or soldiers of illustrious birth, who were to unsheath their swords in the Christian cause; in the second were comprehended the priests, who were to officiate in the churches that belonged to the order; and in the third were the serving brethren, or the soldiers of low condition. This celebrated order gave, upon many occasions, eminent proofs of resolution and valour, and acquired immense opulence by heroic exploits. When Palestine was irrecoverably lost, the knights passed into the isle of Cyprus; they afterwards made themselves masters of the isle of Rhodes, where they maintained themselves for a long time; but, being finally driven thence by the Turks, they received from the emperor Charles V. a grant of the island of Malta.[f]

XIV. Another order, which was entirely of a military nature, was that of the knights templars, so called from a palace, adjoining to the temple of Jerusalem, which was appropriated to their use for a certain time by Baldwin II. The foundations of this order were laid at Jerusalem, in the year 1118, by Hugues des Payens, Geoffrey of St. Aldemar, or of St. Amour, as some will have it, and seven other persons, whose names are unknown; but it was not before the year 1228 that it acquired a proper degree of stability, by being solemnly confirmed in the council of Troyes, and subjected to a rule of discipline drawn up by St. Bernard.[g] These warlike templars were to defend and support the cause of Christianity by force of arms, to have inspection over the public roads, and to protect the pilgrims, who came to visit Jerusalem, against the insults and barbarity of the Moslems. The order flourished for some time, and acquired, by the valour of its knights, immense riches, and an eminent degree of military renown; but, as their prosperity increased, their vices were multiplied, and their arrogance, luxury, and inhuman cruelty, rose at last to such a monstrous height, that their privileges were revoked, and their

of Cilicia. But they are easily to be reconciled with our author, since, according to the descriptions given of the Saleph by several learned geographers, and among others by Roger the Annalist, it appears that the Saleph and the Cydnus were the same river under different names.

[a] See an ample and satisfactory account of this unhappy campaign in the Life of Frederic I. written in German by Henry count Bunau, p. 278, 293, 309.

[b] The learned authors of the Modern Universal History affirm that Philip arrived in Palestine, with a supply of men, money, &c. on board of six ships, whereas Renaudot mentions 100 sail as employed in this expedition. The fleet of Richard consisted of 150 large ships, beside galleys, &c.

[c] More commonly known by the name of Joppa.

[d] Daniel, Histoire de France, tome iii. p. 426.—Rapin Thoyras, Histoire d'Angleterre, tome ii. Regne de Richard Cœur-de-Lion.—Marigny, Histoire des Arabes, tome iv. p. 285.

[e] The writers, who have given the history of these three orders, are enumerated by Jo. Alb. Fabricius, Bibliograph. Antiquar. p. 465; but his enumeration is not complete.

[f] The best and most recent history of this order is that which was composed by Vertot at the request of the knights of Malta; it was first published at Paris, and afterwards at Amsterdam, in five volumes 8vo. in the year 1732. See also Helyot's Hist. des Ordres, tome iii. p. 72.

[g] See Mabillon, Annal. Benedict. tom. vi. p. 159.

order suppressed with the most terrible circumstances of infamy and severity, by a decree of the pope and of the council of Vienne in Dauphiné, as we shall see in the history of the fourteenth century.[a]

XV. The third order resembled the first in this respect, that, though it was a military institution, the care of the poor and relief of the sick were not excluded from the services it prescribed. Its members were distinguished by the title of Teutonic Knights of St. Mary of Jerusalem; and as to its rise, we cannot, with any degree of certainty, trace it farther back than the year 1190, during the siege of Acre, or Ptolemais, though there are historians adventurous enough to seek its origin (which they place at Jerusalem) in a more remote period. During the long and tedious siege of Acre, several pious and charitable merchants of Bremen and Lubeck, moved with compassion at the sight of the miseries which the besiegers suffered in the midst of their success, devoted themselves entirely to the service of the sick and wounded soldiers, and erected a kind of hospital, or tent, where they gave constant attendance to all such unhappy objects as had recourse to their charity. This pious undertaking was so agreeable to the German princes, who were present at this terrible siege, that they thought proper to form a fraternity of German knights to bring it to perfection. Their resolution was highly approved by pope Celestine III., who confirmed the new order by a bull issued on the twenty-third of February, A. D. 1192. This order was entirely appropriated to the Germans; and even of them none were admitted as members of it, but such as were of an illustrious birth. The support of Christianity, the defence of the Holy Land, and the relief of the poor and needy, were the important duties and services to which the Teutonic knights devoted themselves by a solemn vow. Austerity and frugality were the first characteristics of this rising order, and the equestrian garment,[b] bread, and water, were the only rewards which the knights derived from their generous labours. But as, according to the fate of human things, prosperity generates corruption, so it happened that this austerity was of a short duration, and diminished in proportion as the revenues and possessions of the order were augmented. The Teutonic knights, after their retreat from Palestine, made themselves masters of Prussia, Livonia, Courland, and Semigallia; but, in process of time, their victorious arms received several checks; and when the light of the reformation arose upon Germany, they were deprived of the richest provinces which they possessed in that country; though they still retain there a certain portion of their ancient territories.[c]

CHAPTER II.

Concerning the calamitous Events that happened to the Church during this Century.

I. THE progress of Christianity in the west had disarmed its most inveterate enemies, and deprived them of the power of doing much mischief, though they still entertained the same aversion to the disciples of Jesus. The Jews and Pagans were no longer able to oppose the propagation of the Gospel, or to oppress its ministers. Their malignity remained; but their credit and authority were gone. The Jews were accused by the Christians of various crimes, whether real or fictitious we shall not determine; but, instead of attacking their accusers, they were content to defend their own lives, and secure their persons, without daring to give vent to their resentment. Affairs were in a somewhat different state in the northern provinces. The Pagans were yet numerous there in several districts; and wherever they composed the majority, they persecuted the Christians with the utmost barbarity, the most unrelenting and merciless fury.[d] It is true, the Christian kings and princes, who lived in the neighbourhood of these persecuting barbarians, checked by degrees their impetuous rage, and never ceased to harass and weaken them by hostilities and incursions, until at length they subdued them entirely, and deprived them, by force, both of their independence and their superstitions.

II. The writers of this century complain grievously of the inhuman rage with which the Saracens persecuted the Christians in the east; nor can we question the truth of what they relate on the subject of this severe persecution. But they pass over in silence the principal reasons that inflamed the resentment of this fierce people, and voluntarily forget that the Christians were the aggressors in this dreadful war. If we consider the matter with impartiality and candour, the conduct of the Saracens, however barbarous it may have been, will not appear so surprising, particularly when we reflect on the provocations they received. In the first place, they had a right, by the laws of war, to repel by force the violent invasion of their country; and the Christians could not expect, without being chargeable with the most audacious impudence, that a people whom they attacked with a formidable army, and whom, in the fury of their misguided zeal, they massacred without mercy, should receive insults with a tame submission, and give up their lives and possessions without resistance. It must also be confessed, though with sorrow, that the Christians did not content themselves with making war upon the Mohammedans in order to rescue Jerusalem and the holy sepulchre out of their hands, but carried their brutal fury to the greatest length, disgraced their cause by the most detestable crimes, filled the eastern provinces through which they passed with scenes of horror, and made the Saracens feel the terrible effects of their violence and barbarity wherever their arms were successful. Is it then so surprising to see the infidel Saracens committing, by way of reprisal, the same barbarities that the holy warriors had perpetrated without the least provocation? Is there any thing so new and so extraordinary in this, that a people naturally fierce, and exasperated, moreover, by the calamities of a religious war, carried on against them in contradiction to all the dictates of justice and humanity, should

[a] See Matthew Paris, Histor. Major. p. 56, for an account of the commencement of this order. See also Putean, Histoire de l'Ordre Militaire des Templiers, which was republished with considerable additions, at Brussels, in 4to. in the year 1751: and Nic. Gurtleri Historia Templariorum Militum, Amstelodam. 1691, in 8vo.

[b] This garment was a white mantle with a black cross.

[c] See Raymondi Ducklii Histor. Ord. Teutonici, published in folio at Vienna, in 1727.—Chronicon Prussiæ, by Peter Dufburg, published in 4to. at Jena, in the year 1679, by Christoph. Hartknoch.—Helyot. Hist. des Ordres, tome iii. p. 140.—Chronicon Ordinis Teutonici, in Anton. Matthæi Analectis veteris ævi, tom. v. p. 621, 658, ed. nov.—Privilegia Ordinis Teutonici in Petr. à Ludewig Reliquiis Manuscriptor. tom. vi. p. 43.

[d] Helmold, Chronic. Sclavor. lib. i. cap. xxxiv. p. 88, cap. xxxv. p. 89, cap. xl. p. 99.—Lindenbrogii Scriptor. Septentrional. p. 195, 196, 201.—Petri Lambecii Res Hamburg. lib. i. p. 23.

avenge themselves upon the Christians who resided in Palestine, as professing the religion which gave occasion to the war, and attached, of consequence, to the cause of their enemies and invaders?

III. The rapid and amazing victories of the great Genghiz-Khan, emperor of the Tartars, gave an unhappy turn to the affairs of the Christians in the northern parts of Asia, near the close of this century. This warlike prince, who was by birth a Mogul, and whose military exploits raise him in the list of fame above almost all the commanders either of ancient or modern times, rendered his name formidable throughout all Asia, whose most flourishing dynasties fell successively before his victorious arms. David, or Unkhan, who, according to some, was the son, or as others will have it, the brother, but who was certainly the successor, of the famous Prester John, and was himself so called in common discourse, was the first victim that Genghiz sacrificed to his boundless ambition. He invaded his territory, and put to flight his troops in a bloody battle, where David lost, at the same time, his kingdom and his life.[a] The princes, who governed the Turks, Indians, and the province of Cathay, fell, in their turn, before the victorious Tartar, and were all either put to death, or rendered tributary; nor did Genghiz stop here, but proceeding into Persia, India, and Arabia, he overturned the Saracen dominion in those regions, and substituted that of the Tartars in its place.[b] From this period the Christian cause lost much of its authority and credit in the provinces that had been ruled by Prester John and his successor David, and continued to decline and lose ground until it sunk entirely under the weight of oppression, and was succeeded in some places by the errors of the Mohammedan faith, and in others by the superstitions of paganism. We must except, however, in this general account, the kingdom of Tangut, the chief residence of Prester John, in which his posterity, who persevered in the profession of Christianity, maintained, for a long time, a certain sort of tributary dominion, which exhibited, indeed, but a faint shadow of their former grandeur.[c]

[a] The Greek, Latin, and Oriental writers, are far from being agreed concerning the year in which the emperor of the Tartars attacked and defeated Prester John. The greater part of the Latin writers place this event in the year 1202, and consequently in the thirteenth century. But Marcus Paulus Venetus (in his book de Regionibus Orientalibus, lib. i. cap. li. lii. liii.) and other historians whose accounts I have followed as the most probable, place the defeat of this second Prester John in the year 1187. The learned and illustrious Demetrius Cantemir (in his Præf. ad Histor. Imperii Ottomanici, p. 45, tom. i. of the French edition) gives an account of this matter different from the two now mentioned, and affirms, upon the authority of the Arabian writers, that Genghiz did not invade the territories of his neighbours before the year 1214.

[b] See Petit de la Croix, Histoire de Genghiz-Can, p. 120, 121, published in 12mo. at Paris, in the year 1711.—Herbelot, Biblioth. Oriental. at the article Genghiz-Khan, p. 378.—Assemani Biblioth. Oriental. Vatican. tom. iii. part i. p. 101, and 295.—Jean du Plan Carpin, Voyage en Tartarie, ch. v. in the Recueil des Voyages au Nord, tome vii. p. 350.

[c] Assemani Biblioth. Oriental. Vatican, tom. iii. part ii. p. 500.

PART II.

THE INTERNAL HISTORY OF THE CHURCH.

CHAPTER I.

Concerning the State of Letters and Philosophy during this Century.

I. Notwithstanding the decline of the Grecian empire, the calamities in which it was repeatedly involved, and the frequent revolutions and civil wars that consumed its strength, and were precipitating its ruin, the arts and sciences still flourished in Greece, and covered with glory such as cultivated them with assiduity and success. This may be ascribed, not only to the liberality of the emperors, and to the extraordinary zeal which the family of the Comneni discovered for the advancement of learning, but also to the provident vigilance of the patriarchs of Constantinople, who took all possible measures to prevent the clergy from falling into ignorance and sloth, lest the Greek church should thus be deprived of able champions to defend its cause against the Latins. The learned and ingenious commentaries of Eustathius, bishop of Thessalonica, upon Homer and Dionysius the Geographer, are sufficient to show the diligence and labour that were employed by men of the first genius in the improvement of classical erudition, and in the study of antiquity. And if we turn our view toward the various writers who composed in this century the history of their own times, such as Cinnamus, Glycas, Zonaras, Nicephorus, Briennius, and others, we shall find in their productions undoubted marks of learning and genius, as well as of a laudable ambition to obtain the esteem and approbation of future ages.

II. Nothing could equal the zeal and enthusiasm with which Michael Anchialus, patriarch of Constantinople, encouraged the study of philosophy by his munificence, and still more by the extraordinary influence of his illustrious example.[a] It seems, however, to have been the Aristotelian philosophy that was favoured in such a distinguished manner by this eminent prelate; and it was in the illustration and improvement of this profound and intricate system that those Greeks who had a philosophical turn were principally employed, as appears from several remains of ancient erudition, and particularly from the commentaries of Eustratius upon the ethics and other treatises of the Grecian sage. We are not, however, to imagine that the sublime wisdom of Plato was neglected in this century, or that his doctrines had fallen into disrepute. It appears, on the contrary, that they were adopted by many. Such, more especially, as had imbibed the precepts and spirit of the Mystics, preferred them infinitely to the Peripatetic philosophy, which they considered as an endless source of sophistry and presumption, while they looked upon the Platonic system as the philosophy of reason and piety, of candour and virtue. This diversity of sentiment produced the famous controversy, which was managed with such vehemence and erudition among the Greeks, concerning the respective merit and excellence of the Peripatetic and Platonic doctrines.

III. In the western world the pursuit of knowledge was now carried on with incredible emulation and ardour; and all branches of science were studied with the greatest application and industry. This literary enthusiasm was encouraged and supported by the influence and liberality of some of the European monarchs, and Roman pontiffs, who perceived the happy tendency of the sciences to soften the savage manners of uncivilized nations, and thereby to administer an additional support to civil government, as well as an ornament to human society. Hence learned societies were formed, and colleges established, in which the liberal arts and sciences were publicly taught. The prodigious concourse of students, who resorted thither for instruction, occasioned, in process of time, the enlargement of these schools, which had arisen from small beginnings, and their erection into universities, as they were called, in the succeeding age. The principal cities of Europe were adorned with establishments of this kind; but Paris surpassed them all in the number and variety of its schools, the merit and reputation of its public teachers, and the immense multitude of the studious youth that frequented its colleges. And thus was exhibited in that famous city the model of our present schools of learning; a model indeed defective in several respects, but which, in after-times, was corrected and improved, and brought gradually to higher degrees of perfection.[b] About the same time the famous school of Angers, in which the youth were instructed in various sciences, and particularly and principally in the civil law, was founded by the zeal and industry of Ulgerius, bishop of that city;[c] and the college of Montpelier, where law and physic were taught with great success, had already acquired a considerable reputation.[d] The same literary spirit reigned also in Italy. The academy of Bologna, whose origin may be traced higher than this century, was now in the highest renown, and was frequented by great numbers of students, and more especially by such as were desirous of being instructed in the civil and canon laws. The fame of this academy was, in a great measure, established by the munificence of the emperor Lotharius II. who took it under his protection, and enriched it with new privileges and immunities.[e] In the same province flourished also

---

[a] Theodorus Balsamon, Præf. ad Photii Nomocanonem in Henr. Justelli Bibliotheca Juris canonici veteris, tom. ii. p. 814.

[b] Boulay, Hist. Acad. Paris. tom. ii. p. 463.—Pasquier, Recherches de la France, liv. iii. ch. xxix.—Petri Lambecii Histor. Biblioth. Vindobon. lib. ii. cap. v. p. 260.—Histoire Liter. de la France, tome ix. p. 60—80.

[c] Boulay, Hist Acad. Paris, tom. ii. p. 215. Pocquet de la Livoniere. Dissert. sur l'Antiquité de l'Université d'Angers, p. 21. published in 4to. at Angers, 1736.

[d] Histoire Gen. de Languedoc, par les Benedictins, tome ii. p. 517.

[e] The inhabitants of Bologna pretend that their academy was founded in the fifth century by Theodosius II. and they pretend to show the diploma by which that emperor enriched their city with this valuable establishment. But the greatest part of those writers, who have studied with attention and impartiality the records of ancient times, maintain, that this diploma is a spurious production, and allege weighty arguments to prove, that the academy of Bologna is of no older date than the eleventh century, and that in the succeeding age, particularly from the time of Lotharius II. it received those improvements that rendered it so famous throughout all Europe. See Sigonii Historia Bononiensis, as it is published, with learned observations, in the works of that excellent author.—Muratori Antiq. Italic. medii Ævi, tom. ii. p. 23, 884, 839.—Jac.

the celebrated school of Salernum, where great numbers resorted, and which was wholly set apart for the study of physic. While this zealous emulation, in advancing the cause of learning and philosophy, animated so many princes and prelates, and discovered itself in the erection of so many academies and schools of learning, the Roman pontiff, Alexander III. was seized also with noble enthusiasm. In a council holden at Rome, A. D. 1179, he caused a solemn law to be published, for erecting new schools in the monasteries and cathedrals, and restoring to their primitive lustre those which, through the sloth and ignorance of the monks and bishops, had fallen into ruin.[a] But the effect which this law was intended to produce was prevented by the growing fame of the newly erected academies, to which the youth resorted from all parts, and left the episcopal and monastic schools entirely empty; so that they gradually declined, and sunk, at last, into a total oblivion.

IV. Many were the signal advantages that attended these literary establishments; and what is particularly worthy of notice, they not only rendered knowledge more general by facilitating the means of instruction, but were also the occasion of forming a new circle of sciences, better digested, and much more comprehensive than that which had been hitherto studied by the greatest adepts in learning. The whole extent of learning and philosophy, before this period, was confined to the seven liberal arts, as they were commonly called, of which three were known by the name of the trivium, which comprehended grammar, rhetoric, and logic; and the other four by the title of quadrivium, which included arithmetic, music, geometry, and astronomy. The greatest part of the learned, as we have formerly observed, were satisfied with their literary acquisitions, when they had made themselves masters of the trivium, while such as with an adventurous flight aspired to the quadrivium, were considered as stars of the first magnitude, as the great luminaries of the learned world. But in this century the aspect of letters underwent a considerable and an advantageous change. The liberal arts and sciences were multiplied; and new and unfrequented paths of knowledge were opened to the emulation of the studious youth. Theology was placed in the number of the sciences; not that ancient theology which had no merit but its simplicity, and which was drawn, without the least order or connexion, from divers passages of the holy scriptures, and from the opinions and inventions of the primitive doctors, but that philosophical or scholastic theology which, with the deepest abstraction, traced divine truth to its first principles, and thence followed it into its various connexions and branches. Nor was theology alone added to the ancient circle of sciences; the studies of the learned languages, of the civil and canon law, and of physic,[b] were now brought into high repute. Particular academies were consecrated to the culture of each of these sciences, in various places; and thus it was natural to consider them as important branches of erudition, and an acquaintance with them as a qualification necessary to such as aimed at universal learning. All this required a considerable change in the division of the sciences hitherto received; and this change was accordingly brought about. The seven liberal arts were, by degrees, reduced to one general title, and were comprehended under the name of philosophy, to which theology jurisprudence, and physic, were added. And hence originated the four classes of science, or, to use the academic phrase, the four faculties which prevailed in the universities, in the following century.

V. A happy and unexpected event restored in Italy the lustre and authority of the ancient Roman law, and, at the same time, lessened the credit of those systems of legislation which had been received for several ages past. This event was the discovery of the original manuscript of the famous Pandect of Justinian, which was found in the ruins of Amalphi, or Melfi, when that city was taken by Lotharius II. in 1137, and of which that emperor made a present to the inhabitants of Pisa, whose fleet had contributed, in a particular manner, to the success of the siege. This admirable collection, which had been almost buried in oblivion, was no sooner recovered, than the Roman law became the grand object of the studies and labours of the learned. In the academy of Bologna, colleges were erected expressly for the study of the Roman jurisprudence; and these excellent institutions were multiplied in several parts of Italy, in process of time, and animated other European nations to imitate so wise an example. Hence arose a great revolution in the public tribunals, and an entire change in their judicial proceedings. Hitherto different systems of law had been followed in different courts; and every person of distinction, particularly among the Franks, had the liberty of choosing that code of law which was to be the rule of his conduct. But the Roman law acquired such credit and authority, that it superseded, by degrees, all other laws in the greatest part of Europe, and was substituted in the place of the Salic, Lombard, and Burgundian codes, which before this period were in the highest reputation. It is an ancient opinion, that Lotharius II. pursuant to the counsels and solicitations of Irnerius,[c] principal professor of the Roman law in the academy of Bologna, published an edict enjoining the abrogation of all the statutes then in force, and substituting in their place the Roman law, by which, for the future, all without exception were to modify their contracts, terminate their differences, and regulate their actions. But this opinion, as many learned men have abundantly proved,[d] is far from being supported by sufficient evidence.

VI. No sooner was the civil law placed in the number of the sciences, and considered as an important branch of academical learning, than the Roman pontiffs, and their zealous adherents, judged it not only expedient, but also

Hen. Bohmeri Præfat. ad Corpus Juris Canon. p. 9, as also the elegant History of the Academy of Bologna written in the German language by the learned Keufelius, and published at Helmstadt in 8vo. in the year 1750.

[a] See B. Bohmeri Jus Eccles. Protestant. tom. iv. p. 705.

[b] The word *physica*, though, according to its etymology, it denotes the study of natural philosophy in general, was, in the twelfth century, applied particularly to medicinal studies; and it has also preserved that limited sense in the English language.

[c] Otherwise called Werner.

[d] See Herm. Conringius de Origine Juris Germanici, cap. xxii.—Guido Grandus, Epist. de Pandectis, p. 21, 69, published at Florence, in 4to in 1737.—Henry Brencmann, Historia Pandectar. p. 41.—Lud. Ant Muratori, Præf. ad Leges Langobardicas, apud scriptor. rerum Ital tom. i. part ii. p. 4, &c. Antiq. Ital. medii Ævi, tom. ii. p. 285. There was a warm controversy carried on concerning this matter between George Calixtus and Barthol. Nihusius, the latter of whom embraced the vulgar opinion concerning the edict of Lotharius, obtained by the solicitations of Irnerius; of this controversy there is a circumstantial account in the Cimbria Literata of Mollerus, tom. iii. p. 142.

highly necessary, that the canon law should have the same privilege. There existed, before this time, certain collections of the canons or laws of the church; but these collections were so destitute of order and method, and were so defective, both in respect to matter and form, that they could not be conveniently explained in the schools, or be brought into use as systems of ecclesiastical polity. Hence it was, that Gratian, a Benedictine monk, belonging to the convent of St. Felix and Nabor at Bologna, and by birth a Tuscan, composed about the year 1130, for the use of the schools, an abridgment, or Epitome of Canon Law, drawn from the letters of the pontiffs, the decrees of councils, and the writings of the ancient doctors. Pope Eugenius III. was extremely pleased with this work, which was also received with the highest applause by the doctors and professors of Bologna, and was unanimously adopted, as the text they were to follow in their public lectures. The professors at Paris were the first that followed the example of those of Bologna, which, in process of time, was imitated by the greatest part of the European colleges. But, notwithstanding the encomiums bestowed upon this performance, which was commonly called the decretal of Gratian,[a] and was entitled, by the author himself, the re-union or coalition of the jarring canons,[b] several most learned and eminent writers of the Romish communion acknowledge, that it is full of errors and defects.[c] As, however, the main design of this abridgment was to support the despotism, and to extend the authority of the Roman pontiffs, its innumerable defects were overlooked, its merits were exaggerated; and, what is still more surprising, it enjoys, at this day, in an age of light and liberty, that high degree of veneration and authority, which was inconsiderately, though more excusably, lavished upon it in an age of tyranny, superstition, and darkness.[d]

VII. Such among the Latins as were ambitious of making a figure in the republic of letters, applied themselves to philosophy with the utmost zeal and diligence. Taken in its most extensive and general meaning, that study comprehended, according to the method which was the most generally received toward the middle of this century, four classes: it was divided into theoretical, practical, mechanical, and logical. The first class comprised natural theology, mathematics, and natural philosophy. In the second class were ranked ethics, œconomics, and politics. The third contained the seven arts that are more immediately subservient to the purposes of life, such as navigation, agriculture, hunting, &c. The fourth was divided into grammar and composition, the latter of which was subdivided into rhetoric, dialectics, and sophistry; and under the term dialectic was comprehended that part of the metaphysic science which treats of general notions. This division was almost universally adopted. Some, indeed, were inclined to separate grammar and mechanics from philosophy; a separation highly condemned by others, who, under the general term philosophy, comprehended the whole circle of the sciences.[e]

VIII. The learned, who taught or who cultivated these different branches of study, were divided into various factions, which attacked each other with the utmost animosity and bitterness.[f] At this time, three methods of teaching philosophy were practised by different doctors. The first was the ancient and plain method, which confined its researches to the philosophical notions of Porphyry, and the dialectic system, commonly attributed to St Augustine, and in which was laid down this general rule, that philosophical inquiries were to be limited to a small number of subjects, lest, by their becoming too extensive, religion might suffer by a profane mixture of human subtlety with its divine wisdom. The second method was called the Aristotelian, because it consisted in explications of the works of that philosopher,[g] several of whose productions, being translated into Latin, were now almost every where in the hands of the learned. These translations were, indeed, extremely obscure and incorrect, and led those who made use of them in their academical lectures, into various blunders, and often into such notions as were not more absurd than whimsical and singular. The third was termed the free method, employed by such as were bold enough to search after truth, in the manner they thought the most adapted to render their inquiries successful, and who followed the bent of their own genius, without rejecting, however, the aid of Aristotle and Plato. Laudable as this method was, it became an abundant source of sophistry and chicane, by the imprudent management of those who employed it; for these subtle doctors, through a wanton indulgence of their metaphysical fancies, did little more than puzzle their disciples with vain questions, and fatigue them with endless distinctions and divisions.[h] These different systems, and vehement contests, that divided the philosophers, gave to many a disgust against philosophy in general, and prompted them to desire, with impatience, its banishment from the public schools.

IX. Of all the controversies that divided the philosophers in this century, there were none carried on with greater animosity, and treated with greater subtlety and

[a] Decretum Gratiana. [b] Concordia Discordantium Canonum.

[c] See, among others, Anton. Augustinus, de Emendatione Gratiani, published in 8vo. at Arnheim, A. D 1678, with the learned observations of Steph. Baluze and Ger. a Maestricht.

[d] See Gerhard. a Maestricht, Historia Juris Ecclesiastici, sect. 293, p. 325.—B. Just. Hen. Bohmer's Jus Eccles. Protestant. tom. i. p. 100, and more particularly the learned Preface, with which he enriched the new edition of the Canon Law, published at Halle in 4to. in the year 1747. See also Alex. Machiavelli Observationes ad Sigonii Histor. Bononiensem, tom. iii. Oper. Sigonii, p. 128. This writer has drawn, from the Kalendarium Archi-Gymnasii Bononiensis, several particularities concerning Gratian and his work, which were generally unknown, but whose truth is also much disputed. What increases the suspicion of their being fabulous is, that this famous Kalendar, of which the Bolognese boast so much, and which they have so often promised to publish in order to dispel the doubts of the learned, has never yet seen the light. Besides, in the fragments that have appeared, there are manifest marks of unfair dealing.

[e] These literary anecdotes I have taken from several writers, particularly from Hugo a St. Victore, Didascali Libro ii. cap. ii. p. 7. tom. i. op. and from the Metalogicum of John of Salisbury.

[f] See Godof. de St. Victore, Carmen de Sectis Philosoph. published by Le Bœuf, in his Diss. sur l'Histoire Ecclesiast. et Civile de Paris. tome ii. p. 254.—Boulay, Hist. Acad. Paris. tom. ii. p. 562.—Ant. Wood, Antiq. Oxoniens. t. i. p. 51. Jo. Sarisburiensis Metalog. et Policrat. passim.

[g] Rob. de Monte, Append. ad Sigebertum Gemblacens. published by d'Acheri, among the works of Guibert, abbot of Nogent, ad annum 1128, p. 753. "Jacobus Clericus de Venetia transtulit de Græco in Latinum quosdam libros Aristotelis et commentatus est, scilicet Topica, Annal priores et posteriores et elenchos; quamvis antiquior translatio super eosdem libros haberetur." Thom. Becket, Epistolar. lib. ii. ep. xciii. p. 454. edit. Bruxell. 1682, in 4to. "Itero preces, quatenus libros Aristotelis, quos habetis, mihi faciatis exscribi.—Precor etiam iteratâ supplicatione quatenus in operibus Aristotelis, ubi difficiliora fuerint, notulas faciatis, eo quod interpretem aliquatenus suspectum habeo, quia, licet eloquens fuerit alias, ut sæpe audivi, minus tamen fuit in grammaticâ institutus."

[h] See Jo. Sarisburiensis Policrat. p. 434, et Metalog. p. 814, &c.

refinement, than the contest of the Dialecticians concerning universals. The sophistical doctors were wholly occupied about the intricate questions relating to genus and species, to the solution of which they directed all their philosophical efforts, and the whole course of their metaphysical studies; but not all in the same method, nor upon the same principles.[a] The two leading sects into which they had been divided long before this period, and which were distinguished by the titles of Realists and Nominalists, not only still subsisted, but were subdivided, each into smaller parties and factions, according as the two opposite and leading schemes were modified by new fancies and inventions. The Nominalists, though they had their followers, were nevertheless much inferior to the Realists, both with respect to the number of their disciples, and to the credit and reputation of their doctrine. A third sect arose under the name of Formalists, who pretended to terminate the controversy, by steering a middle course between the jarring systems now mentioned; but, as the hypotheses of these new doctors were most obscure and unintelligible, they only perplexed matters more than they had hitherto been, and furnished new subjects of contention and dispute.[b]

Those among the learned, who turned their pursuits to more interesting and beneficial branches of science, than the intricate and puzzling doctrine of universals, travelled into the different countries, where the kinds of knowledge, which they wished to cultivate, chiefly flourished. The students of physic, astronomy, and mathematics, continued to frequent the schools of the Saracens in Spain. Many of the learned productions of the Arabians were also translated into Latin;[c] for the high fame which that people had acquired for erudition, together with a desire of converting the Spanish Saracens to Christianity, had excited many to study their language, and to acquire a considerable knowledge of their doctrine.

CHAPTER II.

Concerning the Doctors and Ministers of the Church, and its Form of Government during this Century.

I. WHEREVER we turn our eyes among the various ranks and orders of the clergy, we perceive, in this century, the most flagrant marks of licentiousness and fraud, ignorance and luxury, and other vices, whose pernicious effects were deeply felt both in church and state. If we except a very small number, who retained a sense of the sanctity of their vocation, and lamented the corruption and degeneracy of their order, it may be said, with respect to the rest, that their whole business was to satisfy their lusts, to multiply their privileges by grasping perpetually at new honours and distinctions, to increase their opulence, to diminish the authority and encroach upon the privileges of princes and magistrates, and, neglecting entirely the interests of religion and the cure of souls, to live in ease and pleasure, and draw out their days in an unmanly and luxurious indolence. This appears manifestly from two remarkable treatises of St. Bernard, in one of which he exposes the corruption of the pontiffs and bishops,[d] while he describes in the other the enormous crimes of the monastic orders, whose licentiousness he chastises with a just severity.[e]

II. The pontiffs, who successively ruled the Latin church, governed that spiritual and mystical body by the maxims of worldly ambition, and thereby fomented the warm contest that had arisen between the imperial and sacerdotal powers. On the one hand, the popes not only maintained the opulence and authority which they had already acquired, but extended their views, and laboured strenuously to enlarge both, though they had not all equal success in this ambitious attempt. The European emperors and princes, on the other hand, alarmed at the strides which the pontiffs were making to universal do-

[a] John of Salisbury, a very elegant and ingenious writer of this age, censures, with no small degree of wit, the crude and unintelligible speculations of these sophists, in his book entitled Policraticon, seu de Nugis Curialium, lib. vii. p. 451. He observes, that more time had been consumed in resolving the question relating to genus and species, than the Cæsars had employed in making themselves masters of the whole world; that the riches of Crœsus were inferior to the treasures which had been exhausted in this controversy; and that the contending parties, after having spent their whole lives upon this single point, had neither been so happy as to determine it to their satisfaction, nor to make, in the labyrinths of science where they had been groping, any discovery that was worth the pains they had taken. His words are: "veterem paratus est solvere quæstionem de generibus et speciebus (he speaks here of a certain philosopher) in qua laborans mundus jam senuit, in qua plus temporis consumptum est, quam in acquirendo et regendo orbis imperio consumpserit Cæsarea domus: plus effusum pecuniæ, quam in omnibus divitiis suis possederit Crœsus. Hæc enim tam diu multos tenuit, ut cum hoc unum totâ vitâ quærerent, tandem nec istud nec aliud invenirent."

[b] See the above cited author's Policrat. lib. vii. p. 451, where he gives a succinct account of the Formalists, Realists, and Nominalists, in the following words: "Sunt qui more mathematicorum formas abstrahunt, et ad illas quicquid de universalibus dicitur referunt." Such were the Formalists, who applied the doctrine of universal ideas to what the mathematicians call abstract forms. "Alii discutiunt Intellectus, et eos universalium nominibus censeri confirmant." Here we find the Realists pointed out, who, under the name of universals, comprehended all intellectual powers, qualities, and ideas. "Fuerunt et qui voces ipsas genera dicerent et species: sed eorum jam explosa sententia est, et facile cum auctore suo evanuit. Sunt tamen adhuc, qui deprehenduntur in vestigiis eorum, licet erubescant vel auctorem vel scientiam profiteri, solis nominibus inhærentes, quod rebus et intellectibus subtrahunt, sermonibus ascribunt." This was a sect of the Nominalists, who, ashamed (as this author alleges) to profess the exploded doctrine of Roscellinus, which placed genus and species in a class of mere words, or simple denominations, modified that system by a slight change of expression only, which did not essentially distinguish their doctrine from that of the ordinary Nominalists. It appears from all this, that the sect of the Formalists is of more ancient date than John Duns Scotus, whom many learned men consider as its founder. See Jo. Sarisbur. Metalogic. lib. ii. cap. xvii. p. 814, where that eminent author describes at large the various contests of these three sects, and sums up their differences in the following words: "Alius consistit in vocibus, licet hæc opinio cum Roscellino suo fere jam evanuerit; alius sermones intuetur: alius versatur in intellectibus," &c.

[c] Gerard of Cremona, who was so famous among the Italians for his eminent skill in astronomy and physic, undertook a voyage to Toledo, where he translated into Latin several Arabian treatises; see Muratori's Antiq. Ital. medii Ævi, tom. iii. p. 936, 937.—Mirmet, a French monk, travelled into Spain and Africa, to learn geography among the Saracens. See Luc. D'Acherii Spicilegium Scriptor. tom. ix. p. 443, ed. Antiq.—Daniel Morlach, an Englishman, who was extremely fond of mathematical learning, undertook a journey to Toledo, whence he brought into his own country a considerable number of Arabian books: Ant. Wood, Antiquit. Oxon. tom. i. p. 55.—Peter, abbot of Clugni, surnamed the Venerable, after having sojourned for some time among the Spaniards, in order to make himself master of the Arabian language, translated into Latin the Koran, and the life of Mohammed: see Mabillon, Annal. Bened. tom. vi. lib. lxxvii. 345. This eminent ecclesiastic, as appears from the Bibliotheca Cluniacensis, p. 1169, found, upon his arrival in Spain, persons of learning from England and other countries, who applied themselves with extraordinary assiduity and ardour to the study of astrology. We might multiply the examples of those who travelled in quest of science during this century; but those now alleged are sufficient for our purpose.

[d] In the work entitled, Considerationum Libri V. ad Eugenium Pontificem.

[e] See his defence of the crusades, under the title of Apologia ad Gulielmum Abbatem; as also Gerhohus, de corrupto Ecclesiæ Statu, in Baluzii Miscell. tom. v. p. 63.—Gallia Christiana, tom. i. p. 6. App. tom. ii. p 265, 273, &c. Boulay's Histor. Academ. Paris. tom ii. p. 490, 690.

minion, used their utmost efforts to disconcert their measures, and to check their growing opulence and power. These violent dissensions between the empire and the priesthood (for so the contending parties were styled in this century,) were most unhappy in their effects, which were felt throughout all the European provinces. Pascal II., who had been raised to the pontificate about the conclusion of the preceding age, seemed now to sit firm and secure in the apostolic chair, without the least apprehension from the imperial faction, whose affairs had taken an unfavourable turn, and who had not the courage to elect a new pope of their party in the place of Guibert, who died in the year 1100.[a]

Unwilling to let pass unimproved the present success of the papal faction, Pascal renewed, in a council assembled at Rome, A. D. 1102, the decrees of his predecessors against investitures, and the excommunications they had thundered out against Henry IV., and used his most vigorous endeavours to raise up on all sides new enemies to that unfortunate emperor. Henry opposed, with great constancy and resolution, the efforts of this violent pontiff, and eluded, with much dexterity and vigilance, his perfidious stratagems. But his heart, wounded in the tenderest part, lost all its firmness and courage, when, in the year 1106, an unnatural son, under the impious pretext of religion, took up arms against his person and his cause. Henry V. (so was this monster afterwards named) seized his father in a most treacherous manner, and obliged him to abdicate the empire; after which the unhappy prince retired to Liege, where, deserted by all his adherents, he shook off, in 1106, the burthen of life and of misery. It has been a matter of dispute, whether it was the instigation of the pontiff, or the ambitious and impatient thirst of dominion, that engaged Henry V. to declare war against his father; nor is it, perhaps, easy to decide this question with a perfect degree of evidence. One thing, however, is unquestionably certain, that Pascal II. not only dissolved, or rather impiously pretended to dissolve, the oath of fidelity and obedience that Henry had taken to his father, but adopted the cause, and supported the interests of this unnatural rebel with the utmost zeal, assiduity, and fervour.[b]

III. The revolution that this odious rebellion caused in the empire, was, however much less favourable to the views of Pascal, than that lordly pontiff expected. Henry V. could by no means be persuaded to renounce his right of investing the bishops and abbots, though he was willing to grant the right of election to the canons and monks, as was usual before his time. Upon this the exasperated pontiff renewed, in the councils of Guastalla and Troyes, the decrees that had so often been promulgated against investitures; and the flame broke out with new force. It was, indeed, suspended during a few years, by the wars in which Henry was engaged, and which prevented his bringing the affair to a decision. But no sooner had he made peace with his enemies, and composed the tumults that troubled the tranquillity of the empire, than he set out for Italy with a formidable army, A. D. 1110, in order to put an end to this long and unhappy contest. He advanced towards Rome by slow marches, while the trembling pontiff, seeing himself destitute of all succour, and reduced to the lowest and most defenceless condition, proposed the following conditions of peace: That the emperor, on one hand, should renounce the right of investing with the ring and crosier; and that the bishops and abbots should, on the other hand, resign and give over, to him and his successors, all the grants, received from Charlemagne, of the rights and privileges that belong to royalty, such as the power of raising tribute, coining money, and possessing independent lands and territories, with other immunities of a like nature. These conditions were agreeable to Henry, who accordingly gave a formal consent to them in the year 1111; but they were extremely displeasing to the Italian and German bishops, who expressed their dissent in the strongest terms. Hence a terrible tumult arose in the church of St. Peter, where the contending parties were assembled with their respective followers; upon which Henry ordered the pope to be seized, and to be confined in the castle of Viterbo. After having remained there for some time, the captive pontiff was engaged, by the unhappy circumstances of his present condition, to enter into a new convention, by which he solemnly receded from the article of the former treaty that regarded investitures, and confirmed to the emperor the privilege of inaugurating the bishops and abbots with the ring and crosier. Peace being thus concluded, the vanquished pontiff arrayed Henry with the imperial diadem.[c]

IV. This transitory peace, which was the fruit of violence and necessity, was followed by greater tumults and more dreadful wars, than had yet afflicted the church. Immediately after the conclusion of this treaty, Rome was filled with the most vehement commotions; and a loud clamour was raised against the pontiff, who was accused of having violated, in a scandalous manner, the duties and dignity of his station, and of having prostituted the majesty of the church by his ignominious compliance with the demands of the emperor. To appease these commotions, Pascal assembled, in the year 1112, a council in the Lateran church, and not only confessed, with contrition and humility, the fault he had committed in concluding such a convention with Henry, but submitted the question to the determination of the council, who accordingly took that treaty into consideration, and solemnly annulled it.[d] This step was followed by many events, that gave, for a long time, an unfavourable turn to the affairs of the emperor. He was excommunicated in many synods and councils, both in France and Germany; he was even placed in the black list of heretics, a denomination which exposed him to the greatest dangers in those superstitious and barbarous times;[e] and, to complete his anxiety, he saw

☞ [a] Dr. Mosheim's affirmation here must be somewhat modified in order to be true; it is certain that, after the death of Guibert, the imperial party chose in his place a person named Albert, who, indeed, was seized and imprisoned on the day of his election. Theodoric and Magnulf were successively chosen after Albert, but could not long support their claims to the pontificate. See Fleury, Hist. Eccles. liv. lxv. vol. xiv. p. 10. Brussels edition in 8vo.

[b] These accounts are drawn from the most authentic sources, and also from the eminent writers, whose authority I made use of, and whose names I mentioned, in that part of the preceding century which corresponds with the subject here treated.

[c] Beside the writers already mentioned, see Mabillon, Annal. Benedict. tom. v. p. 681, and tom. vi. p. 1, at the particular years to which the events here noticed belong.

[d] Pascal, upon this occasion, as Gregory VII. had formerly done in the case of Berenger, submitted his proceedings and his authority to the judgment of a council, to which, of consequence, he acknowledged his subordination. That council even condemned his measures, and declared them scandalous.

[e] See Gervaise, Diss. sur l'Heresie des Investitures, which is the fourth of the dissertations prefixed to his History of the Abbot Suger.

the German princes revolting from his authority in several places, and taking up arms in the cause of the church. To put an end to calamities that thus afflicted the empire on all sides, Henry set out a second time for Italy, with a numerous army, in the year 1116, and arrived, in the following year, at Rome, where he assembled the consuls, senators, and nobles, while the fugitive pontiff retired to Benevento. Pascal, however, during this forced absence, engaged the Normans to come to his assistance; and, encouraged by the prospect of immediate succour, prepared every thing for a vigorous war against the emperor, and attempted to make himself master of Rome. But, in the midst of these warlike preparations, which drew the attention of Europe, and portended great and remarkable events, the military pontiff yielded to fate, A. D. 1118.

V. A few days after the death of Pascal, John of Gaieta, a Benedictine monk of Mont Cassin, and chancellor of the Roman church, was raised to the pontificate under the title of Gelasius II. In opposition to this choice, Henry elected to the same dignity Maurice Burdin, archbishop of Braga, in Spain,[a] who assumed the denomination of Gregory VIII.[b] Upon this, Gelasius, not thinking himself safe at Rome, or indeed in Italy, set out for France, and soon after died at Clugni. The cardinals, who accompanied him in his journey, elected to the papacy, immediately after his departure, Guy, archbishop of Vienne, count of Burgundy, who was nearly related to the emperor, and is distinguished in the list of the Roman pontiffs by the name of Calixtus II. The elevation of this eminent ecclesiastic was, in the issue, extremely fortunate both for the church and state. Remarkably distinguished by his illustrious birth, and still more by his noble and heroic qualities, this magnanimous pontiff continued to oppose the emperor with courage and success, and to carry on the war both with the sword of the spirit, and with the arm of flesh. He made himself master of Rome, threw into prison the pontiff who had been chosen by the emperor, and fomented the civil commotions in Germany. But his fortitude and resolution were tempered with moderation, and accompanied with a spirit of generosity and compliance which differed much from the obstinate arrogance of his lordly predecessors. Accordingly, he lent an ear to prudent councils, and was willing to relinquish a part of the demands upon which the former pontiffs had so vehemently insisted, that he might restore the public tranquillity, and satisfy the ardent desires of so many nations, who groaned under the dismal effects of these deplorable divisions.[c]

It will appear unquestionably evident to every attentive and impartial observer of things, that the illiberal and brutal manners of those who ruled the church were the only reason that rendered the dispute concerning investitures so violent and cruel, so tedious in its duration, and so unhappy in its effects. During the space of fifty-five years, the church was governed by monks, who, to the obscurity of their birth, the asperity of their natural tempers, and the unbounded rapacity of their ambition and avarice, joined that inflexible obstinacy which is one of the essential characteristics of the monastic order. Hence arose those bitter feuds, those furious efforts of ambition and vengeance, that dishonoured the church and afflicted the state during the course of this controversy. But as soon as the papal chair was filled by a man of a more dignified nature, and of a liberal education, the face of things changed entirely, and a prospect of peace arose to the desires and hopes of ruined and desolate countries.

VI. These hopes were not disappointed; for, after much contestation, peace was, at length, concluded between the emperor and the pope's legates, at a general diet, holden at Worms, A. D. 1122. The conditions were as follow:

"That for the future the bishops and abbots should be chosen by those to whom the right of election belonged;[d] but that this election should be made in the presence of the emperor, or of an ambassador appointed by him for that purpose:[e]

"That, in case of a dispute among the electors, the decision of it should be left to the emperor, who was to consult with the bishops upon that occasion:

"That the bishop or abbot elect should take an oath of allegiance to the emperor, receive from his hand the regalia, and do homage for them:

"That the emperor should no more confer the regalia by the ceremony of the ring and crosier, which were the ensigns of a ghostly dignity, but that of the sceptre, which was more proper to invest the person elected in the possession of rights and privileges merely temporal."[f]

This convention was solemnly confirmed in the following year in the Lateran council, and remains still in force in our times, though the true sense of some of its articles has occasioned disputes between the emperors and pontiffs.[g]

VII. Calixtus did not long enjoy the fruits of this peace, to which he had so much contributed by his prudence and moderation. He died in the year 1124, and was succeeded by Lambert, bishop of Ostia, who assumed the title of Honorius II. and under whose pontificate nothing worthy of mention was transacted. His death, which happened A. D. 1130, gave rise to a considerable schism in the church of Rome, or rather in the college of cardinals, of whom one party elected, to the papal chair, Gregory, a cardinal deacon of St. Angelo, who was distinguished by the name of Innocent II., while the other chose, for successor to Honorius, Peter, the son of Leo, a Roman prince, under the title of Anacletus II. The friends of Innocent were far from being numerous in Rome, or throughout Italy in general, for which reason he judged it expedient to retire into France, where he had many adherents, and where he sojourned during the space of two years. His credit was very great out of Italy; for, beside the emperor Lotharius, the kings of England, France, and Spain, with other princes, espoused warmly the cause of Innocent, principally by the influence of St. Bernard, who was his intimate friend, and

[a] Braga was the metropolis of ancient Galicia, but at present is one of the three archbishoprics of Portugal, in the province of Entre Duero è Minho. The archbishop of that see claims the title of primate of Spain, which is annexed in Spain to the see of Toledo.

[b] See Stephani Baluzii Vita Mauritii Burdini, in Miscellaneis, tom. iii. p. 471.

[c] The paragraph following is the note (t) of the original placed in the text.

[d] The expression is ambiguous; but it signifies that the elections of bishops and abbots were to be made by monks and canons as in former times.

[e] From this period the people in Germany were excluded from the right of voting in the election of bishops. See Petr. de Marca, de concordia sacerdotii et imperii, lib. vi. cap. ii. sect. 9, p. 788, edit. Bohmeri.

[f] See Muratori, Antiq. Ital. medii Ævi, tom. vi. p. 76.—Schilterus, de Libertate Eccl. Germanicæ, lib. iv. cap. iv. p. 545.—Cæsar Rasponus, de Basilica Lateranensi, lib. iv. p. 295.

[g] It was disputed among other things, whether the consecration of the bishop elect was to precede or follow the collation of the regalia. See Jo. Wilh. Hoffman, ad concordatum Henrici V. et Calisti II. Vitembergæ, 1739, in 4to.

whose counsels had the force and authority of laws in almost all the countries of Europe. The patrons of Anacletus were fewer in number, and were confined to the kings of Sicily and Scotland. His death, in the year 1138, terminated the contest, and left Innocent in the entire and undisputed possession of the apostolic chair. The surviving pontiff presided, in the year 1139, at the second Lateran council, and, about four years after, ended his days in peace.[a]

VIII. After the death of Innocent the Roman see was filled by Guy, cardinal of St. Mark, who ruled the church about five months, under the title of Celestine II. If his reign was short, it was, however, peaceable, and not like that of his successor, Lucius II., whose pontificate was disturbed by various tumults and seditions, and who, about eleven months after his elevation to the papacy, was killed in a riot which he was endeavouring to suppress by his presence and authority. He was succeeded by Bernard, a Cistertian monk, and an eminent disciple of the famous St. Bernard, abbot of Clairval. This worthy ecclesiastic, who is distinguished among the popes by the title of Eugenius III., was raised to that high dignity in the year 1145, and, during a period of eight years, he was involved in the same perils and perplexities that had embittered the government of his predecessor. He was often obliged to leave Rome, and to save himself by flight from the fury of the people;[b] and the same reason engaged him to retire into France, where he resided for a considerable time. At length, exhausted by the opposition he met with in supporting what he deemed the prerogatives of the papacy, he died in the year 1153. The pontificate of his successor, Conrad, bishop of Sabino, who, after his elevation to the see of Rome, assumed the title of Anastasius IV., was less disturbed by civil commotions; but it was not of long duration; for Anastasius died about a year and four months after his election.

IX. The warm contest between the emperors and the popes, which was considered as at an end ever since the time of Calixtus II., was unhappily renewed under the pontificate of Adrian IV. who was a native of England, and whose original name was Nicolas Breakspear. Frederick I. surnamed Barbarossa, being placed, in 1152, on the imperial throne, publicly declared his resolution to maintain the dignity and privileges of the Roman empire in general, and more particularly to render it respectable in Italy; nor was he at all studious to conceal the design he had formed of reducing the overgrown power and opulence of the pontiffs and clergy within narrower limits. Adrian perceived the danger that threatened the majesty of the church and the authority of the clergy, and prepared himself for defending both with vigour and constancy. The first occasion of trying their strength was offered at the coronation of the emperor at Rome, in the year 1155, when the pontiff insisted upon Frederick's performing the office of equerry, and holding the stirrup to his holiness. This humiliating proposal was at first rejected with disdain by the emperor, and was followed by contests of a more momentous nature, relating to the political interests of the empire.

These differences were no sooner reconciled, than new disputes, equally important, arose in the year 1158, when the emperor, in order to put a stop to the enormous opulence of the pontiffs, bishops, and monks, which increased from day to day, enacted a law to prevent the transferring of fiefs without the knowledge or consent of the superior, or lord, in whose name they were holden,[c] and turned the whole force of his arms to reduce the little republics of Italy under his dominion. An open rupture between the emperor and the pontiff, was expected as the inevitable consequence of such vigorous measures, when the death of Adrian, which happened on the first of September, 1159, suspended the storm.[d]

X. In the election of a new pontiff, the cardinals were divided into two factions. The more numerous and powerful of the two parties raised to the pontificate, Rowland, bishop of Sienna, who assumed the name of Alexander III., while the rest of the conclave elected to that high dignity Octavian, cardinal of St. Cecilia, known by the title of Victor IV. The latter was patronised by the emperor, to whom Alexander was extremely disagreeable on several accounts. The council of Pavia, which was assembled by the emperor in the year 1160, adopted his sentiments, and pronounced in favour of Victor, who thus became triumphant in Germany and Italy; so that France alone was left open to Alexander, who accordingly fled thither from Rome for safety and protection. Amidst the tumults and commotions which this schism occasioned, Victor died at Lucca, in the year 1164; but his place was immediately filled by the emperor, at whose desire Guy, cardinal of St. Calixtus, was elected pontiff under the title of Pascal III. and acknowledged in that character by the German princes assembled in the year 1167, at the diet of Wurtzburg. In the mean time Alexander recovered his spirits, and, returning into Italy, maintained his cause with uncommon resolution and vigour, and not without some promising hopes of success. He held at Rome, in the year 1167, the Lateran council, in which he solemnly deposed the emperor, (whom he had, upon several occasions before this period, publicly loaded with anathemas and execrations,) dissolved the oath of allegiance which his subjects had taken to him as their lawful sovereign, and encouraged and exhorted them to rebel against his authority, and to shake off his yoke. But, soon after this audacious proceeding, Frederick made himself master of Rome; upon which the insolent pontiff fled to Benevento, and left the apostolic chair to Pascal, his competitor.

XI. The affairs of Alexander seemed, soon after, to take a more prosperous turn, when (the greatest part of the imperial army being consumed by a pestilential disorder) the emperor was forced to abandon Italy, and when the death of Pascal, which happened in the year 1168, delivered him from a powerful and formidable rival.

[a] Beside the ordinary writers of the papal history, see Jean de Lannes, Histoire du Pontificat du Pape Innocent II. Paris, 1741, in 8vo.

☞ [b] There was a party formed in Rome at this time, whose design was to restore the Roman senate to its former privileges, and to its ancient splendour and glory; and, for this purpose, to reduce the papal revenues and prerogatives to a narrower compass, even to the tithes and oblations that were offered to the primitive bishops, and to the spiritual government of the church, attended with an utter exclusion from all civil jurisdiction over the city of Rome. It was this party that produced the feuds and seditions to which Dr. Mosheim has an eye in this eighth section.

[c] This prohibition of transferring the possession of fiefs from one to another, without the consent of the sovereign, or supreme lord, under whom they were holden, together with other laws of a like nature, formed the first effectual barrier that was opposed to the enormous and growing opulence and authority of the clergy. See Muratori, Antiq. Ital. medii Ævi. tom. vi. p. 239.

[d] See the accurate and circumstantial account of this whole affair that

But this fair prospect soon vanished; for the imperial faction elected to the pontificate John, abbot of Strum, under the title of Calixtus III., whom Frederick, notwithstanding his absence in Germany, and the various wars and disputes in which he was involved, supported to the utmost of his power. When peace was in some measure restored to the empire, Frederick marched into Italy, A. D. 1174, to chastise the perfidy of the states and cities that had revolted during his absence, and seized the first opportunity of throwing off his yoke. Had this expedition been crowned with the expected success, Alexander would, undoubtedly, have been obliged to desist from his pretensions, and to yield the papal chair to Calixtus. But the event came far short of the hopes which this grand expedition had excited; and the emperor, after having, during the space of three years, been alternately defeated and victorious, was at length so fatigued with the hardships he had suffered, and so dejected at a view of the difficulties he had yet to overcome, that, in the year 1177, he concluded a treaty of peace at Venice with Alexander, and a truce with the rest of his enemies.[a] Some writers affirm, that, upon this occasion, the haughty pontiff trod upon the neck of the suppliant emperor, while he kissed his foot, repeating at the same time those words of the royal Psalmist: "Thou shalt tread upon the lion and adder: the young lion and the dragon shalt thou trample under feet."[b] The greatest part, however, of modern authors have called this event in question, and consider it as utterly destitute of authority and unworthy of credit.[c]

XII. Alexander III., who was rendered so famous by his long and successful contest with Frederick I., was also engaged in a warm dispute with Henry II., king of England, which was occasioned by the arrogance of Thomas Becket, archbishop of Canterbury. In the council of Clarendon, which that prince held in the year 1164, several laws were enacted, by which the king's power and jurisdiction over the clergy were accurately explained, and the rights and privileges of the bishops and priests reduced within narrower bounds.[d] Becket refused obedi-

is given by the illustrious and learned count Bunau, in his history of Frederick I. written in German, p. 45, 49, 73, 99, 105, &c.

[a] All the circumstances of these conventions are accurately related by count Bunau, in this History of Frederick I. p. 115—242.—See also Fortunati Olmi Istoria della Venuta à Venitia occultamente nel A. 1177, di Papa Alessandro III. Venet. 1629, in 4to.—Muratori, Antiq. Italicæ medii Ævi, tom. iv. p. 2, 9.—Origines Guelphicæ, tom. ii. p. 379.—Acta Sanctorum, tom. i. April. p. 46, in Vita Hugonis abbatis Bonæ-Vallis, et tom. ii. April. in Vita Galdini Mediolanensis, p. 596, two famous ecclesiastics, who were employed as ambassadors and arbiters in the treaty of peace here mentioned.

[b] Psalm xci. 13.

[c] See Bunau's Life of Frederick I. p. 242.—Heumanni Pœciles. tom. iii. lib. i. p. 145.—Bibliotheque Italique, tom. vi. p. 5, as also the authors mentioned by Caspar Sagittarius, in his Introduct. in Histor. Eccles. tom. i. p. 630, tom. ii.

[d] See Matth. Paris, Histor. Major, p. 82, 83, 101, 114.—Dav. Wilkins, Concilia Magnæ Britanniæ, tom. i. p. 434.

☞ Henry II. had formed the wise project of bringing the clergy under the jurisdiction of the civil courts, on account of the scandalous abuse they had made of their immunities, and the crimes which the ecclesiastical tribunals let pass with impunity. The Constitutions of Clarendon, which consisted of sixteen articles, were drawn up for this purpose: and, as they are proper to give the reader a just idea of the prerogatives and privileges that were claimed equally by the king and the clergy, and which occasioned of consequence such warm debates between state and church, it will not be altogether useless to transcribe them at length.

I. When any difference relating to the right of patronage arises between the laity, or between the clergy and laity, the controversy is to be tried and ended in the King's Court.

II. Those churches which are fees of the crown, cannot be granted away in perpetuity without the king's consent.

III. When the clergy are charged with any misdemeanour, and summoned by the justiciary, they shall be obliged to make their appearance in his court, and plead to such parts of the indictment as shall be put to them; and likewise to answer such articles in the ecclesiastical courts as they shall be prosecuted for by that jurisdiction; always provided, that the king's justiciary shall send an officer to inspect the proceedings of the Court Christian. And in case any clerk is convicted, or pleads guilty, he is to forfeit the privilege of his character, and to be protected by the church no longer.

IV. No archbishops, bishops, or parsons, are allowed to depart from the kingdom, without a license from the crown; and provided they have leave to travel, they shall give security, not to act or solicit any thing during their passage, stay, or return, to the prejudice of the king or kingdom.

V. When any of the laity are prosecuted in the ecclesiastical courts, the charge ought to be proved before the bishop by legal and reputable witnesses; and the course of the process is to be so managed, that the archdeacon may not lose any part of his right, or the profits accruing to his office: and if any offenders seem to have been screened from prosecution upon the score either of favour or quality, the sheriff, at the bishop's instance, shall order twelve sufficient men of the neighbourhood to make oath before the bishop, that they will discover the truth according to the best of their knowledge.

VI. Excommunicated persons shall not be obliged to make oath, or give security to continue upon the place where they live, but only to abide by the judgment of the church in order to their absolution.

VII. No person that holds in chief of the king, or any of his barons, shall be excommunicated, nor any of their estates put under an interdict, before application be made to the king, provided he be in the kingdom; and if his highness be out of England, the justiciary must be acquainted with the dispute, in order to make satisfaction: and thus what belongs to the cognisance of the king's court, must be tried there; and that which belongs to the Court Christian, must be remitted to that jurisdiction.

VIII. In case of appeals in ecclesiastical causes, the first step is to be made from the archdeacon to the bishop, and from the bishop to the archbishop; and, if the archbishop fails to do justice, recourse may be had to the king, by whose order the controversy is to be finally decided in the archbishop's court. Neither shall it be lawful for either of the parties to move for any farther remedy without leave from the crown.

IX. When a difference happens to arise between any clergyman and layman concerning a tenement, and the clerk pretends that it is holden by frank Almoine*, and the layman pleads it a lay-fee, the tenure shall be tried by the inquiry and verdict of twelve sufficient men of the neighbourhood, summoned according to the custom of the realm. And, if the tenement or thing in controversy shall be found frank Almoine, the dispute concerning it shall be tried in the ecclesiastical court. But if it is brought in a lay-fee, the suit shall be followed in the king's courts, unless both the plaintiff and defendant hold the tenement in question of the same bishop; in which case the cause shall be tried in the court of such bishop or baron, with this farther proviso, that he who is seised of the thing in controversy, shall not be disseised during the suit, (pendente lite,) upon the ground of the verdict above mentioned.

X. With regard to one who holds of the king in any city, castle, or borough, or resides upon any of the demesne lands of the crown, in case he is cited by the archdeacon or bishop to answer for any misbehaviour belonging to their cognisance; if he refuses to obey their summons, and to stand to the sentence of the court, it shall be lawful for the ordinary to put him under an interdict, but not to excommunicate him, till the king's principal officer of the town shall be pre-acquainted with the case, in order to enjoin him to make satisfaction to the church. And if such officer or magistrate shall fail in his duty, he shall be fined by the king's judges. And then the bishop may exert his discipline on the refractory person as he thinks fit.

XI. All archbishops, bishops, and ecclesiastical persons, who hold of the king in chief, and by the tenure of a barony, are for that reason obliged to appear before the king's justices and ministers, to answer the duties of their tenure, and to observe all the usages and customs of the realm; and, like other barons, are bound to be present at trials in the king's court, till sentence is to be pronounced for the losing of life or limbs.

XII. When any archbishopric, bishopric, abbey, or priory, of royal foundation, become vacant, the king is to make seisure; from which time all the profits and issues are to be paid into the exchequer, as if they were the demesne lands of the crown. And when it is determined that the vacancy shall be filled up, the king is to summon the most considerable persons of the chapter to court, and the election is to be made in the chapel royal, with the consent of our sovereign lord the king, and by the advice of such persons of the government, as his highness shall think fit to consult; at which time, the person elected shall, before his consecration, be obliged to do homage and fealty to the king, as his liege lord; which homage shall be performed in the usual form, with a clause saving the privilege of his order.

XIII. If any of the temporal barons, or great men, shall encroach

* i. e. A tenure by divine service, as Britton explains it.

ence to these laws, which he deemed prejudicial to the divine rights of the church in general, and to the prerogatives of the Roman pontiffs in particular. Upon this there arose a violent debate between the resolute monarch and the rebellious prelate, which obliged the latter to retire into France, where Alexander was at that time in a kind of exile. This pontiff and the king of France interposed their good offices in order to compose these differences, in which they succeeded so far, after much trouble and difficulty, as to encourage Becket to return to England, where he was re-instated in his forfeited dignity. But the generous and indulgent proceedings of his sovereign towards him, were not sufficient to subdue his arrogant and rebellious obstinacy in maintaining what he called the privileges of the church; nor could he be induced by any means to comply with the views and measures of Henry. The consequences of this inflexible resistance were fatal to the haughty prelate; for he was, soon after his return into England, assassinated before the altar, while he was at vespers in his cathedral, by four persons, who certainly did not commit this act of violence without the king's knowledge and connivance.[a] This event produced warm debates between the king of England and the Roman pontiff, who gained his point so far as to make the suppliant monarch undergo a severe course of penance, in order to expiate a crime of which he was considered as the principal promoter, while the murdered prelate, in 1173, was solemnly enrolled in the highest rank of saints and martyrs.[b]

XIII. It was not only by force of arms, but also by uninterrupted efforts of dexterity and artifice, by wise counsels and prudent laws, that Alexander III. maintained the pretended rights of the church, and extended the authority of the Roman pontiffs. For, in the third Lateran Council, holden at Rome, in 1179, the following decrees, among many others upon different subjects, were passed by his advice and authority. 1st, In order to put an end to the confusion and dissensions which so often accompanied the election of the Roman pontiffs, it was determined that the right of election should be vested in the cardinals alone, and that the person, in whose favour two thirds of the college of cardinals voted, should be considered as the lawful pontiff. This law is still in force; it was therefore from the time of Alexander that the election of the pope acquired that form which it still retains, and by which, not only the people, but also the Roman clergy, are excluded from all share in the honour of conferring that important dignity. 2dly, A spiritual war was declared against the heretics, whose numbers, increasing considerably about this time, created much disturbance in the church in general, and infested, in a more particular manner, several provinces in France, which groaned under the fatal dissensions that accompanied the propagation of their errors.[c] 3dly, The right of recommending and nominating to the saintly order was also taken away from councils and bishops, and canonization was ranked among the greater and more important causes, the cognisance of which belonged to the pontiff alone.[d] We must not forget to add, that the power of erecting new kingdoms, which had been claimed by the pontiffs from the time of Gregory VII., was not only assumed, but also exercised by Alexander in a remarkable instance; for, in the year 1179, he conferred the title of king, with the ensigns of royalty, upon Alphonso I.,

upon the rights or property of any archbishop, bishop, or archdeacon, and refuse to make satisfaction for wrong done by themselves, or their tenants, the king shall do justice to the party aggrieved. And if any person shall disseise the king of any part of his lands, or trespass upon his prerogative, the archbishops, bishops, and deacons, shall call him to an account, and oblige him to make the crown restitution; i. e. "They were to excommunicate such disseisers and injurious persons, in case they proved refractory and incorrigible."

XIV. The goods and chattels of those who lie under forfeitures of felony or treason are not to be detained in any church or church-yard, to secure them against seisure and justice, because such goods are the king's property, whether they are lodged within the precincts of a church or without it.

XV. All actions, and pleas of debts, though particularly solemn in the circumstances of the contract, shall be tried in the king's courts.

XVI. The sons of copy-holders are not to be ordained without the consent of the lord of the manor where they were born.

Such were the articles of the constitutions of Clarendon, against the greatest part of which the pope protested. They were signed by the English clergy, and also by Becket. The latter, however, repented of what he had done, and retiring from court, suspended himself from his office in the church for about forty days, till he received absolution from Alexander, who was then at Sens. His aversion to these articles manifested itself by an open rebellion against his sovereign, in which he discovered his true character, as a most daring, turbulent, vindictive, and arrogant priest, whose ministry was solely employed in extending the despotic dominion of Rome, and whose fixed purpose was to aggrandize the church upon the ruins of the state. See Collier's Ecclesiastical History, vol. i. xiith century. Rapin de Thoyras, in the reign of Henry II.

☞ [a] This assertion is in our opinion by much too strong. It can only be founded upon certain indiscreet and passionate expressions, which the intolerable insolence and phrenetic obstinacy of Becket drew from Henry in an unguarded moment, when, after having received new affronts, notwithstanding the reconciliation he had effected with so much trouble and condescension, he expressed himself to this purpose: 'Am I not unhappy, that, among the numbers who are attached to my interests, and employed in my service, there is no one possessed of spirit enough to resent the affronts which I am constantly receiving from a miserable priest?' Th se words, indeed, were not pronounced in vain. Four gentlemen of the court, whose names were Fitz-Urse, Tracy, Brito, and Morville, murdered Becket in his chapel, and thus performed, in a licentious and criminal manner, an action which the laws might have commanded with justice. But it is extremely remarkable, that, after the murder, the assassins were afraid they had gone too far, and durst not return to the king's court, which was then in Normandy; but retired at first to Knaresborough in Yorkshire, which belonged to Morville, whence they repaired to Rome for absolution, and being admitted to penance by Alexander, were sent by that pontiff to Jerusalem, and passed the remainder of their lives upon the Black Mountain in the severest acts of austerity and mortification. All this does not look as if the king had been deliberately concerned in this murder, or had expressly consented to it. On the contrary, various circumstances concur to prove that Henry was entirely innocent of this murder. Mr. Hume mentions particularly one, which is worthy of our notice. The king, suspecting the design of the four gentlemen above mentioned, by some menacing expressions they had dropped, "despatched (says Mr. Hume) a mes-"senger after them, ordering them to attempt nothing against the person "of the primate. But these orders came too late." See his History of England, vol. i. p. 294; Rapin Thoyras, Histoire d'Angleterre; Collier's Ecclesiastical History of England. The works to which Dr. Mosheim refers for an account of this matter, are as follow: Guliel. Stephanidæ Historia Thomæ Cantuariensis apud Scriptores rerum Anglicarum, published in folio at London by Sparke, in the year 1723.—Christ. Lupi Epistolæ et Vita Thomæ Cantuar.—Epistolæ Alexandri III. Ludovici VII. Henrici II. in hac causa, ex M. S. Vaticano, Bruxelles, 1682, 2 vols. 4to.—Natalis Alexandri Select. Histor. Eccles. Capita, Sæc. XII. Diss. x. p. 833.—Thomæ Stapletoni Tres Thomæ, seu res gestæ Thomæ Apostoli, S. Thomæ Cantuariensis, et Thomæ Mori. Coloniæ, 1612, in 8vo.

[b] Boulay, Histor. Academ. Paris. tom. ii. p. 328, et de Die Festo ejus, p. 397.—Dom. Colonia, Hist. Lit. de la Ville de Lyon, tom. ii. p. 249.

[c] See Natalis Alexander, Select. Histor. Eccles. Capit. Sæc. XII. Diss. ix. p. 819, where he treats particularly of this council.—See also tom. vi. part ii. Conciliorum Harduini, p. 1671.

☞ Dr. Mosheim, as also Spanheim and Fleury, call this the 3d Lateran council, whereas other historians mention eight preceding councils holden in the Lateran church, viz. those of the years 649, 864, 1105, 1112, 1116, 1123, 1139, 1167. Our author has also attributed, to this council of 1179, decrees that probably belonged to a later period.

[d] See what has been observed already, under the xth century, concerning the election of the popes, and the canonization of saints.

duke of Portugal, who, under the pontificate of Lucius II., had rendered his province tributary to the Roman see.[a]

XIV. Upon the death of Alexander, Ubald, bishop of Ostia, otherwise known by the name of Lucius III., was raised to the pontificate, A. D. 1181, by the suffrages of the cardinals alone, in consequence of the law mentioned in the preceding section. The administration of this new pontiff was embittered by violent tumults and seditions; for he was twice driven out of the city by the Romans, who could not bear a pope that was elected in opposition to the ancient custom, without the knowledge and consent of the clergy and the people. In the midst of these troubles he died at Verona in the year 1185, and was succeeded by Hubert Crivelli, bishop of Milan, who assumed the title of Urban III., and who, without having transacted any thing worthy of mention during his short pontificate, died of grief in the year 1187, upon hearing that Saladin had made himself master of Jerusalem. The pontificate of his successor Albert,[b] whose papal denomination was Gregory VIII., exhibited a still more striking instance of the fragility of human grandeur; for this pontiff yielded to fate about two months after his elevation. He was succeeded by Paul, bishop of Preneste, who filled the papal chair above three years under the title of Clement III., and died in 1191, without having distinguished his ecclesiastical reign by any memorable achievement, if we except his zeal for draining Europe of its treasures and inhabitants by the publication of new crusades. Celestine III.[c] makes a more shining figure in history than the pontiffs we have been now mentioning; for he thundered his excommunications against the emperor Henry VI., and Leopold, duke of Austria, on account of their having seized and imprisoned Richard I., king of England, as he was returning from the Holy Land: he also subjected to the same malediction Alphonso X., king of Gallicia and Leon, on account of an incestuous marriage into which that prince had entered; and commanded Philip Augustus, king of France, to readmit to the conjugal state and honours Ingelburga his queen, whom he had divorced for reasons unknown; though this order, indeed, produced little effect.[d] But the most illustrious and resolute pontiff that filled the papal chair during this century, and whose exploits made the greatest noise in Europe, was Lotharius, count of Segni, cardinal deacon, otherwise known by the name of Innocent III. The arduous undertakings and bold achievements of this eminent pontiff, who was placed at the head of the church in the year 1198, belong to the history of the following century.

XV. If, from the series of pontiffs that ruled the church in this century, we descend to the other ecclesiastical orders, such as the bishops, priests, and deacons, very unpleasing objects will be exhibited to our view. The unanimous voice of the historians of this age, the laws and decrees of synods and councils, loudly declare the gross ignorance, odious frauds, and flagitious crimes, that reigned among the different ranks and orders of the clergy now mentioned. It is not therefore at all surprising, that the monks, whose rules of discipline obliged them to a regular method of living, and placed them out of the way of many temptations to licentiousness, and occasions of sinning, to which the episcopal and sacerdotal orders were exposed, were in higher estimation than these were. The [illegible]n of corruption became, however, so general, that it reached at last even the convents; and the monks, who were gaining with the most ardent efforts the summit of ecclesiastical power and authority, and who beheld both the secular clerks and the regular canons with aversion and contempt,[e] began, in many places, to degenerate from that sanctity of manners, and that exact obedience to their rules of discipline, by which they had been formerly distinguished, and to exhibit to the people scandalous examples of immorality and vice.[f] The Benedictines of Clugni, who undoubtedly surpassed, in regularity of conduct and purity of manners, all the monastic orders who lived under their rule, maintained their integrity for a long time, amidst the general decay of piety and virtue: but they were at length carried away with the torrent. Seduced by the examples of their abbot Pontius, and corrupted by the treasures that were poured daily into their convent by the liberality of the opulent and pious, they fell from their primitive austerity, and following the dissolute examples of the other Benedictines, they 'gave themselves up to pleasure, and dwelt carelessly.'[g] Several of the succeeding abbots endeavoured to remedy this disorder, and to recover the declining reputation of their convent; but their efforts were much less successful than they expected, nor could the monks of Clugni ever be brought back to their primitive sanctity and virtue.[h]

XVI. The Cistertian Order, which was much inferior to the monks of Clugni, both with respect to the antiquity of its institution, and the possessions and revenues of its convent, far surpassed them in external regularity of life and manners, and in a striking air of innocence and sanctity. Hence its members acquired that high degree of reputation and authority which the order of Clugni had formerly enjoyed; and the fraternity increased daily in number, credit, and opulence. The famous St. Bernard, abbot of Clairv[illegible] whose influence throughout Europe was incredible, whose word was a law, and whose counsels were regarded by kings and princes as so many orders to which the most respectful obedience was due, was the person who contributed most to enrich and aggrandize the Cistertian order. Hence he is justly considered as its second parent and founder; and hence the

[a] Baronius, Annal. ad. A. 1179.—Innocentii III. Epistolæ Lib. ep. xlix. p. 54, tom. i. ed. Baluz.

☞ Alphonso had been declared, by his victorious army, king of Portugal, in the year 1136, in the midst of the glorious exploits he had performed in the war against the Moors; so that Alexander did no more than confirm this title by an arrogant bull, in which he treats that excellent prince as his vassal.

[b] This prelate, before his elevation to the papacy, was bishop of Benevento, and chancellor of the Roman church.

[c] Whose name was Hyacinth, a native of Rome, and a cardinal deacon.

☞ [d] It was in consequence of the vigorous and terrible proceedings of Innocent III. that the re-union between Philip and Ingelburga was accomplished. See L'Histoire de France, par l'Abbé Velly, tom. iii. p. 367.

[e] See Ruperti Epistola in Martenne's Thesaur. Anecd. tom. i. p. 285. This writer prefers the monks to the apostles.

[f] See Bernardi Considerationes ad Eugenium, lib. iii. cap. iv.—See also the Speculum Stultorum, or Brunellus, a poem, composed by Nigel Wireker, an English bard of no mean reputation, who lived about the middle of the xiith century. In this poem, of which several editions have been published, the different orders of monks are severely censured; the Carthusians alone have escaped the keen and virulent satire of this witty writer.

[g] Isaiah, xlvii. 8.

[h] See Martenne's Amplissima Collectio Monumentor. Veter. tom. ix. p. 1119.

Cistertians, not only in France, but also in Germany and other countries, were distinguished by the title of Bernardine monks.[a] A hundred and sixty religious communities derived their origin, or their rules of discipline, from this illustrious abbot; and he left, at his death, seven hundred monks in the monastery of Clairval. The church abounded with bishops and archbishops who had been formed and prepared for the ministry by his instructions; and he also reckoned, among the number of his disciples, Eugenius III. one of the best and wisest of the Roman pontiffs.

XVII. The growing prosperity of the Cistertian Order excited the envy and jealousy of the monks of Clugni, and, after several dissensions of less consequence, produced at length an open rupture, a declared war, between these opulent and powerful monasteries. They both followed the rule of St. Benedict, though they differed in their habit, and in certain laws, which the Cistertians more especially had added to that rule. The monks of Clugni accused the Cistertians of affecting an extravagant austerity in their manners and discipline; while the Cistertians, on the other hand, charged them, upon very good grounds, with having degenerated from their former sanctity and regularity of conduct. St. Bernard, who was the oracle and protector of the Cistertians, wrote, in the year 1127, an apology for his own conduct with respect to the division that subsisted between the two convents, and inveighed, with a just but not intemperate severity, against the vices that corrupted the monks of Clugni.[b] This charge was answered, though with uncommon moderation and candour, by Peter Mauricius, abbot of Clugni; and hence arose a controversy in form, which spread from day to day its baneful influence, and excited disturbances in several provinces of Europe.[c] It was, however, followed by a much more vehement and bitter contest concerning an exemption from the payment of tithes, granted among other privileges and immunities to the Cistertians, A. D. 1132, by Innocent II. A considerable part of the lands which the Cistertians possessed, and to which the pontiff granted this exemption, were subject to the monks of Clugni, who consequently suffered by this act of liberality, and disputed the matter, not only with the Cistertians, but with the pope himself. This keen dispute was, in some measure, terminated in the year 1155; but in what manner, or upon what conditions, we do not precisely know.[d]

XVIII. The regular canons, who had been formed into a fixed and permanent order in the preceding century, employed their time in a much more useful and exemplary manner than the monastic drones, who passed their days in luxury and sloth. They kept public schools for the instruction of youth, and exercised a variety of ecclesiastical functions, which rendered them extremely useful to the church.[e] Hence they rose daily in credit and reputation, received many rich and noble donations from several persons, whose opulence and piety rendered them able and willing to distinguish merit, and were also often put in possession of the revenues of the monks, whose dissolute lives occasioned, from time to time, the suppression of their convents. This, as might well be expected, inflamed the rage of the monastic orders against the regular canons, whom they attacked with the greatest fury, and loaded with the bitterest invectives. The canons, in their turn, were far from being backward in making reprisals; they exclaimed, on the contrary, against the monks with the utmost vehemence; enumerated their vices both in discourses and in writings, and insisted upon their being confined to their monasteries, sequestered from human society, and excluded from all ecclesiastical honours and functions. Hence arose, between the monks and canons, a long and warm contest for pre-eminence; in which both parties carried their pretensions too high, and exceeded the bounds of decency and moderation.[f] The champions, who espoused the interest of the monks, were the famous Peter Abelard, Hugh of Amiens, Rupert of Duytz; while the cause of the canons was defended by Philip Harvengius, a learned abbot, and several other men of genius and abilities.[g] The effects and remains of this ancient controversy are yet visible in our times.

XIX. A new society of religious Benedictines arose about the commencement of this century, whose principal monastery was erected in a barren and solitary place, called Fontevraud, between Angers and Tours; whence the order derived its name. Robert of Arbrisselles, its founder, who had been first a hermit, and afterwards a monk, prescribed to his religious of both sexes the rule of St. Benedict, amplified, however, by the addition of several new laws, which were extremely singular and excessively severe. Among other singularities that distinguished this institution, one was, that the several monasteries which Robert had built, within one and the same inclosure, for his monks and nuns, were all subjected to the authority and government of one abbess; in justification of which measure, the example of Christ was alleged, who recommended St. John to the Virgin Mary, and imposed it as an order upon that beloved disciple, to be obedient to her as to his own mother.[h] This new order, like all other novelties of that kind, gained immediately a high degree

[a] See Jo. Mabillon, Annal. Ord. Benedict. tom. vi. passim, in Vita Sti. Bernardi, which he has prefixed to his edition of the works of that saint.—See also the Annales Cistercienses, by Manriquez, tom. ii. and iii.

☞ [b] This apology, as it is called, of St. Bernard, is well worth the attention of the curious reader, as it exhibits a true and lively picture of monastic opulence and luxury, and shows how the religious orders in general lived in this century. The famous abbot, in this performance, accuses the monks of Clugni of luxury and intemperance at their table, of superfluity and magnificence in their dress, their bed-chambers, their furniture, equipage, and buildings. He points out the pride and vanity of the abbots, who looked much more like the governors of provinces, than the spiritual fathers of humble and holy communities, whose original profession it was, to be crucified and dead to the interests and pleasures, the pomps and vanities of the present world. He declares, with a pious concern, that he knew several abbots, each of whom had more than sixty horses in his stable, and such a prodigious variety of wines in his cellar, that it was scarcely possible to taste the half of them at a single entertainment. See Fleury, Hist. Ecclesiastique, liv. lxxvii. tom. xiv. p. 351, edit. Bruxelles.

[c] See S. Bernardi Apologia in Oper. tom. i. p. 523—533. The apology of Peter, abbot of Clugni, surnamed the venerable, which is published among his Epistles, lib. i. ep. 28, in the Bibliotheca Cluniacensis, tom. i. p. 657—695. See also the Dialogus inter Cluniacensem, et Cisterciensem published by Martenne, in his Thesaur. Anecd. tom. v. p. 1573—1613. Compare with all these Mabillon, Annal. Benedict. tom. vi. p. 80, and Manriquez, Annal. Cisterc. tom. i. p. 28.

[d] See Manriquez, Annal. Cistercienses, tom. i. p. 232.—Mabillon, Annal. Benedict. tom. vi. p. 212, 479, and præfat. ad Opera S. Bernardi—Jo. de Lannes, Histoire du Pontificat d'Innocent II. p. 68—79.—Jo. Nic. Hertii Diss. de exemptione Cisterc. à decimis.

[e] See the Histoire Literaire de la France, tom. ix. p. 112.

[f] See Lamberti Epistola in Martenne's Thesaur. Anecdot. tom. i. p. 329.

[g] Abelardi Opera, p. 228. Paris, 1616, in 4to.—Martenne's Thesaur. Anecdot. tom. v. p. 970—975, 1614, et Amplissima ejusdem Collectio, tom. ix. p. 971—972.—Phil. Harvengii Opera, p. 385. Duaci 1621, in folio.

[h] See the Works of Abelard, p. 48, whose testimony in this matter is confirmed by the present state and constitution of this famous order; though Mabillon, from an excessive partiality in favour of the Bene-

of credit: the singularity of its discipline, its form, and its laws, engaged multitudes to embrace it; and thus the labours of its founder were crowned with remarkable success. [☞ But the association of vigorous monks and tender virgins, in the same community, was an imprudent measure, and could not but be attended with many inconveniences. However that may be, Robert continued his pious labours, and the odour of his sanctity perfumed all the places where he exercised his ministry.] He was, indeed, suspected by some, of too great an intimacy with his female disciples; and it was rumored, that in order to try his virtue, by opposing it to the strongest temptations, he exposed it to an inevitable defeat by the manner in which he conversed with these holy virgins. It was affirmed, that their commerce was softened by something more tender than divine love; against which charge his disciples have used their most zealous endeavours to defend their master.[a]

XX. Norbert, a German nobleman, who took holy orders, and was afterwards archbishop of Magdeburg, employed his most strenuous efforts to restore to its primitive severity the discipline of the regular canons, which was extremely relaxed in some places, and almost totally abolished in others. This eminent reformer founded, in the year 1121, the Order of Premontré in Picardy, whose fame spread throughout Europe with an amazing rapidity, and whose opulence, in a short space of time, became excessive and enormous,[b] in consequence of the high esteem which the monks of this community had acquired by the gravity of their manners, and their assiduous application to the liberal arts and sciences. But their overgrown prosperity was the source of their ruin; it soon diminished their zeal for the exercises of devotion, extinguished their thirst after useful knowledge, and thus gradually plunged them into all kinds of vice. The rule which they followed was that of St. Augustin, with some slight alterations, and an addition of certain severe laws, whose authority, however, did not long survive their austere founder.[c]

XXI. About the middle of this century, a Calabrian, whose name was Berthold, set out with a few companions for mount Carmel, and, upon the very spot where the prophet Elias is said to have disappeared, built an humble cottage, with an adjoining chapel, in which he led a life of solitude, austerity, and labour. This little colony subsisted, and the places of those that died were more than filled by new-comers; so that it was, at length,[d] erected into a monastic community by Albert, patriarch of Jerusalem. This austere prelate drew up, for the new monks, a rule of discipline, which was afterwards confirmed by the authority of the Roman pontiffs, who modified and altered it in several respects, and, among other corrections, mitigated its excessive rigour.[e] Such was the origin of the famous Order of Carmelites, or, as they are commonly called, the Order of our Lady of Mount Carmel, which was afterwards transplanted from Syria into Europe, and obtained the principal rank among the mendicant or begging orders. It is true, the Carmelites reject, with the highest indignation, an origin so recent and obscure, and affirm to this very day, that the prophet Elias was the parent and founder of their ancient community.[f] Very few, however, have been engaged to adopt this fabulous and chimerical account of the establishment, except the members of the order; and many Roman Catholic writers have treated their pretensions to such a remote antiquity with the utmost contempt.[g] [☞ And scarcely, indeed, can any thing be more ridiculous than the circumstantial narrations of the occasion, origin, founder, and revolutions of this famous order, which we find in several ecclesiastical authors, whose zeal for this fraternity has rendered them capable of adopting without reluctance, or, at least, of reciting without shame, the most puerile and glaring absurdities. They tell us that Elias was introduced into the state of monachism by the ministry of angels; that

dictines, has endeavoured to diminish its credit in his Annal. Benedict. tom. v. p. 423. For an account of Robert and his order, see the Acta Sanctor. tom. iii. Februar. p. 593.—Dion. Sammarthani Gallia Christiana, tom. ii. p. 1311.—Bayle's Dictionary, at the article Fontevraud.—Helyot, Hist. des Ordres, tom. vi. p. 83.—The present state of this monastery is described by Moleon, in his Voyages Liturgiques, p. 108, and by Martenne, in the second part of his Voyage Literaire de deux Benedictins.

[a] See the letters of Geoffry, abbot of Vendôme, and of Marbod, bishop of Rennes; in which Robert is accused of lying in the same bed with the nuns. How the grave abbot was defended against this accusation by the members of his order, may be seen in Mainferme's Clypeus Nascentis Ordinis Fontebraldensis, published in 8vo. at Paris in the year 1684; and also by another production of the same author, entitled, Dissertationes in Epistolam contra Robertum de Arbrissello, Salmurii, 1682, in 8vo. Bayle's account of this famous abbot, in which there is such an admirable mixture of wit, sense, and malice, has been also attacked by several writers; see, among other works, the vth and vith tomes of Mabillon's Annals, and the Dissertation Apologetique pour le bienheureux Robert d'Arbrisselles sur ce qu'en a dit M. Bayle, Anvers 1701, in 8vo.

☞ In the year 1177, some nuns of this order were brought into England at the desire of Henry II. who gave them the monastery of Ambresbury, in Wiltshire. They had two other houses here; one at Eton, the other at Westwood, in Worcestershire.

☞ [b] The religious of this order were at first so poor, that they had nothing they could call their own, but a single ass, which served to carry the wood they cut down every morning, and sent to Laon in order to purchase bread. But in a short time they received so many donations, and built so many monasteries, that thirty years after the foundation of this order, they had above a hundred abbeys in France and Germany. In process of time, the order increased so prodigiously, that it had monasteries in all parts of Christendom, amounting to 1000 abbeys, 300 provostships, a vast number of priories, and 500 nunneries. But this number is now greatly diminished. Besides what they lost in Protestant countries, of 65 abbeys, that they had in Italy, there is not one now remaining.

[c] See Helyot, Hist. des Ordres, tom. ii. p. 156.—Chrysost. Vander Sterre, Vita S. Norberti Præmonstratensium Patriarchæ, published in 8vo. at Antwerp, in 1656.—Louis Hughes, Vie de S. Norbert, Luxemb. 1704, in 4to.—Add to these, notwithstanding his partiality, Jo. Launoy, Inquisit. in Privilegia Ordin. Præmonstrat. cap. i. ii. Oper. tom. iii. part i. p. 448. For an account of the present state of the Order of Premontré, see Martenne's Voyage Literaire de deux Benedictins, tom. ii. p. 59.

☞ The Præmonstratenses, or monks of Premontré, vulgarly called White Canons, came first into England in the year 1046. Their first monastery, called New House, was built in Lincolnshire, by Peter de Saulia, and dedicated to St. Martial. In the reign of Edward I. the order in question had 27 monasteries in England.

[d] In the year 1205.

[e] I have here principally followed Dan. Papebroch, an accurate writer, and one who is always careful to produce sufficient testimonies of the truth of his narrations. See the Acta Sanctor. Antwerp. Mense April. tom. iii. p. 774—802. It is well known, that an accusation was brought against this learned Jesuit, before the tribunal of the pope, by the Carmelites, on account of his having called in question the dignity and high antiquity of their order. We have in Helyot's Hist. des Ordres (tom. i. p. 282) an account of this long and tedious contest, which was so far determined, or at least suspended, in the year 1698, by Innocent XII. that silence was imposed upon the contending parties.

[f] The most concise and accurate of all the Carmelite writers, who have treated this matter, is Thomas Aquinas, a French monk, in his Dissertatio Histor. Theol. in qua Patriarchatus Ordinis Carmelitarum Prophetæ Eliæ vindicatur, published in 8vo. at Paris in the year 1632. The modern writers who have maintained the cause of the Carmelites against Papebroch, are extremely prolix and tiresome.

[g] See Harduini Opera Posthum. p. 652.—Labat, Voyage en Espagne et Italie, t. iii. p. 87.—Courayer, Examen des Defauts Theol. t. i. p. 455.

his first disciples were Jonah, Micah, and also Obadiah, whose wife, in order to shake off an importunate crowd of lovers, who fluttered about her at the court of Ahab after the departure of her husband, bound herself by a vow of chastity, received the veil from the hands of father Elias, and thus became the first abbess of the Carmelite order. They enter into a minute detail of the circumstances that relate to the rules of discipline which were drawn up for this community, the habit which distinguished its members, and the various alterations which were successively introduced into their rule of discipline. They observe, that among other marks which were used to distinguish the Carmelites from the seculars, the tonsure was one; that this mark of distinction exposed them, indeed, to the mockeries of a profane multitude; and that this furnishes the true explication of the term bald-head, which the children addressed, by way of reproach, to Elisha as he was on his way to Carmel.[a] They also affirm, that Pythagoras was a member of this ancient order; that he drew all his wisdom from Mount Carmel, and had several conversations with the prophet Daniel at Babylon, upon the subject of the Trinity. They even go farther into the region of fable, and assert, that the Virgin Mary, and Jesus himself, assumed the habit and profession of Carmelites; and they load this fiction with a heap of absurd circumstances, which it is impossible to read without the highest astonishment.[b]

XXII. To this brief account of the religious orders, it will not be amiss to add a list of the principal Greek and Latin writers who flourished in this century. The most eminent among the Greeks were those that follow:

Philippus Solitarius, whose Dioptra, or controversy between the soul and the body, is sufficiently known;

Eustratius, who maintained the cause of the Greek church against the Latins with great learning and spirit, and who wrote commentaries on certain books of Aristotle;

Euthymius Zigabenus, who by his anti-heretical Panoply, together with his commentaries upon several parts of the sacred writings, acquired a place among the principal authors of this century;[c]

Johannes Zonaras, whose Annals, with several other productions of his learned pen, are still extant;

Michael Glycas, who also applied himself to historical composition, as well as to other branches of learning;[d]

Constantius Harmenopulus, whose commentaries on the civil and canon laws are deservedly esteemed;

Andronicus Camaterus, who wrote with great warmth and vehemence against the Latins and Armenians;

Eustathius, bishop of Thessalonica, the most learned of the Greeks in this century, and the celebrated commentator upon the Iliad;

Theodorus Balsamon, who employed great diligence, erudition, and labour, in explaining and digesting the civil and ecclesiastical laws of the Greeks.[e]

XXIII. The most eminent among the Latin writers were,

Bernard, abbot of Clairval, from whom the Cistertian monks (as has been already observed) derived the title of Bernardins; a man who was not destitute of genius and taste, and whose judgment, in many respects, was just and penetrating; but who, on the other hand, discovered in his conduct many marks of superstition and weakness, and what is still worse, concealed the lust of dominion under the mask of piety, and made no scruple of loading with false accusations, such as had the misfortune to incur his displeasure;[f]

Innocent III. bishop of Rome, whose epistles and other productions contribute to illustrate the religious sentiments, as also the discipline and morals, that prevailed in this century;[g]

Anselm of Laon, a man of a subtle genius, and deeply versed in logical disquisition;

Abelard, the disciple of Anselm, and most famous in this century, on account of the elegance of his wit, the extent of his erudition, the power of his rhetoric, and the severity of his fate;[h]

Geoffry of Vendome, whose Epistles and Dissertations are yet extant;

Rupert of Duytz, the most eminent, perhaps, of all the scriptural expositors who flourished among the Latins during this century, a man of a sound judgment and an elegant taste;[i]

Hugh of St. Victor, a man distinguished by the fecundity of his genius, who treated of all the branches of sacred and profane erudition that were known in his time, and composed several dissertations that are not destitute of merit;[k]

Richard of St. Victor, who was at the head of the Mys-

---

[a] See 2 Kings ii. 23.

☞ [b] For an ample account of all the absurd inventions here hinted at, see a very remarkable work, entitled, "Ordres Monastiques, Histoire extraite de tous les Auteurs qui ont conservé a la Posterité ce qu'il y a de plus curieux dans chaque Ordre, enrichie d'un très grand nombre de passages des memes Auteurs, pour servir de demonstration que ce qu'on y avance est egalement veritable et curieux." This work, which was first printed at Paris in 1751, under the title of Berlin, and which was suppressed almost as soon as it appeared, is written with great wit, eloquence, and learning: and all the narrations it contains are confirmed by citations from the most eminent authors, who have given accounts of the religious orders. The author's view seems to have been to expose the monks of every denomination to the laughter of his readers; and it is very remarkable, that, in the execution of his purpose, he has drawn his materials from the gravest writers, and from the most zealous defenders of monachism. If he has embellished his subject, it is by the vivacity of his manner, and the witty elegance of his style, and not by imputing to the monastic communities any practices which their most serious historians omit or disavow. The authors of the Bibliotheque des Sciences et des Beaux Arts, at the Hague, have given several interesting extracts from this work in the 2d, 3d, 4th, and 5th volumes of that literary journal.

☞ The Carmelites came into England in the year 1240, and erected a vast number of monasteries in that kingdom. See Broughton's Historical Library, vol. i. p. 208.

[c] See Rich. Simon, Critique de la Bibliotheque des Auteurs Eccles. par M. Du-Pin, tom. i. p. 318, 324.

[d] Other historians place Glycas in the fifteenth century. See Lami Dissertatio de Glyca, which is prefixed to the first volume of his Deliciæ Virorum eruditorum.

[e] See the Bibliotheca Græca of Fabricius.

[f] The learned Mabillon has given a splendid edition of the works of St. Bernard, and has not only, in his preface, made many excellent observations upon the life and history of this famous abbot, but has also subjoined to his works the accounts that have been given, by the ancient writers, of his life and actions.

[g] The Epistles of Innocent III. were published at Paris, in two large volumes in folio, by Baluze, in the year 1682.

[h] See Bayle's Dictionary, at the articles Abelard and Paraclet.—Gervais, Vie de Pierre Abeillard, Abbé de Ruys, et d'Heloise, published at Paris in two volumes 8vo., in the year 1728. The works of this famous and unfortunate monk were published at Paris in 1616, in one volume 4to., by Franc. Amboise. Another edition, much more ample, might be given, since there are a great number of the productions of Abelard that have never yet seen the light.

[i] See Mabillon, Annal. Bened. tom. vi. p. 19, 42, 144, 168, 261, 282, 296. He gives an ample account of Rupert, and of the disputes in which he was involved.

[k] See Gallia Christiana, tom. vii. p. 661. The works of this learned man were published at Rouen, in three folio volumes, in the year 1648.

tics in this century, and whose treatise, entitled, The Mystical Ark, which contains, as it were, the marrow of that kind of theology, was received with the greatest avidity, and applauded by the fanatics of the times;[a]

Honorius of Autun,[b] no mean philosopher, and tolerably versed in theological learning;

Gratian, a learned monk, who reduced the canon law into a new and regular form, in his vast compilation of the decisions of the ancient and modern councils, the decretals of the pontiffs, the capitularies of the kings of France, &c.;

William of Rheims, the author of several productions, calculated to excite pious sentiments, and contribute to the progress of practical religion;

Peter Lombard, who was commonly called, in France, Master of the Sentences, because he had composed a work so entitled, which was a collection of opinions and sentences relative to the various branches of theology, extracted from the Latin doctors, and reduced into a sort of system;[c]

Gilbert de la Porrée,[d] a subtle dialectician, and a learned divine, who is, however, said to have adopted several erroneous sentiments concerning the Divine Essence, the Incarnation, and the Trinity;[e]

William of Auxerre, who acquired a considerable reputation by his Theological System;[f]

Peter of Blois,[g] whose epistles and other productions may yet be read with profit;

John of Salisbury, a man of great learning and true genius, whose philosophical and theological knowledge was adorned with a lively wit and a flowing eloquence, as appears in his Metalogicus, and his book de Nugis Curialium;

Petrus Comestor, author of an Abridgment of the Old and New Testament, which was used in the schools for the instruction of the youth, and called (probably from that circumstance) Historia Scholastica.

A more ample account of the names and characters of the Latin writers may be found in those authors who have professedly treated of that branch of literature.

CHAPTER III.

Concerning the Doctrine of the Christian Church during this Century.

I. WHEN we consider the multitude of causes which united their influence in obscuring the lustre of genuine Christianity, and corrupting it by a profane mixture of the inventions of superstitious and designing men with its pure and sublime doctrines, it will appear surprising, that the religion of Jesus was not totally extinguished. All orders contributed, though in different ways, to corrupt the native purity of true religion. The popes led the way; they would not suffer any doctrines to prevail that had the smallest tendency to diminish their despotic authority; but obliged the public teachers to interpret the precepts of Christianity in such a manner, as to render them subservient to the support of papal dominion and tyranny. This order was so much the more terrible, as those who refused to comply with it, and to force the words of scripture into significations totally opposite to the intentions of its divine author (such, in a word, as had the courage to place the authority of the Gospel above that of the Roman pontiffs, and to consider it as the supreme rule of their conduct,) were answered with the formidable arguments of fire and sword, and received death in the most cruel forms, as the fruit of their sincerity and resolution. The priests and monks contributed, in their way, to disfigure the beautiful simplicity of religion; and, finding it their interest to keep the people in the grossest ignorance and darkness, dazzled their feeble eyes with the ludicrous pomp of a gaudy worship, and led them to place the whole of religion in vain ceremonies, bodily austerities and exercises, and particularly in a blind and stupid veneration for the clergy. The scholastic doctors, who considered the decisions of the ancients, and the precepts of the Dialecticians, as the great rule and criterion of truth, instead of explaining the doctrines of the Gospel, undermined them by degrees, and sunk divine truth in the ruins of a captious philosophy; while the Mystics, running into the opposite extreme, maintained that the souls of the truly pious were incapable of any spontaneous motions, and could only be moved by a divine impulse; and thus not only set limits to the pretensions of reason, but excluded it entirely from religion and morality, if they did not in some measure deny its very existence.

II. The consequences of all this were superstition and ignorance, which were substituted for true religion, and reigned over the multitude with an universal sway. Relics, which were for the most part fictitious, or at least uncertain, attracted more powerfully the confidence of the people, than the merits of Christ, and were supposed by many to be more effectual, than the prayers offered to heaven, through the mediation and intercession of that divine Redeemer.[h] The opulent, whose circumstances enabled them either to erect new temples, or to repair and embellish the old, were considered as the happiest of all mortals, and as the most intimate friends of the Most High; whilst they, whom poverty rendered incapable of such pompous acts of liberality, contributed to the multiplication of religious edifices by their bodily labours, cheerfully performed the services in which beasts of burthen are usually employed, (such as carrying stones and drawing wagons,) and expected to obtain eternal salvation by these voluntary and painful efforts of misguided zeal.[i] The saints had a greater number of worshippers than the Supreme Being and the Saviour of mankind; nor did these superstitious worshippers trouble their heads

---

See, for a farther account of him, Derlangii Dissert. de Hugone a S. Victore, Helmstadt, 1746, in 4to., and Martenne's Voyage Literaire, tom. ii. p. 91, 92.

[a] Gallia Christiana, tom. vii. p. 669.

[b] Such is the place to which Honorius is said to have belonged. But Le Bœuf proves him to have been a German, in his Dissert. sur l'Hist. Françoise, tom. i. p. 254.

[c] Gallia Christiana, tom. vii. p. 68.

[d] Called, in Latin, Gilbertus Porretanus.

[e] He held, among other things, this trifling and sophistical proposition, that the divine essence and attributes are not God; a proposition that was every way proper to exercise the quibbling spirit of the scholastic writers.

[f] Le Bœuf, Dissert. sur la Somme Theologique de Guillaume d'Auxerre, in Molat's Continuation des Memoires d'Histoire et de Literature, tom. iii. part ii. p. 317.

[g] Petrus Blesensis.

[h] See Guibert de Novigento, de Pignoribus (so were relics called) Sanctorum, in his Works published by d'Acheri, p. 327, where he attacks, with judgment and dexterity, the superstition of these miserable times.

[i] See Haymon's Treatise concerning this custom, published by Mabillon, at the end of the sixth tome of his Annal. Benedict. See also those Annales, p. 392.

about that knotty question, which occasioned much debate and many laborious disquisitions in succeeding times, viz. How the inhabitants of heaven came to the knowledge of the prayers and supplications that were addressed to them from the earth? This question was prevented in this century by an opinion, which the Christians had received from their pagan ancestors, that the inhabitants of heaven descended often from above, and frequented the places in which they had formerly taken pleasure during their residence upon earth.[a] To finish the horrid portrait of superstition, we shall only observe, that the stupid credulity of the people in this century went so far, that when any persons, either through the phrensy of a disordered imagination, or with an intention of deceiving, published the dreams or visions, which they fancied or pretended they had from above, the multitude resorted to the new oracle, and respected its decisions as the commands of God, who in this way was pleased, as they imagined, to communicate counsel, instruction, and the knowledge of his will to men. This appears (to mention no other examples) from the extraordinary reputation which the two famous prophetesses Hildegard, abbess of Bingen, and Elizabeth of Schonauge, obtained in Germany.[b]

III. The general prevalence of ignorance and superstition was dexterously, yet basely improved, by the rulers of the church, to fill their coffers, and to drain the purses of the deluded multitude: indeed, each rank and order of the clergy had a peculiar method of fleecing the people. The bishops, when they wanted money for their private pleasures, or for the exigencies of the church, granted to their flock the power of purchasing the remission of the penalties imposed upon transgressors, by a sum of money, which was to be applied to certain religious purposes; or, in other words, they published indulgences, which became an inexhaustible source of opulence to the episcopal orders, and enabled them, as is well known, to form and execute the most difficult schemes for the enlargement of their authority, and to erect a multitude of sacred edifices, which augmented considerably the external pomp and splendour of the church.[c] The abbots and monks, who were not qualified to grant indulgences, had recourse to other methods of enriching their convents. They carried about the country the carcases and relics of the saints in solemn procession, and permitted the multitude to behold, touch, and embrace, at fixed prices, these sacred and lucrative remains. The monastic orders often gained as much by this raree-show, as the bishops did by their indulgences.[d]

IV. When the Roman pontiffs cast an eye upon the immense treasures that the inferior rulers of the church were accumulating by the sale of indulgences, they thought proper to limit the power of the bishops in remitting the penalties imposed upon transgressors, and assumed, almost entirely, this profitable traffick to themselves. In consequence of this new measure, the court of Rome became the general magazine of indulgences; and the pontiffs, when either the wants of the church, the emptiness of their coffers, or the demon of avarice, prompted them to look out for new subsidies, published not only a general, but also a complete, or what they called a plenary remission of the temporal pains and penalties, annexed by the church to certain transgressions. They went still farther; and not only remitted the penalties which the civil and ecclesiastical laws had enacted against transgressors, but audaciously usurped the authority which belongs to God alone, and impiously pretended to abolish even the punishments which are reserved in a future state for the workers of iniquity; a step which the bishops, with all their avarice and presumption, had never once ventured to take.[e]

The pontiffs first employed this pretended prerogative in promoting the holy war, and shed abroad their indulgences, though with a certain degree of moderation, in order to encourage the European princes to form new expeditions for the conquest of Palestine; but, in process of time, the charm of indulgence was practised upon various occasions of much less consequence, and merely with a view to base lucre.[f] Their introduction, among other things, destroyed the credit and authority of the ancient canonical and ecclesiastical discipline of penance, and occasioned the removal and suppression of the penitentials,[g] by which the reins were let loose to every kind of vice. Such proceedings stood much in need of a plausible defence; but this was impossible. To vindicate in an authoritative manner these scandalous measures of the pontiffs, an absurd and even monstrous doctrine was now invented, which was modified and embellished by St. Thomas in the succeeding century, and which contained, among others, the following enormities: "That there actually existed an immense treasure of merit, composed of the pious deeds, and virtuous actions, which the saints had performed beyond what was necessary for their own salvation,[h] and which were therefore applicable to the benefit of others; that the guardian and dispenser of this precious treasure was the Roman pontiff; and that consequently he was empowered to assign, to such as he deemed proper objects, a portion of this inexhaustible source of merit, suitable to their respective guilt, and sufficient to deliver them from the punishment due to their crimes." It is a most deplorable mark of the power of superstition, that a doctrine, so absurd in its nature, and so pernicious in its effects, should yet be retained and defended in the church of Rome.[i]

[a] As a proof that this assertion is not without foundation, we shall transcribe the following remarkable passage of the life of St. Altman, bishop of Padua, as it stands in Seb. Tengnagel's Collect. Vet. Monumentor. p. 41. "Vos licet, sancti Domini, somno vestro requiescatis ... haud tamen crediderim, spiritus vestros deesse locis quæ viventes tantâ devotione construxistis et dilexistis. Credo vos adesse cunctis illic degentibus, astare videlicet orantibus, succurrere laborantibus, et vota singulorum in conspectu divinæ majestatis promovere."

[b] See Mabillon, Annales Benedict. tom. vi. p. 431, 529, 554.

[c] Stephanus Obazinensis in Baluzii Miscellan. tom. iv. p. 130.—Mabillon, Annal. Benedict. tom. vi. p. 535, &c.

[d] We find in the records of this century innumerable examples of this method of extorting contributions from the multitude. See the Chronicon Centulense in d'Acherii Spicilegio Veter. Scriptor. tom. ii. p. 354.—Vita Stæ. Romaniæ, ibid. p. 137.—Mabillon, Annal. Benedict. tom. vi. p. 332, 644.—Acta Sanctor. Mensis Maii, tom. vii. p. 533, where we have an account of a long journey made by the relics of St. Marculus. Mabillon, Acta Sanctorum Ordinis Benedictini, tom. vi. p. 519, 520; tom. ii. p. 732.

[e] Morinus, de administratione Sacramenti Pœnitentiæ, lib. x. cap. xx. xxi. xxii. p. 768.—Rich. Simon, Biblioth. Critique, tom. iii. cap. xxxiii. p. 371.—Mabillon, Præfatio ad Acta Sanctorum Sæc. V. Acta Sanctorum Benedictini, p. 54, not to speak of the protestant writers, whom I designedly pass over.

[f] Muratori, Antiq. Italic. medii Ævi, tom. v. p. 761.—Franc. Pagi, Breviar. Rom. Pontif. tom. ii. p. 60.—Theod. Ruinarti Vita Urbani II. p. 231, tom. iii. Op. Posthum.

[g] The Penitential was a book, in which the degrees and kinds of penance, that were annexed to different crimes, were registered.

[h] These works are known by the name of Works of Supererogation.

[i] For a satisfactory and ample account of the enormous doctrine

V. Nothing was more common in this century than expositors and interpreters of the sacred writings; but nothing was so rare, as to find, in that class of authors, the qualifications that are essentially required in a good commentator. Few of these expositors were attentive to search after the true signification of the words employed by the sacred writers, or to investigate the precise sense in which they were used; and these few were destitute of the succours which such researches demand. The Greek and Latin commentators, blinded by their enthusiastic love of antiquity, and their implicit veneration for the doctors of the early ages of the church, drew from their writings, without discernment or choice, a heap of passages, which they were pleased to consider as illustrations of the holy scriptures. Such were the commentaries of Euthymius Zigabenus, an eminent expositor among the Greeks, upon the Psalms, the Gospels, and Epistles; though it must, at the same time, be acknowledged, that this writer follows, in some places, the dictates of his own judgment, and gives, upon certain occasions, proofs of penetration and genius. Among the Latins, we might give several examples of the injudicious manner of expounding the divine word that prevailed in this century, such as the Lucubrations of Peter Lombard, Gilbert de la Porrée, and the famous Abelard, upon the Psalms of David, and the Epistles of St. Paul. Nor do those Latin commentators who expounded the whole of the sacred writings, and who are placed at the head of the expositors of this age, (such as Gilbert, bishop of London, surnamed the Universal, on account of the vast extent of his erudition,[a] and Hervey,[b] a most studious Benedictine monk,) deserve a higher place in our esteem, than the authors before mentioned. The writers that merit the preference among the Latins are Rupert of Duytz, and Anselm of Laon; the former of whom expounded several books of scripture, and the latter composed, or rather compiled, a glossary upon the sacred writings. As to those doctors who were not carried away by an enthusiastical veneration for the ancients, who had courage enough to try their own talents, and to follow the dictates of their own sagacity, they were chargeable with defects of another kind; for, disregarding and overlooking the beautiful simplicity of divine truth, they were perpetually bent on the search of all sorts of mysteries in the sacred writings, and were constantly on the scent after some hidden meaning in the plainest expressions of scripture. The Mystics excelled peculiarly in this manner of expounding; and, by their violent explications, forced the word of God into a conformity with their visionary doctrines, their enthusiastic feelings, and the system of discipline which they had drawn from the excursions of their irregular fancies. Nor were the commentators, who pretended to logic and philosophy, and who, in effect, had applied themselves to these profound sciences, free from the contagion of mysticism in their explications of scripture. That they followed the example of those fanatics may be seen by the Allegorical Exposition which Hugh of St. Victor gave of the Old and New Testament, by the Mystical Ark of Richard of St. Victor, and by the Mystical Commentaries of Guibert, abbot of Nogent, on Obadiah, Hosea, and Amos;[c] not to mention several other writers, who seem to have been animated by the same spirit.

VI. The most eminent teachers of theology resided at Paris, which city was, from this time forward, frequented by students of divinity from all parts of Europe, who resorted thither in crowds, to receive instruction from these celebrated masters. The French divines were divided into different sects. The first of these sects, who were distinguished by the title of the Ancient Theologists, explained the doctrines of religion, in a plain and simple manner, by passages drawn from the holy scriptures, from the decrees of councils, and the writings of the ancient doctors, and very rarely made use of the succours of reason or philosophy in their theological lectures. In this class we place St. Bernard, Peter surnamed the Chanter, Walter of St. Victor, and other theologians, who declared an open and bitter war against the philosophical divines. The doctors, who were afterwards known by the name of positive and sententiary teachers of religion, were not, in all respects, different from these now mentioned. Imitating the examples of Anselm, archbishop of Canterbury, Lanfranc, Hildebert, and other doctors of the preceding century, they taught and confirmed their system of theology, principally by collecting the decisions of the inspired writers, and the opinions of the ancients. At the same time they were far from rejecting the succours of reason, and the discussions of philosophy, to which they more especially had recourse, when difficulties were to be solved, and adversaries to be refuted, but, in the application of which, all did not discover the same degree of moderation and prudence. Hugh of St. Victor is supposed to have been the first writer of this century, who taught in this manner the doctrines of Christianity, digested into a regular system. His example was followed by many; but no one acquired such a shining reputation by his labours, in this branch of sacred erudition, as Peter, bishop of Paris, surnamed Lombard, from the country which gave him birth. The four books of Sentences of this eminent prelate, which appeared in the year 1162,[d] were not only received with general applause, but acquired also such a high degree of authority, as induced the most learned doctors in all places to employ their labours in illustrating and expounding them. Scarcely was there any divine of note that did not undertake this popular task, except Henry of Ghent, and a few others;[e] so that Lombard, who was commonly called Master of the Sentences, on account of the famous work now mentioned, became truly a classic author in divinity.[f]

VII. The followers of Lombard, who were called Sententiarii, though their manner of teaching was defective

of indulgences, see a very learned and judicious work, entitled, Lettres sur les Jubilés, published in the year 1751, in three volumes, 8vo. by the Rev. Mr. Chais, minister of the French church at the Hague, on occasion of the universal Jubilee celebrated at Rome in the preceding year, by the order of Benedict XIV. In the second volume of this excellent work, which we shall have frequent occasion to consult in the course of this history, a clear account and a satisfactory refutation of the doctrine may be found, with the history of that monstrous practice from its origin to the present times.

[a] For an account of this prelate, see Le Bœuf, Memoires concernant l'Histoire d'Auxerre, tom. ii. p. 486.

[b] An ample account of this learned Benedictine is to be found in Gabr. Liron's Singularités Historiques et Literaires, tom. iii. p. 29.—See also Mabillon, Annales Benedict. tom. vi. p. 477, 719.

[c] The Prologus in Abdiam was published by Mabillon, in his Annales Benedict. tom. vi. p. 637.

[d] Erpoldi Lindenbrogii Scriptores Rerum Septentrionalium, p. 250.

[e] A list of the commentators who laboured in explaining the Sentences of Lombard, is given by Anton. Possevinus, in his Biblioth. Selecta, tom. i. lib. iii. cap. xiv. p. 242.

[f] The Book of Sentences, which rendered the name of Peter Lombard so illustrious, was a compilation of sentences and passages drawn from the fathers, whose manifold contradictions this eminent prelate endeavoured to reconcile. His work may be considered as a complete

in some respects, and not altogether exempt from vain and trivial questions, were always attentive to avoid entering too far into the subtleties of the Dialecticians, nor did they presumptuously attempt to submit the divine truths of the Gospel to the uncertain and obscure principles of a refined and intricate logic, which was rather founded on the excursions of fancy than on the true nature of things. They had for contemporaries another set of theologians, who were far from imitating their moderation and prudence in this respect; a set of subtle doctors, who taught the plain and simple truths of Christianity, in the obscure terms, and with the perplexing distinctions used by the Dialecticians, and explained, or rather darkened with their unintelligible jargon, the sublime precepts of that wisdom which emanates from above. This method of teaching theology, which was afterwards called the scholastic system, because it was in general use in the schools, had for its author Peter Abelard, a man of the most subtle genius, whose public lectures in philosophy and divinity had raised him to the highest summit of literary renown, and who was successively canon of Paris, and monk and abbot of Ruys.[a] The fame he acquired by this new method engaged many ambitious divines to adopt it; and, in a short space of time, the followers of Abelard multiplied prodigiously, not only in France, but also in England and Italy. Thus was the pure and peaceable wisdom of the Gospel perverted into a science of mere sophistry and chicane; for these subtle doctors never explained or illustrated any subject, but, on the contrary, darkened and disfigured the plainest expressions, and the most evident truths, by their laboured and useless distinctions, fatigued both themselves and others with unintelligible solutions of abstruse and frivolous questions, and, through a rage for disputing, maintained with equal vehemence and ardour the opposite sides of the most serious and momentous questions.[b]

VIII. From this period, therefore, an important distinction was made between the Christian doctors, who were divided into two classes. In the first class were placed those, who were called by the various names of biblici, i. e. bible-doctors, dogmatici, and positivi, i. e. didactic divines, and also veteres, or ancients; and in the second were ranged the scholastics, who were also distinguished by the titles of Sententiarii, after the Master of the Sentences, and Novi, to express their recent origin. The former expounded, though in a wretched manner, the sacred writings in their public schools, illustrated the doctrines of Christianity, without deriving any succours from reason or philosophy, and confirmed their opinions by the united testimonies of Scripture and Tradition. The latter expounded, instead of the Bible, the famous Book of Sentences; reduced, under the province of their subtle philosophy, whatever the Gospel proposed as an object of faith, or a rule of practice; and perplexed and obscured its divine doctrines and precepts by a multitude of vain questions and idle speculations.[c] The method of the scholastics exhibited a pompous aspect of learning, and these disputants seemed to surpass their adversaries in sagacity and genius; hence they excited the admiration of the studious youth, who flocked to their schools in multitudes, while the biblici or doctors of the sacred page, as they were also called, had the mortification to see their auditories unfrequented, and almost deserted.[d] The scholastic theology continued in high repute in all the European colleges until the time of Luther.

IX. It must, however, be observed, that these metaphysical divines had many difficulties to encounter, and much opposition to overcome, before they could obtain that boundless authority in the European schools, which they so long enjoyed. They were attacked from different quarters; on the one hand, by the ancient divines, or bible doctors; on the other by the mystics, who considered true wisdom and knowledge as unattainable by study or reasoning, and as the fruit of mere contemplation, inward feeling, and a passive acquiescence in divine influences. Thus that ancient conflict between faith and reason, that had formerly divided the Latin doctors, and had been for many years hushed in silence, was now unhappily revived, and produced various tumults, and bitter dissensions. The patrons of the ancient theology, who attacked the schoolmen, were Guibert, abbot of Nogent,[e] Peter, abbot of Moustier-la-Cella,[f] Peter the Chanter,[g] and principally Walter of St. Victor.[h] The mystics also sent forth into the field of controversy, upon this occasion, their ablest and most violent champions, such as Joachim, abbot of Flori, Richard of St. Victor, who loaded with invectives the scholastic divines, and more especially Lombard, though he was, undoubtedly, the most candid and modest doctor of that subtle tribe. These dissensions and contests, whose deplorable effects augmented from day to day, engaged pope Alexander III. to interpose his authority, in order to restore tranquillity and concord in the church. For this purpose he convoked a solemn

body of divinity. It consists of four books, each of which is subdivided into various chapters and sections. In the first he treats of the Trinity, and the Divine Attributes; in the second, of the Creation in general, of the Origin of Angels, the Formation and Fall of Man, of Grace and Free Will, of Original Sin and Actual Transgression; in the third, of the Incarnation and Perfections of Jesus Christ, of Faith, Hope, and Charity, of the Gifts of the Spirit, and the Commandments of God. The Sacraments, the Resurrection, the Last Judgment, and the State of the Righteous in Heaven, are the subjects treated in the fourth and last book of this celebrated work, which was the wonder of the twelfth century, but is little more than an object of contempt in ours.

[a] Abelard acknowledges this himself, Epist. i. cap. ix. p. 20. Oper.—See also Launoy, de Scholis Caroli M. p. 67, cap. lix. tom. iv. op. part i.

[b] Cæs. Egasse de Boulay, Histor. Acad. Paris, tom. ii. p. 201, 583.—Anton. Wood, Antiquit. Oxoniens. tom. i. p. 58.—Launoy, de varia Aristotelis Fortuna in Acad. Paris. cap. iii. p. 187, edit. Elswichii, Vitem. 1720, in 8vo.

[c] See Boulay, Histor. Acad. Paris. tom. iii. p. 657.

[d] The Book of Sentences seemed to be at this time in much greater repute than the Holy Scriptures; and the compilations of Peter Lombard were preferred to the doctrines and precepts of Jesus Christ. This appears evident from the following remarkable passage in Roger Bacon's Op. Maj. ad Clementem IV. Pontif. Rom. published in 1733 at London by Sam. Jebb, from the original MS. "Baccalaureus qui legit textum (scripturæ) succumbit lectori sententiarum, et ubique in omnibus honoratur et præfertur: nam ille, qui legit sententias, habet principalem horam legendi secundum suam voluntatem, habet et socium et cameram apud religiosos: sed qui legit Bibliam, caret his, et mendicat horam legendi secundum quod placet lectori sententiarum: et qui legit summas, disputat ubique et pro magistro habetur; reliquus qui textum legit, non potest disputare, sicut fuit hoc anno Bononiæ, et in multis aliis locis, quod est absurdum: manifestum est igitur, quod textus illius facultatis (sc. Theologicæ) subjicitur uni summæ magistrali." Such was now the authority of the scholastic theology, as appears from the words of Bacon, who lived in the following century, and in whose writings there are many things highly worthy of the attention of the curious.

[e] In his Tropologia in Oseam, p. 203, op.

[f] Opuscul. p. 277, 396, edit. Benedict.

[g] In his Verbum Abbreviat. cap. iii. p. 6, 7, published at Mons in the year 1639, in 4to. by George Galopin.

[h] In his Libri IV. contra Quatuor Franciæ Labyrinthos et novos Hæreticos. He called Abelard, Gilbert de la Porrée, Lombard, and Peter of Poictiers, who were the principal scholastic divines of this century, the four Labyrinths of France. For an account of this work, which is yet in manuscript, see Boulay, Hist. Acad. Paris, tom. ii. p. 619, 659.

and numerous assembly of the clergy in the year 1164,[a] in which the licentious rage of religious disputation was condemned; and another in 1179, in which some particular errors of Peter Lombard were pointed out and censured.[b]

X. But of all the adversaries that assailed the scholastic divines in this century, no one was so formidable as the famous St. Bernard, whose zeal was ardent beyond all expression, and whose influence and authority were equal to his zeal. And, accordingly, we find this illustrious abbot combating the Dialecticians, not only in his writings and his conversation, but also by his deeds; arming against them synods and councils, the decrees of the church, and the laws of the state. The renowned Abelard, who was as much superior to St. Bernard in sagacity and erudition, as he was his inferior in credit and authority, was one of the first who felt, by a bitter experience, the aversion of the lordly abbot to the scholastic doctors: for, in the year 1121, he was called before the council of Soissons, and before that of Sens in 1140; in both of which assemblies he was accused by St. Bernard of the most pernicious errors, and was finally condemned as an egregious heretic.[c] The charge brought against this subtle and learned monk was, that he had notoriously corrupted the doctrine of the Trinity, blasphemed against the majesty of the Holy Ghost, entertained unworthy and false conceptions of the person and offices of Christ, and the union of the two natures in him; denied the necessity of the divine grace to render us virtuous; and, in a word, that his doctrines struck at the fundamental principles of all religion. It must be confessed, by those who are acquainted with the writings of Abelard, that he expressed himself in a very singular and incongruous manner upon several points of theology;[d] and this, indeed, is one of the inconveniences to which subtle refinements upon mysterious doctrines frequently lead. But it is certain, on the other hand, that St. Bernard, who had much more genius than logic, misunderstood some of the opinions of Abelard, and wilfully perverted others: for the zeal of this good abbot too rarely permitted him to consult in his decisions the dictates of impartial equity; and hence it was, that he almost always applauded beyond measure, and censured without mercy.[e]

XI. Abelard was not the only scholastic divine who paid dearly for his metaphysical refinement upon the doctrines of the Gospel, and whose logic exposed him to the unrelenting fury of persecution; Gilbert de la Porrée, bishop of Poictiers, who had taught theology and philosophy at Paris, and in other places, with the highest applause, met with the same fate. Unfortunately for him, Arnold and Calo, two of his archdeacons, who had been educated in the principles of the ancient theology, heard him one day disputing, with more subtlety than was meet, of the divine nature. Alarmed at the novelty of his doctrine, they brought a charge of blasphemy against him before pope Eugenius III., who was at that time in France; and, to give weight to their accusation, they engaged St. Bernard in their cause. The zealous abbot treated the matter with his usual vehemence, and opposed Gilbert with the utmost severity and bitterness, first in the council of Paris, A. D. 1147, and afterwards in that which was assembled at Rheims in the following year. In the latter council the accused bishop, in order to put an end to the dispute, offered to submit his opinions to the judgment of the assembly, and of the Roman pontiff, by whom they were condemned. The errors attributed to Gilbert were the fruits of an excessive subtlety, and of an extravagant passion for reducing the doctrines of Christianity under the empire of metaphysics and dialectics. He distinguished the divine *essence* from the *Deity*, the properties of the three divine persons from the persons themselves, not in reality, but by abstraction, *in statu rationis*, as the metaphysicians speak; and, in consequence of these distinctions, he denied the incarnation of the divine nature. To these he added other opinions, derived from the same source, which were rather vain, fanciful, and adapted to excite surprise by their novelty, than glaringly false, or really pernicious. These refined notions were far above the comprehension of good St. Bernard, who was by no means accustomed to such profound disquisitions, to such intricate researches.[f]

XII. The important science of morality was not now in a very flourishing state, as may be easily imagined when we consider the genius and spirit of that philosophy, which, in this century, reduced all the other sciences under its dominion, and of which we have given some account in the preceding sections. The only moral writer among the Greeks, worthy of mention, is Philip, surnamed the Solitary, whose book, entitled Dioptra, which consists of a dialogue between the body and the soul, is composed with judgment and elegance, and contains many remarks proper to nourish pious and virtuous sentiments.

The Latin moralists of this age may be divided into two classes, the *scholastics* and *mystics*. The former discoursed about virtue, as they did about truth, in the most unfeeling jargon, and generally subjoined their arid system of morals to what they called their *didactic theology*. The latter treated the duties of morality in a quite different manner; their language was tender, persuasive, and affecting, and their sentiments were often beautiful and sublime; but they taught in a confused and irregular manner, without method or precision, and

[a] Ant. Pagi, Critic. in Baronium, tom. iv. ad A. 1164, p. 614, 615.

[b] Matth. Paris. Histor. Major, p. 115.—Boulay, Histor. Acad. Paris. tom. ii. p. 402.

[c] See Bayle's Dictionary, at the article Abelard.—Gervais, Vie d'Abelard et d'Heloise.—Mabillon, Annal. Benedict. tom. vi. p. 63, 84, 395.—Martenne, Thesaur. Anecdotor. tom. v. p. 1139.

[d] He affirmed, for example, among other things equally unintelligible and extravagant, that the names, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, were improper terms, and were only used to express the fulness of the sovereign good; that the Father was the plenitude of power, the Son a certain power, and the Holy Ghost no power at all; that the Holy Ghost was the soul of the world; with other crude fancies of a like nature, mingled, however, with bold truths.

[e] See Gervais, Vie d'Abelard, tom. ii. p. 162.—Le Clerc, Biblioth. Ancienne et Moderne, tom. ix. p. 352.—Dionys. Petav. Dogmata Theolog. tom. i. lib. v. cap. vi. p. 217, as also the works of Bernard, *passim*. Abelard, who, notwithstanding all his crude notions, was a man of true genius, was undoubtedly worthy of a better fate than that which fell to his lot, and of a more enlightened age than that in which he lived. After passing through the furnace of persecution, and having suffered afflictions of various kinds, of which he has transmitted the history to posterity, he retired to the monastery of Clugni, where he ended his days in the year 1142.

[f] See Du Boulay, Hist. Acad. Paris. tom. ii. p. 223, 232.—Mabillon, Annal. Benedictin. tom. vi. p. 343, 415, 433.—Gallia Christiana Benedictin. tom. ii. p. 1175.—Matth. Paris, Histor. Major, p. 56.—Petavii Dogmata Theologica, tom. i. lib. i. cap. viii.—Longueval Histoire de l'Eglise Gallicane, tom. ix. p. 147.

frequently mixed the dross of Platonism with the pure treasures of celestial truth.

We might also place in the class of moral writers the greatest part of the commentators and expositors of this century, who, laying aside all attention to the signification of the words used by the sacred writers, and scarcely ever attempting to illustrate the truths which they reveal, or the events which they relate, turned, by forced and allegorical explications, every passage of scripture to practical uses, and drew lessons of morality from every quarter. We could produce many instances of this way of commenting, beside Guibert's Moral Observations on the Book of Job, the Prophecy of Amos, and the Lamentations of Jeremiah.

XIII. Both Greeks and Latins were seized with that enthusiastic passion for dialectical researches, which raged in this century, and were thus rendered extremely fond of captious questions and theological contests; and, at the same time, the love of controversy seduced them from the paths that lead to truth, and involved them in labyrinths of uncertainty and error. The discovery of truth was not, indeed, the great object they had in view; their principal aim was to perplex and embarrass their adversaries, and overwhelm them with an enormous heap of fine-spun distinctions, an impetuous torrent of words without meaning, a long list of formidable authorities, and a specious train of fallacious consequences, embellished with railings and invectives. The principal polemic writers among the Greeks were Constantinus Harmenopulus, and Euthymius Zigabenus. The former published a short treatise *de Sectis Hæreticorum, i. e.* concerning the Sects of Heretics. The latter, in a long and laboured work, entitled *Panoplia*, attacked all the heresies and errors that troubled the church; but, not to mention the extreme levity and credulity of this writer, his mode of disputation was highly defective, and all his arguments, according to the wretched method that now prevailed, were drawn from the writings of the ancient doctors, whose authority supplied the place of evidence. Both these authors were sharply censured in a satirical poem composed by Zonaras. The Latin writers were also employed in various branches of religious controversy. Honorius of Autun wrote against certain heresies; and Abelard combated them all. The Jews, whose credit was now extremely low, and whose circumstances were miserable in every respect, were refuted by Gilbert de Castilione, Odo, Peter Alfonsus, Rupert of Duytz, Peter Mauritius, Richard of St. Victor, and Peter of Blois, according to the logic of the times, while Euthymius and several other divines directed their polemic force against the Saracens.

XIV. That contest between the Greeks and Latins, the subject of which has been already mentioned, was still carried on by both parties with the greatest obstinacy and vehemence. The Grecian champions were Euthymius, Nicetas, and others of less renown; while the cause of the Latins was vigorously maintained by Anselm, bishop of Havelberg, and Hugo Etherianus, who eminently distinguished themselves by their erudition in this famous controversy.[a] Many attempts were made, both at Rome and Constantinople, to reconcile these differences, and heal these divisions; and this union was solicited, in a particular manner, by the emperors of the Comnene family, who expected to draw great advantage from the friendship and alliance of the Latins, toward the support of the Grecian empire, which was at this time in a declining, and almost in a desperate condition. But as the Latins aimed at nothing less than a despotic supremacy over the Greek church, and as, on the other hand, the Grecian bishops could by no means be induced to yield an implicit obedience to the Roman pontiff, or to condemn the measures and proceedings of their ancestors, the negotiations, undertaken for the restoration of peace, widened the breach instead of healing it; and the terms proposed on both sides, but especially by the Latins, exasperated, instead of calming, the resentments and animosities of the contending parties.

XV. Many controversies of inferior moment were carried on among the Greeks, who were extremely fond of disputing, and were scarcely ever without debates upon religious matters. We shall not enter into a circumstantial narration of these theological contests, which would fatigue rather than amuse or instruct; but shall confine ourselves to a brief mention of those which made the greatest noise in the empire. Under the reign of Emanuel Comnenus, whose extensive learning was accompanied with an excessive curiosity, several theological controversies were carried on, in which he himself bore a principal part, and which fomented such discords and animosities among a people already exhausted and dejected by intestine tumults, as threatened their destruction. The first question that exercised the metaphysical talent of this over-curious emperor and his subtle doctors, was this:—in what sense was it, or might it be, affirmed, that an incarnate God was at the same time the *offerer* and the *oblation?* When this knotty question had been long debated, and the emperor had maintained, for a considerable time, that solution of it which was contrary to the opinion generally received, he yielded at length, and embraced the popular notion of that unintelligible subject. The consequence of this step was, that many men of eminent abilities and great credit, who had differed from the doctrine of the church upon this article, were deprived of their honours and employments.[b] What the emperor's opinion of this matter was we are not satisfactorily informed; and we are equally ignorant of the sentiments adopted by the church in this question. It is highly probable that Emanuel, followed by certain learned doctors, differed from the opinions generally received among the Greeks concerning the Lord's supper, and the *oblation* or sacrifice of Christ in that holy ordinance.

XVI. Some years after this, a still more warm contest arose concerning the sense of these words of Christ, John xiv. 28. 'For my Father is greater than I,' and divided the Greeks into the most bitter and deplorable factions. To the ancient explications of that important passage new illustrations were now added; and the emperor himself, who, from an indifferent prince, had become a wretched divine, published an exposition of that remarkable text, which he obtruded as the only true sense of the words, upon a council assembled for that purpose, and was desirous of having received as a rule of faith by all the Grecian clergy. He maintained that the words in question

[a] See Leo Allat. de perpet. Consen. Ec. Ori. et Occid. lib. ii. c. xi. p. 644.

[b] Nicetas Choniates, Annal. lib. vii. sect. 5.

related to the flesh that was hidden in Christ, and that was passible, *i. e.* subject to suffering,[a] and not only ordered this decision to be engraven on tables of stone in the principal church of Constantinople, but also published an edict, in which capital punishments were denounced against all such as should presume to oppose this explication, or teach any doctrine repugnant to it.[b] This edict, however, expired with the emperor by whom it was issued; and Andronicus, upon his accession to the imperial throne, prohibited all those contests concerning speculative points of theology, that arose from an irregular and wanton curiosity, and suppressed, in a more particular manner, all inquiry into the subject now mentioned, by enacting the severest penalties against such as should in any way contribute to revive this dispute.[c]

XVII. The same theological emperor troubled the church with another controversy concerning the God of Mohammed. The Greek catechisms pronounced an anathema against the Deity worshipped by that false prophet, whom they represented as a *solid* and *spherical Being*;[d] for so they translated the Arabian word *elsemed*, which is applied in the Koran to the Supreme Being, and which indeed is susceptible of that sense, though it also signifies *eternal*.[e] The emperor ordered this anathema to be effaced in the catechism of the Greek church, on account of the high offence it gave to those Mohammedans, who had either been already converted to Christianity, or were disposed to embrace that divine religion, and who were extremely shocked at such an insult offered to the name of God, with whatever restrictions and conditions it might be attended. The Christian doctors, on the other hand, opposed with resolution and vehemence this imperial order. They observed, that the anathema, pronounced in the catechism, had no relation to the nature of God in general, or to the true God in particular; and that, on the contrary, it was solely directed against the error of Mohammed, against that phantom of a divinity which he had imagined; for that impostor pretended that the Deity could neither be *engendered* nor *engender*, whereas the Christians adore God the *Father*. After the bitterest disputes concerning this abstruse subject, and various efforts to reconcile the contending parties, the bishops assembled in council consented, though with the utmost difficulty, to transfer the imprecation of the catechism from the God of Mohammed to the pseudo-prophet himself, his doctrine, and his sect.[f]

XVIII. The spirit of controversy raged among the Latins, as well as among the Greeks; and various sentiments concerning the sacrament of the Lord's supper were propagated, not only in the schools, but also in the writings of the learned; for, though all the doctors of the church were now exceedingly desirous of being looked upon as enemies to the system of Berenger, yet many of them, and among others[g] Rupert of Duytz, differed very little from the sentiments of that great man; at least it is certain, that the famous controversy, which had arisen in the church concerning the opinions of Berenger, had still left the manner of Christ's presence in the eucharist undetermined.

Rupert had also religious contests of another nature with Anselm, bishop of Laon, William of Champeaux, and their disciples, who maintained their doctrine when they were no more. The divine will and the divine omnipotence were the subjects of this controversy; and the question debated was, "Whether God *really willed*, and *actually produced*, all things that exist, or whether there are certain things whose existence he *merely permits*, and whose production, instead of being the *effect of his will*, was contrary to it?" The affirmative of the latter part of this question was maintained by Rupert, while his adversaries affirmed that all things were the effects, not only of the divine power, but also of the divine will. This learned abbot was also accused of having taught that the angels were formed out of darkness; that Christ did not administer his body to Judas, in the last supper; and several other doctrines,[h] contrary to the received opinions of the church.

XIX. These and other controversies of a more private kind, which made little noise in the world, were succeeded, about the year 1140, by one of a more public nature, concerning what was called the *Immaculate Conception of the Virgin Mary*.[i] Certain churches in France began, about that time, to celebrate the festival consecrated to this pretended conception, which the English had observed before this period in consequence of the exhortations of Anselm, archbishop of Canterbury, as some authors report. The church of Lyons was one of the first that adopted this new festival, which no sooner came to the knowledge of St. Bernard, than he severely censured the canons on account of this innovation, and opposed the *Immaculate Conception of the Virgin* with the greatest vigour, as it supposed her being honoured with a privilege which belonged to Christ alone. Upon this a warm contest arose; some siding with the canons of Lyons, and adopting the new festival, while others adhered to the sentiments of St. Bernard.[k] The controversy, however, notwithstanding the zeal of the contending parties, was carried on, during this century, with a certain degree of decency and moderation. But, in subsequent times, when the Dominicans were established in the academy of Paris, the contest was renewed with the greatest vehemence, and the same subject was debated, on both sides, with the utmost animosity and contention of mind. The Dominicans declared for St. Bernard, while the academy patronised the canons of Lyons, and adopted the new festival.

CHAPTER IV.

Concerning the Rites and Ceremonies used in the Church during this Century.

I. THE rites and ceremonies used in divine worship, both public and private, were now greatly augmented

[a] Κατὰ τὴν ἐν αὐτῳ κτιστὴν καὶ παθητὴν σάρκα.
[b] Nicetas Choniates, Annal. lib. vii. sect. 6, p. 113.
[c] Nicetas in Andronico, lib. ii. sect. 5, p. 175.
[d] Ὁλόσφαιρος.
Reland, de Religione Mohammedicâ, lib. ii. sect. 3, p. 142.
[e] Nicet. Chron. Annales, lib. vii. p. 113—116.
[f] Boulay, Hist. Acad. Paris. tom. ii. p. 30.
[g] See the Epistle of Mengoz, published by Martenne, in his Thesaur. Anecdotor. tom. i. p. 290.—Jo. Mabillon, Annal. Benedict. tom. vi. p. 19, 42, 168, 261.
[i] The defenders of the *Immaculate Conception* maintained, that the Virgin Mary was *conceived* in the womb of her mother with the same *purity* that is attributed to Christ's conception in her womb.
[k] Sti. Bernardi Epistola 174.—Boulay, Hist. Acad. Paris. tom. ii. p 135.—Mabillon, Annal. Bened. tom. vi. p. 327.—Dom. Colonia, Hist. Lit. de la Ville de Lyon, tom. ii. p. 233.

among the Greeks; and the same superstitious passion for the introduction of new observances, discovered itself in all the eastern churches. The Grecian, Nestorian, and Jacobite pontiffs, who were in any degree remarkable for their credit or ambition, were desirous of transmitting their names to posterity by the invention of some new rite, or by the introduction of some striking change into the method of worship that had hitherto prevailed. This was, indeed, almost the only way left to distinguish themselves in an age when, a due sense of the excellence of genuine religion and substantial piety being almost totally lost, the whole care and attention of an ostentatious clergy, and a superstitious multitude, were employed upon the round of external ceremonies and observances substituted in their place. Thus some attempted, though in vain, to render their names immortal, by introducing a new method of reading or reciting the prayers of the church; others changed the church music; some tortured their inventions to find out some new mark of veneration, that might be offered to the relics and images of the saints; while several ecclesiastics did not disdain to employ their time, with the most serious assiduity, in embellishing the garments of the clergy, and in forming the motions and postures they were to observe, and the looks they were to assume, in the celebration of divine worship.

II. We may learn from the book *de Divinis Officiis*, composed by the famous Rupert, or Robert, of Duytz, what were the rites in use among the Latins during this century, as also the reasons on which they were founded. According to the plan we follow, we cannot here enlarge upon the additions that were made to the doctrinal part of religion. We shall therefore only observe, that the enthusiastic veneration for the Virgin Mary, which had been hitherto carried to such an excessive height, increased now instead of diminishing, since her dignity was at this time considerably augmented by the new fiction or invention relating to her immaculate conception; for, though St. Bernard and others opposed with vigour this chimerical notion, yet their efforts were counteracted by the superstitious fury of the deluded multitude, whose judgment prevailed over the counsels of the wise; so that, about the year 1138, there was a solemn festival instituted in honour of this pretended conception, though we neither know by whose authority it was established, nor in what place it was first celebrated.[a]

CHAPTER V.

Concerning the Divisions and Heresies that troubled the Church during this Century.

I. THE Greek and eastern churches were infested with fanatics of different kinds, who gave them much trouble, and engaged them in the most warm and violent contests. Some of these fanatics professed to believe in a double trinity, rejected wedlock, abstained from flesh, treated with the utmost contempt the sacraments of baptism and the Lord's supper, as also all the various branches of external worship; placed the essence of religion in internal prayer alone, and maintained, as it is said, that an evil being, or genius, dwelt in the breast of every mortal, and could be thence expelled by no other method than by perpetual supplications to the Supreme Being. The founder of this enthusiastical sect is said to have been a person called Lucopetrus. His chief disciple was named Tychicus, who corrupted, by false and fanatical interpretations, several books of the sacred writings, and particularly the Gospel according to St. Matthew.[b] It is well known, that enthusiasts of this kind, who were rather wrong headed than vicious, lived among the Greeks and Syrians, especially among the monks, for many ages before this period, and also in this century. The accounts, indeed, that have been given of them, are not in all respects to be depended upon; and there are several circumstances, which render it extremely probable, that many persons of eminent piety, and zeal for genuine Christianity, were confounded by the Greeks with these enthusiasts, and ranked in the list of heretics, merely on account of their opposing the vicious practices and the insolent tyranny of the priesthood, and their treating with derision that motley spectacle of superstition which was supported by public authority. In Greece, and in all the eastern provinces, these fanatics were distinguished by the general and invidious appellation of *Massalians* or *Euchites*,[c] as the Latins comprehended all the adversaries of the Roman Pontiff under the general terms of *Waldenses* and *Albigenses*. It is, however, necessary to observe, that the names above mentioned were very vague and ambiguous in the way they were applied by the Greeks and the Orientals, who made use of them to characterise, without distinction, all such as complained of the multitude of useless ceremonies, and of the vices of the clergy, without any regard to the difference that existed between such persons in point of principles and morals. In short, the righteous and the profligate, the wise and the foolish, were equally comprehended under the name of Massalians, whenever they opposed the raging superstition of the times, or considered true and genuine piety as the essence of the Christian character.

II. From the sect now mentioned, that of the *Bogomiles* is said to have proceeded, whose founder Basilius, a monk by profession, was committed to the flames at Constantinople, under the reign of Alexius Comnenus, after all attempts to make him renounce his errors had proved ineffectual. By the accounts we have of this unhappy man, and of the errors he taught, it appears sufficiently evident, that his doctrine resembled, in a striking manner, the religious system of the ancient Gnostics and Manichæans; though, at the same time, the Greeks may have falsified his tenets in some respects. Basilius maintained, that the world and all animal bodies were formed, not by the Deity, but by an evil demon, who had been cast down from heaven by the Supreme Being; whence he concluded, that the body was no more than the prison of the im-

[a] Mabil. An. Benedict. t. vi. p. 327, 412.—Gallia Christ. t. i. p. 1198.

[b] Euthymii Triumph. de Sectâ Massalianorum, in Jac. Tollii Insignibus Itineris Italici, p. 106—125.

☞ [c] *Massalians* and *Euchites* are denominations that signify the same thing, and denote, one in the Hebrew, and the other in the Greek language, *persons who pray*. A sect, under this denomination, arose during the reign of the emperor Constantius, about the year 361, founded by certain monks of Mesopotamia, who dedicated themselves wholly to prayer, and held many of the doctrines attributed by Mosheim to the Massalians of the twelfth century. See August. de Hæres. cap. lvii. and Theod. Hæret. Fab. lib. iv. Epiphanius speaks of another sort of Massalians still more ancient, who were mere Gentiles, acknowledged several gods, yet adored only one whom they called *Almighty*, and had oratories in which they assembled to pray and sing hymns. This resemblance between the Massalians and the Essenes, induced Scaliger to think that Epiphanius confounded the former with the latter.

mortal spirit, and that it was, therefore, to be enervated by fasting, contemplation, and other exercises, that so the soul might be gradually restored to its primitive liberty; for this purpose also wedlock was to be avoided, with many other circumstances which we have often had occasion to explain and repeat in the course of this history. It was in consequence of the same principles, that this unfortunate enthusiast denied the *reality* of Christ's body, (which, like the Gnostics and Manichæans, he considered only as a phantom,) rejected the law of Moses, and maintained that the body, upon its separation by death, returned to the malignant mass of matter, without either the prospect or possibility of a future resurrection to life and felicity. We have so many examples of fanatics of this kind in the records of ancient times, and also in the history of this century, that it is by no means to be wondered, that some one of them, more enterprising than the rest, should found a sect among the Greeks. The name of this sect was taken from the *divine mercy*, which its members are said to have incessantly implored; for the word *bogomilus*, in the Mœsian language, signifies *calling out for mercy from above*.[a]

III. The Latin sects were yet more numerous than those of the Greeks; and this will not appear at all surprising to such as consider the state of religion in the greatest part of the European provinces. As the prevalence of superstition, the vices of the clergy, the luxury and indolence of the pontiffs and bishops, the encouragement of impiety by the traffic of *indulgences*, increased from day to day, several pious, though weak men, who had the true religion of Christ at heart, easily perceived that it was in a most declining and miserable state, and therefore attempted a reformation in the church, in order to restore Christianity to its primitive purity and lustre. But the knowledge of these good men did not equal their zeal; nor were their abilities in any proportion to the grandeur of their undertakings. The greater part of them were destitute both of learning and judgment, and, being involved in the general ignorance of the times, very imperfectly understood the holy scriptures, whence Christianity was derived, and by which alone the abuses that had been mingled with it could be reformed. In a word, few of these well-meaning Christians were equal to an attempt so difficult and arduous as an universal reformation; and the consequence of this was, that while they avoided the reigning abuses, they fell into others that were as little consistent with the genius of true religion, and carried the spirit of censure and reformation to such an excessive length, that it degenerated often into the various extravagances of enthusiasm, and engendered a number of new sects, that became a new dishonour to the Christian cause.

IV. Among the sects that troubled the Latin church during this century, the principal place is due to the *Cathari* or *Catharists*, whom we have already had occasion to mention.[b] This numerous faction, leaving their first residence, which was in Bulgaria, spread themselves throughout almost all the European provinces, where they occasioned much tumult and disorder; but their fate was unhappy; for, wherever they were found, they were put to death with the most unrelenting cruelty.[c] Their religion resembled the doctrine of the Manichæans and Gnostics, on which account they commonly received the denomination of the former, though they differed in many respects from the genuine and primitive Manichæans. They all indeed agreed in the following points of doctrine, viz. That matter was the source of all evil; that the creator of this world was a being distinct from the Supreme Deity; that Christ was neither clothed with a real body, nor could be properly said to have been born, or to have seen death; that human bodies were the production of the evil principle, and were extinguished without the prospect of a new life; and that baptism and the Lord's Supper were useless institutions, destitute of all efficacy and power. They exhorted all who embraced their doctrine to a rigorous abstinence from animal food, wine, and wedlock, and recommended to them in the most pathetic terms the most severe acts of austerity and mortification. They moreover treated with the utmost contempt all the books of the Old Testament, but expressed a high degree of veneration for the New, particularly for the four Gospels; and, to pass over many other peculiarities in their doctrine, they maintained, that human souls, endued with reason, were shut up by an unhappy fate in the dungeons of mortal bodies, from which they could only be delivered by fasting, mortification, and continence of every kind.[d]

V. These principles and tenets, though they were adopted and professed by the whole sect, were variously interpreted and modified by different doctors. Hence the Catharists were divided into various sects, which, however, on account of the general persecution in which they were involved, treated each other with candour and forbearance, disputed with moderation, and were thus careful not to augment their common calamity by intestine feuds and animosities. Out of these factions arose two leading and principal sects of the Catharists, which were distinguished from the rest by the number of their respective followers, and the importance of their differences. The one, borrowing hints from the Manichæan system, maintained the doctrine of two eternal Beings, from whom all things are derived, the God of light, who was also the father of Jesus Christ, and the principle of darkness, whom they considered as the author of the material world. The other believed in one eternal principle, the father of Christ, and the Supreme God, by whom also they held that the *first matter* was created; but they added to this, that the *evil being*, after his rebellion against God and his fall from heaven, arranged this original matter according to his fancy, and divided it into four elements, for the production of this visible world. The former maintained, that Christ, clothed with a celestial body, descended into the womb of the Virgin, and derived no part of his substance from her; while the latter taught, that he first assumed a real body in the womb of Mary, though not *from* her.[e] The sect which held the doctrine of two principles, derived the name

[a] See the Alexias of Anna Comnena, lib. xv. p. 384, edit. Venet.—Zonaræ Annales, lib. xviii. p. 336. Jo. Christ. Wolf. Historia Bogomilorum, published at Wittenberg, in 1712.—Sam. Andreæ Diss. de Bogomilis in Jo. Voigtii Bibliotheca Historiæ Hæresiologicæ, tom. i. part ii. p. 121. Chr. Aug. Heumanni Dissertat. de Bogomilis.

[b] See Cent. III. Part II. Ch. V. sect. xviii.; but principally, for the Catharists here mentioned, see Cent. XI. Part II. Ch. V. sect. ii.

[c] See the account given of this unhappy and persecuted sect by Charles Plessis d'Argentre, in his Collectio Judiciorum de novis Erroribus, tom i. in which, however, several circumstances are omitted.

[d] Beside the works which will be soon mentioned, see the Disputatio inter Catholicum et Paterinum, published by Martenne, in his Thesaur. Anecdotor. tom. v. p 1703, as also Bonacursi Manifestatio Hæresis Catharorum, in d'Acheri's Spicileg. tom. i. p. 208.

[e] See Bern. Moneta, Summa adversus Catharos et Valdenses, published at Rome in the year 1743, by Thom. August. Riccini, who prefixed

Albanenses from the place where their spiritual ruler resided; and this sect was subdivided into two, of which one took the name of Balazinansa, bishop of Verona, and the other that of John de Lugio, bishop of Bergamo. The sect which adhered to the doctrine of one eternal principle was also subdivided into the congregation of Baioli, the capital town of the province, and that of Concoregio, or Concorezzo. The Albigenses, who were settled in France, belonged to the church or congregation of Baioli.[a]

VI. In the internal constitution of the church that was founded by this sect, there were many rules and principles of a singular nature, which we pass over in silence, as they would oblige us to enter into a detail inconsistent with our intended brevity. The government of this church was administered by bishops; and each of these had two vicars, of whom one was called the elder son, and the other the younger, while the rest of the clergy and doctors were comprehended under the general denomination of deacons.[b] The veneration, which the people had for the clergy in general, and more especially for the bishops and their spiritual sons, was carried to a height that almost exceeds credibility. The discipline observed by this sect was so excessively rigid and austere, that it was practicable only by a certain number of robust and determined fanatics. But that such as were not able to undergo this discipline might not, on that account, be lost to the cause, it was thought necessary, in imitation of the ancient Manichæans, to divide this sect into two classes, one of which was distinguished by the title of the *consolati*, (comforted,) while the other received only the denomination of *confederates*. The former gave themselves out for persons of consummate wisdom and extraordinary piety, lived in perpetual celibacy, and led a life of the severest mortification and abstinence, without allowing themselves the enjoyment of any worldly comfort. The latter, if we except a few particular rules which they observed, lived like the rest of mankind, but at the same time were obliged by a solemn agreement they had made with the church, and which, in Italian, they called *la convenenza*, to enter before their death, in their last moments, if not sooner, into the class of the comforted, and to receive the *consolamentum*, or form of inauguration, by which they were introduced into that fanatical order.[c]

VII. A much more rational sect was that which was founded about the year 1110, in Languedoc and Provence, by Peter de Bruys, who made the most laudable attempts to reform the abuses and to remove the superstitions that disfigured the beautiful simplicity of the Gospel; but, after having engaged in his cause a great number of followers, during a laborious ministry of twenty years, he was burned at St. Giles', in the year 1130, by an enraged populace, instigated by the clergy, whose traffic was in danger from the enterprising spirit of this reformer. The whole system of doctrine, which this unhappy martyr whose zeal was not without a considerable mixture of fanaticism, taught to the *Petrobrussians*, his disciples, is not known; it is however certain, that the five following tenets made a part of his system: 1. That no persons were to be baptized before they had the full use of their reason; 2. that it was an idle superstition to build churches for the service of God, who will accept a sincere worship wherever it is offered; and that therefore such churches as had already been erected were to be destroyed; 3. that the crucifixes, as instruments of superstition, deserved the same fate; 4. that the real body and blood of Christ were not exhibited in the eucharist, but were merely represented in that holy ordinance by figures and symbols; 5. and lastly, that the oblations, prayers, and good works of the living, could in no respect be advantageous to the dead.[d]

VIII. This innovator was succeeded by another, who was an Italian by birth, and whose name was Henry, the founder and parent of the sect called *Henricians*. It was, no doubt, a rare thing to see a person, who was at the same time monk and hermit, undertaking to reform the superstitions of the times; yet such was the case of Henry, who, leaving Lausanne, a city in Switzerland, travelled to Mans, and being banished thence, removed successively to Poictiers, Bourdeaux, and the neighbouring places, and at length to Toulouse in the year 1147, exercising his ministerial function with the utmost applause from the people, and declaiming with vehemence and fervour against the vices of the clergy, and the superstitions they had introduced into the Christian church. At Toulouse he was warmly opposed by St. Bernard, by whose influence he was overpowered, notwithstanding his popularity, and obliged to save himself by flight. But being seized by a prelate in his retreat, he was carried before pope Eugenius III., who presided in person at a council then assembled at Rheims, and who, in consequence of the accusations brought against Henry, committed him, in the year 1148, to a close prison, where he soon ended his days.[e] We have no satisfactory account of the doctrines of this reformer. We merely know that he rejected the baptism of infants, censured with severity the corrupt and licentious manners of the clergy, treated the festivals and ceremonies of the church with the utmost contempt, and held clandestine assemblies, in which he explained and inculcated the novelties he taught. Several writers affirm, that he was the disciple of Peter de Bruys; but I cannot see upon what evidence or authority this assertion is grounded.[f]

to it a dissertation concerning the Cathari, that is by no means worthy of the highest encomiums. Moneta was no mean writer for the time in which he lived. See lib. i. p. 2. et 5. lib. ii. p. 247, &c.

[a] Raineri Sachoni Summa de Catharis et Leonistis, in Martenne's Thesaur. Anecdot. tom. v. p. 1761, 1768.—Peregrinus Priscianus in Muratorii Antiq. Ital. medii Ævi, tom. v. p. 93, who exhibits, in a sort of table, these different sects, but erroneously places the Albigenses, who were a branch of the Baiolenses, in the place of the Albanenses: this, perhaps, may be an error of the press. The opinions of these Baiolenses or Bagnolenses, may be seen in the Codex Inquisitionis Tolosanæ, which Limborch published with his History of the Inquisition. The account, however, which we have in this history (Book i. ch. viii.) of the opinions of the Albigenses, is by no means accurate. A great variety of causes have contributed to involve in darkness and perplexity the distinctive characters of these different sects, whose respective systems we cannot enlarge upon at present.

[b] See Sachoni Summa de Catharis, p. 1766.

[c] For a farther account of this sect, see the writers mentioned before, and particularly the Codex Inquisitionis Tolosanæ.

[d] See Petri Venerab. Lib. contra Petrobrussianos in Bibliothecâ Cluniensi, p. 1117.—Mabillon, Annal. Benedict. tom. iv. p. 346.—Basnage, Histoire des Eglises Reformées, period IV. p. 140.

[e] Gesta Episcoporum Cenomanens. in Mabillon, Analect. veter. Ævi, p. 315.—Gaufridi Epistola in lib. vi. Vita Sti. Bernardi, tom. ii. Op. Bernard. p. 1207.—Matth. Paris. Histor. Maj. p. 71.—Mabillon, Præf. ad Opera Bernardi, sect. vi. et Annal. Benedict. tom. vi. p. 346, 420, 434.

[f] That Henry was the disciple of Peter de Bruys is not at all probable; since, not to insist upon other reasons, the latter could not bear the sight of a cross, and in all likelihood owed his death to the multitude of crucifixes which he had committed to the flames; whereas the former, when he entered into any city, appeared with a cross in his hand, which he bore as a standard, to attract the veneration of the people. See Mabillon, Analecta, p. 316.

IX. While the Henricians were propagating their doctrines in France, an illiterate man, called Tanquelin, or Tanquelm, arose in Brabant about the year 1115, excited the most deplorable commotions at Antwerp, and drew after him a most numerous sect. If the accounts given of this heresiarch by his adversaries may be at all depended upon, he must either have been a monstrous impostor, or an outrageous madman. For he walked in public with the greatest solemnity, pretended to be God, or, at least, the Son of God, ordered daughters to be ravished in presence of their mothers, and committed himself the greatest disorders. Such are the enormities that are attributed to Tanquelm; but they are absolutely incredible, and cannot be true.[a] What seems most worthy of credit in this matter is, that this new teacher had imbibed the opinions and spirit of the Mystics; that he treated with contempt the external worship of God, the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, and the rite of baptism; and held clandestine assemblies to propagate more effectually his visionary notions. But as, beside all this, he inveighed against the clergy, like the other heretics already mentioned, and declaimed against their vices with vehemence and intrepidity, it is probable that these blasphemies were falsely charged upon him by a vindictive priesthood. Be that as it may, the fate of Tanquelm was unhappy; for he was assassinated by an ecclesiastic in a cruel manner. His sect, however, did not perish with him, but acquired strength and vigour under the ministry of his disciples, until it was at length extinguished by the famous St. Norbert, the founder of the order of Præmonstratenses, or Premontres.[b]

X. In Italy, Arnold of Brescia, a disciple of Abelard, and a man of extensive erudition and remarkable austerity, but of a turbulent and impetuous spirit, excited new troubles and commotions both in church and state. He was, indeed, condemned in the Lateran council, A. D. 1139, by Innocent II., and obliged to retire into Switzerland; but, upon the death of that pontiff, he returned into Italy, and raised at Rome, during the pontificate of Eugenius III., several tumults and seditions among the people, who changed, by his instigation, the government of the city, and insulted the persons of the clergy in the most disorderly manner. He fell however at last a victim to the vengeance of his enemies; for, after various turns of fortune, he was seized, in the year 1155, by a prefect of the city, by whom he was crucified, and afterwards burned to ashes. This unhappy man seems not to have adopted any doctrines inconsistent with the spirit of true religion; and the principles upon which he acted were chiefly reprehensible from their being carried too far, applied without discernment or discretion, and executed with a degree of vehemence which was both imprudent and criminal. Having perceived the discords and animosities, the calamities and disorders, that sprang from the overgrown opulence of the pontiffs and bishops, he was persuaded that the interests of the church and the happiness of nations in general required, that the clergy should be divested of all their worldly possessions, of all their temporal rights and prerogatives. He, therefore, publicly maintained, that the treasures and revenues of popes, bishops, and monasteries, ought to be resigned and transferred to the supreme rulers of each state, and that nothing was to be left to the ministers of the gospel but a spiritual authority and a subsistence drawn from tithes, and from the voluntary oblations and contributions of the people.[c] This violent reformer, in whose character and manners there were several points worthy of esteem, drew after him a great number of disciples, who derived from him the denomination of *Arnoldists*, and, in succeeding times, evinced the spirit and intrepidity of their leader, as often as any opportunities of reforming the church seemed to be offered to their zeal.

XI. Of all the sects that arose in this century, not one was more distinguished by the reputation it acquired, by the multitude of its votaries, and the testimony which its bitterest enemies bore to the probity and innocence of its members, than that of the Waldenses, so called from their parent and founder Peter Waldus. This sect was known by different denominations. From the place where it first appeared, its members were called *The poor men of Lyons*,[d] or *Lyonists*, and, from the wooden shoes which its doctors wore, and a certain mark that was imprinted upon these shoes, they were called *Insabbatati*, or *Sabbatati*.[e] The origin of this famous sect was as follows: Peter, an opulent merchant of *Lyons*, surnamed *Valdensis*, or *Validisius*, from *Vaux*, or *Waldum*, a town in the marquisate of Lyons, being extremely zealous for the advancement of true piety and Christian knowledge, employed a certain priest,[f] about the year 1160, in translating from Latin into French the Four Gospels, with other books of Holy Scripture, and the most remarkable sentences of the ancient doctors, which were so highly esteemed in this century. But no sooner had he perused these sacred books with a proper degree of attention, than he perceived that the religion, which was now taught in the Roman church, differed totally from that which was originally inculcated by Christ and his apostles. Shocked at this glaring contradiction between the doctrines of the pontiffs and the truths of the Gospel, and animated with a pious zeal for promoting his own salvation, and that of others, he abandoned his mercantile vocation, distributed his riches among the poor,[g] and forming an association with other pious men, who had adopted his sentiments and his turn of devotion, he began, in the year 1180, to assume the quality of a public teacher, and to instruct the multitude in the doctrines and precepts of Christianity.

[a] Epist. Trajectens. Eccles. ad Fred. Epis. de Tanchelmo, in Seb. Tengnagelii Col. Vet. Mon. p. 368. Boulay, Hist. Acad. Paris. tom. ii. p. 98.—Argentre, Collec. Judicior. de novis Error. t. i. p. 10.

[b] Louis Hugo, Vie de S. Norbert, liv. ii. p. 126.—Chrys. Vander-Sterre, Vita S. Norberti, cap. xxxvi. p. 164, et Polyc. de Hertogh, ad illam Annotationes, p. 387.

[c] See Otto Frising. de Gestis Frederici I. lib. ii. cap. xx.—S. Bernardus, Epist. 195, 196, tom. i. p. 187.—Boulay, Histor. Acad. Paris. tom. ii. p. 157.—Muratori, Droits de l'Empire sur l'Etat Ecclesiastique, p. 137.—Henr. de Bunau, Vita Frederici I. p. 41.—Chauffepied, Nouveau Diction. Hist. Crit. tom. i. p. 482.

[d] They were called *Leonists* from *Leona*, the ancient name of Lyons, where their sect took its rise. The more eminent persons of that sect manifested their progress toward perfection by the simplicity and meanness of their external appearance. Hence, among other things, they wore wooden shoes, which in the French language are termed *sabots*, and had imprinted on these shoes the sign of the cross, to distinguish themselves from other Christians; and it was on these accounts that they acquired the denomination of *sabbatati* and *insabbatati*. See Du Fresne, Glossarium Latin. medii Ævi, vi. voce *Sabbatati*. Nicol. Eumerici Directorium Inquisitorum, Part III. N. 112, &c.

[e] See Steph. de Borbone, de septem donis Spiritus Sancti, in Echard and Quetif, Bibliotheca Scriptor. Dominicanor, tom. i. p. 192.—Anonym. Tractatio de Hæresi Pauperum de Lugduno, in Martenne's Thesaur. Anecdotor. tom. v. p. 1777.

[f] This priest was called Stephanus de Evisa.

[g] It was on this account that the Waldenses were called *Pauvres de Lyons*, or Poor Men of Lyons.

The archbishop of Lyons, and the other rulers of the church in that province, opposed, with vigour, this new doctor in the exercise of his ministry. But their opposition was unsuccessful; for the purity and simplicity of that religion which these good men taught, the spotless innocence that shone forth in their lives and actions, and the noble contempt of riches and honours manifested in the whole of their conduct and conversation, appeared so engaging to all such as had any sense of true piety, that the number of their disciples and followers increased from day to day.[a] They accordingly formed religious assemblies, first in France, and afterwards in Lombardy, whence they propagated their sect through the other provinces of Europe with incredible rapidity, and with such invincible fortitude, that neither fire nor sword, nor the most cruel inventions of merciless persecution, could damp their zeal, or entirely ruin their cause.[b]

XII. The attempts of Peter Waldus and his followers were neither employed nor intended to introduce new doctrines into the church, nor to propose new articles of faith to Christians. All they aimed at was, to reduce the form of ecclesiastical government, and the lives and manners both of the clergy and people, to that amiable simplicity, and that primitive sanctity, which had characterised the apostolic ages, and which appear so strongly recommended in the precepts and injunctions of the divine author of our holy religion. In consequence of this design, they complained that the Roman church had degenerated, under Constantine the Great, from its primitive purity and sanctity. They denied the supremacy of the Roman pontiff, and maintained that the rulers and ministers of the church were obliged, by their vocation, to imitate the poverty of the apostles, and to procure for themselves a subsistence by the work of their hands. They considered every Christian, as in a certain measure qualified and authorised to instruct, exhort, and confirm the brethren in their Christian course, and demanded the restoration of the ancient penitential discipline of the church, *i. e.* the expiation of transgressions by prayer, fasting, and alms, which the new-invented doctrine of indulgences had nearly abolished. They at the same time affirmed, that every pious Christian was qualified and entitled to prescribe to penitents the kind and degree of satisfaction or expiation that their transgressions required; that confession made to a priest was by no means necessary, since the humble offender might acknowledge his sins and testify his repentance to any true believer and might expect from such the counsels and admonitions that his case and circumstances demanded. They maintained, that the power of delivering sinners from the guilt and punishment of their offences belonged to God alone; and that indulgences, in consequence, were the criminal inventions of sordid avarice. They looked upon the prayers, and other ceremonies that were instituted in behalf of the dead, as vain, useless, and absurd, and denied the existence of departed souls in an intermediate state of purification, affirming, that they were immediately, upon their separation from the body, received into heaven, or sent down to hell. These and other tenets of a like nature composed the system of doctrine propagated by the Waldenses. Their rules of practice were extremely austere; for they adopted, as the model of their moral discipline, the sermon of Christ on the mount, which they interpreted and explained in the most rigorous and literal manner, and consequently prohibited and condemned in their society all wars, and suits of law, all attempts toward the acquisition of wealth, the infliction of capital punishments, self-defence against unjust violence, and oaths of all kinds.[c]

XIII. The government of the church was committed, by the Waldenses, to bishops,[d] presbyters, and deacons; for they acknowledged that these three orders were instituted by Christ himself. But they deemed it absolutely necessary, that all these orders should resemble exactly the apostles of the divine Saviour, and be, like them, illiterate, poor, destitute of all worldly possessions, and

[a] Certain writers give different accounts of the origin of the Waldenses, and suppose they were so called from the valleys in which they had resided for many ages before the birth of Peter Waldus. But these writers have no authority to support this assertion; and, beside this, they are amply refuted by the best historians. I do not mean to deny, that there were in the valleys of Piedmont, long before this period, a set of men who differed widely from the opinions adopted and inculcated by the church of Rome, and whose doctrine resembled, in many respects, that of the Waldenses; all that I maintain is, that these inhabitants of the valleys above mentioned are to be carefully distinguished from the Waldenses, who, according to the unanimous voice of history, were originally inhabitants of Lyons, and derived their name from Peter Waldus, their founder and chief. ☞ We may venture to affirm the contrary, with the learned Beza and other writers of note; for it seems evident from the best records, that Waldus derived his name from the true Valdenses of Piedmont, whose doctrine he adopted, and who were known by the names of *Vaudois* and Valdenses, before he or his immediate followers existed. If the Valdenses had derived their name from any eminent teacher, it would probably have been from Valdo, who was remarkable for the purity of his doctrine in the IXth century, and was the contemporary and chief counsellor of Berengarius. But the truth is, that they derived their name from their *valleys* in *Piedmont*, which in their language are called *Vaux;* hence *Vaudois*, their true name; hence Peter, or (as others call him) John of Lyons, was called in Latin, *Valdus*, because he had adopted their doctrine; and hence the term *Valdenses* and *Waldenses* used by those who write in English or Latin, in the place of *Vaudois*. The bloody inquisitor Reinerus Sacco, who exerted such a furious zeal for the destruction of the Waldenses, lived but about 80 years after Valdus of Lyons, and must therefore be supposed to have known whether he was the real founder of the Valdenses or Leonists; and yet it is remarkable that he speaks of the Leonists (mentioned by Dr. Mosheim, in this section, as synonymous with Waldenses) as a sect that had flourished above 500 years, and even mentions authors of note, who make their antiquity remount to the apostolic age. See the account given of Sacco's book by the Jesuit Gretser, in the Bibliotheca Patrum. I know not upon what principle Dr. Mosheim maintains, that the inhabitants of the valleys of Piedmont are to be carefully distinguished from the Waldenses; and I am persuaded, that whoever will be at the pains to read attentively the 2d, 25th, 26th, and 27th chapters of the first book of Leger's Histoire Generale des Eglises Vaudoises, will find this distinction entirely groundless.—When the Papists ask us, where our religion was before Luther, we generally answer, *in the Bible;* and we answer well. But to gratify their taste for tradition and human authority, we may add to this answer, *and in the vallcys of Piedmont.*

[b] See the following ancient writers, who have given accounts of the sect in question; namely, Sachoni Summa contra Valdenses.—Monetæ Summa contra Catharos et Valdenses, published by Riccini.—Tr. de Hæresi Pauperum de Lugduno, published by Martenne, in his Thesaur. Anecdot. tom. v. p. 1777.—Pilichdorfius contra Valdenses, t. xxv. B. Max. Patr.—Add to these authors, Jo. Paul Perrin, Histoire des Vaudois, published at Geneva, in 1619. Jo. Leger, Histoire Generale des Eglises Vaudoises, liv. i. ch. xiv. p. 156.—Usher, de successione Ecclesiarum Occidentis, cap. viii. p. 209.—Jac. Basnage, Histoire des Eglises Reformées, tom. i. period IV. p. 329.—Thom. August. Riccini, Dissertat. de Valdensibus, prefixed to his edition of the Summa Monetæ, p. 36.—Boulay, Histor. Acad. Paris, tom. ii. p. 292.

[c] See the Codex Inquisitionis Tolosanæ, published by Limborch, as also the Summa Monetæ contra Valdenses, and the other writers of the Waldensian history. Though these writers are not all equally accurate, nor perfectly agreed about the number of doctrines that entered into the system of this sect, yet they are nearly unanimous in acknowledging the sincere piety and exemplary conduct of the Waldenses, and show plainly enough that their intention was not to oppose the doctrines which were universally received among Christians, but only to revive the piety and manners of the primitive times, and to combat the vices of the clergy, and the abuses that had been introduced into the worship and discipline of the church.

[d] The bishops were also called *majorales* or *elders*.

furnished with some laborious trade or vocation, in order to gain by constant industry their daily subsistence.[a] The laity were divided into two classes; one of which contained the *perfect*, and the other the *imperfect* Christians. The former spontaneously divested themselves of all worldly possessions, manifested their extreme poverty in the wretchedness of their apparel, and emaciated their bodies by frequent fasting. The latter were less austere, and approached the method of living generally received, though they abstained, like the graver sort of anabaptists in later times, from all appearance of pomp and luxury. It is, however, to be observed, that the Waldenses were not without their intestine divisions. Such as resided in Italy differed considerably in their opinions from those who dwelt in France and the other European countries. The former considered the church of Rome as the church of Christ, though much corrupted and sadly disfigured; they also acknowledged the validity of its seven sacraments, and solemnly declared that they would ever continue in communion with it, provided that they might be allowed to live as they thought proper, without molestation or restraint. The latter affirmed, on the contrary, that the church of Rome had apostatised from Christ, was deprived of the Holy Spirit, and was, in reality, the *whore of Babylon* mentioned in the Revelations of St. John.[b]

XIV. Beside these famous sects, which made a great noise in the world, and drew after them multitudes from the bosom of a corrupt and superstitious church, there were religious factions of less importance, which arose in Italy, and more especially in France, though they seem to have expired soon after their birth.[c] In Lombardy, which was the principal residence of the Italian heretics, there sprang up a singular sect, known (for what reason I cannot tell) by the denomination of *Pasaginians*, and also by that of the *circumcised*. Like the other sects already mentioned, they had the utmost aversion to the dominion and discipline of the church of Rome; but they were, at the same time, distinguished by two religious tenets, which were peculiar to themselves. The first was a notion, that the observance of the law of Moses, in every thing except the offering of sacrifices, was obligatory upon Christians; in consequence of which they circumcised their followers, abstained from those meats, the use of which was prohibited under the Mosaic economy, and celebrated the Jewish Sabbath. The second tenet that distinguished this sect was advanced in opposition to the doctrine of three persons in the divine nature; for the Pasaginians maintained that Christ was no more than the first and purest creature of God; nor will their adoption of this opinion seem very surprising, if we consider the prodigious number of Arians that were scattered throughout Italy long before this period.[d]

XV. A sect of fanatics, called *Caputiati*, from a singular kind of cap that was the badge of their faction, infested the province of Burgundy, the diocese of Auxerre, and several other parts of France, in all which places they excited much disturbance among the people. They wore upon their caps a leaden image of the Virgin Mary; and they declared publicly, that their purpose was to level all distinctions, to abrogate magistracy, to remove all subordination among mankind, and to restore that primitive liberty, that natural equality, which were the inestimable privileges of the first mortals. Hugo, bishop of Auxerre, attacked these disturbers of human society in the proper manner, employing against them the force of arms, instead of arguments.[e]

The sect of the *apostolics*, whom St. Bernard opposed with such bitterness and fury, and who were so called, as that zealous abbot himself acknowledged, because they professed to exhibit, in their lives and manners, the piety and virtues of the holy apostles, were very different from the audacious heretics now mentioned. They were a clownish set of men, of the lowest birth, who gained their subsistence by bodily labour; yet, as soon as they formed themselves into a sect, they drew after them a multitude of adherents of all ranks and orders. Their religious doctrine, as St. Bernard confesses, was free from error, and their lives and manners were irreproachable and exemplary: but they were reprehensible on account of the following peculiarities: 1. They held it unlawful to take an oath; 2. They suffered their hair and their beards to grow to an enormous length, so that their aspect was inexpressibly extravagant and savage; 3. They preferred celibacy to wedlock, and called themselves the *chaste brethren and sisters;* notwithstanding which, 4. Each man had a spiritual sister with him, after the manner of the apostles, with whom he lived in a domestic relation, lying in the same chamber with her, though not in the same bed.[f]

XVI. In the council assembled at Rheims, in the year 1148, in which pope Eugenius III. presided, a gentleman of the province of Bretagne, whose name was Eon, and whose brain was undoubtedly disordered, was condemned for pretending to be the Son of God. Having heard, in the form that was used for exorcising malignant spirits, these words pronounced, *per Eum, qui venturus est judicare vivos et mortuos*, he concluded, from the resemblance between the word *Eum* and his name, that he was the person who was to come and judge both the quick and the dead. This poor man should rather have been delivered over to the physicians than placed in the list of heretics. He ended his days in a miserable prison, and left a considerable number of followers and adherents, whom persecution and death in the most dreadful forms could not persuade to abandon his cause, or to renounce an absurdity, which one would think could never have gained credit, but in a receptacle of lunatics.[g] This remarkable example is sufficient to show, not only the astonishing credulity of the stupid multitude, but also how far even the rulers of the church were destitute of judgment, and unacquainted with true and genuine religion.

[a] The greatest part of the Waldenses gained their livelihood by weaving; hence the whole sect, in some places, were called the *sect of weavers*.

[b] Monetæ Summa contra Catharos et Valdenses, p. 406, &c. They seem to have been also divided in their sentiments concerning the possession of worldly goods, as appears from the accounts of Stephanus de Borbone, apud Echardi Script. Dominican. tom. i. This writer divides the Waldenses into two classes, the poor men of Lyons, and the poor men of Lombardy. The former rejected and prohibited all sorts of possessions; the latter looked upon worldly possessions as lawful. This distinction is confirmed by several passages of other ancient authors.

[c] For an account of these obscure sects, see Stephanus de Borbone apud Echardi Script. Dominican. tom. i.

[d] See F. Bonacursi Manifestatio hæresis Catharorum, in d'Acheri's Spicileg. Veter. Scriptor. tom. i. p. 211. Gerard. Bergamensis contra Catharos et Pasagios, in Lud. Anton. Muratorii Antiq. Italic. medii Ævi, tom. v. p. 151.

[e] Jacques Le Bœuf, Memoires sur l'Histoire d'Auxerre, t. i. p. 317.

[f] Sti. Bern. Serm. lxv. in Canticum, t. iv. op. p. 1495, ed. Mabill.

[g] Matth. Paris, Hist. Maj. p. 68.—Guil. Neubrigensis, Hist. Rerum Angli. lib. i. p. 50.—Boulay, Hist. Acad. Paris, tom. ii. p. 241.

THE THIRTEENTH CENTURY

PART I.

THE EXTERNAL HISTORY OF THE CHURCH.

CHAPTER I.

Concerning the prosperous Events that happened to the Church during this Century.

I. Though the successors of Genghiz-Khan, the powerful emperor of the Tartars, or rather of the Mogols, had carried their victorious arms through a great part of Asia, and, having reduced China, India, and Persia, under their yoke, had involved in many calamities and sufferings the Christian assemblies which were established in those vanquished lands,[a] yet we learn from the best accounts, and the most respectable authorities, that in China, and in the northern parts of Asia, the Nestorians continued to have a flourishing church, and a great number of adherents. The emperors of the Tartars and Mogols had no great aversion to the Christian religion. It even appears from authentic records, that several kings and grandees of those nations had either been instructed in the doctrines of the Gospel by their ancestors, or were converted to Christianity by the ministry and exhortations of the Nestorians.[b] But the religion of Mohammed, which was so calculated to flatter the passions of men, gradually infected these noble converts, opposed with success the progress of the Gospel, and at length so effectually triumphed over it, that not the least remains of Christianity were to be perceived in the courts of those eastern princes.

II. The Tartars having made an incursion into Europe, in the year 1241, and having laid waste, with the most unrelenting and savage barbarity, Hungary, Poland, Silesia, and the adjacent countries, the Roman pontiffs thought it incumbent upon them to endeavour to calm the fury, and soften the ferocity, of these new and formidable enemies. For this purpose, in 1245, Innocent IV. sent an embassy to the Tartars, which consisted of Dominican and Franciscan friars.[c] In 1274, Abaca, the emperor of that fierce nation, sent ambassadors to the council of Lyons, which was holden under the pontificate of Gregory X.[d] About four years after this, pope Nicolas III. paid the same compliment to Coblai, emperor of the whole Tartar nation, to whom he sent a solemn embassy of Franciscan monks, with a view to render that prince propitious to the Christian cause. The last expedition of this kind that we shall mention at present, was that of Johannes à Monte Corvino, who, in 1289, was sent with other ecclesiastics to the same emperor, by Nicolas IV., and who carried letters to the Nestorians from that zealous pontiff. This mission was far from being useless, since those spiritual ambassadors converted many of the Tartars to Christianity, engaged considerable numbers of the Nestorians to adopt the doctrine and discipline of the church of Rome, and erected churches in various parts of Tartary and China. In order to accelerate the propagation of the Gospel among these darkened nations, Johannes à Monte Corvino translated the New Testament and the Psalms of David into the language of the Tartars.[e]

III. The Roman pontiffs employed their most zealous and assiduous efforts in the support of the Christian cause in Palestine, which was now in a most declining, or rather in a desperate state. They had learned, by a delightful experience, how much these Asiatic wars, undertaken from a principle, or at least carried on under a pretext of religion, had contributed to fill their coffers, augment their authority, and cover them with glory; and therefore they had nothing more at heart than the renewal and prolongation of these sacred expeditions.[f] Innocent III. therefore, sounded the charge, but the greatest part of the European princes and nations were deaf to the voice of the holy trumpet. At length, however, after many unsuccessful attempts in different countries, a body of French nobles entered into an alliance with the republic of Venice, and set sail for the east with an army that was far from being formidable. The event of this new expedition was by no means answerable to the expectations of the pontiff. The French and Venetians, instead of steering their course toward Palestine, sailed directly for Constantinople, and, in 1203, took that imperial city by storm, with a design of restoring to the throne Isaac Angelus, who implored their succour against the violence of his brother Alexius, the usurper of the empire. In the following year a dreadful sedition was raised at Constantinople, in which the emperor Isaac was put to death, and his son, the young Alexius, was strangled by Alexius Ducas, the ringleader of this furious faction.[g] The account of this atrocity no sooner came to the ears of the chiefs of the crusade, than they made themselves masters of Constantinople for the second time, dethroned and drove from the city the tyrant Ducas, and elected Baldwin, count of Flanders, emperor of the Greeks. This proceeding was a source of new divisions; for, about two years after this, the Greeks resolved to set up, in opposition to this Latin emperor, one

[a] Gregor. Abulfaraj. Historia Dynastiar. p. 281, edit. Pocock.

[b] See Marc. Paul. Venet. de Regionibus Oriental. lib. i. c. iv. lib. ii. c. vi.—Haytho the Armenian's Histor. Oriental. cap. xix. p. 35, cap. xxiii. p. 39, cap. xxiv.—Jos. Sim. Assemani Biblioth. Orient. Vatic. tom. iii. part ii. See particularly the Ecclesiastical History of the Tartars, published in Latin at Helmstadt, in 1741, under my auspices and inspection.

[c] See Wadding, Annal. Minor. tom. iii. p. 116, 149, 179, 256.

[d] Wadding, tom. iv. p. 35. tom. v. p. 128. See particularly an accurate and ample account of the negotiations between the pontiffs and the Tartars, in the Historia Ecclesiastica Tartarorum, already mentioned.

[e] Odor. Raynaldus, Annal. Ecclesiastic. tom. xiv. *ad annum* 1278, sect. 17, and *ad annum* 1289, sect. 59.—Pierre Bergeron, Traité des Tartares, chap. xi. See also the writers mentioned in the Historia Ecclesiastica Tartarorum.

[f] This is remarked by the writers of the twelfth century, who soon perceived the avaricious and despotic views of the pontiffs, in the encouragement they gave to the crusades. See Matth. Paris, Hist. Major

[g] The learned authors of the Universal History call this ringleader, by mistake, John Ducas.

of their own nation, and elected, for that purpose, Theodore Lascaris, who chose Nice in Bithynia for the place of his imperial residence. From this period until the year 1261, two emperors reigned over the Greeks; one of their own nation, who resided at Nice; and the other of Latin or French extraction, who lived at Constantinople, the ancient metropolis of the empire. But, in the year 1261, the face of things was changed by the Grecian emperor, Michael Palæologus, who, by the valour and stratagems of his general, Cæsar Alexius, became master of Constantinople, and forced the Latin emperor to abandon that city, and save himself by flight into Italy. Thus fell the empire of the Franks at Constantinople, after a duration of fifty-seven years.[a]

IV. Another sacred expedition was undertaken in 1217, under the pontificate of Honorius III., by the confederate arms of Italy and Germany. The allied army was commanded in chief by Andrew, king of Hungary, who was joined by Leopold, duke of Austria, Louis of Bavaria, and several other princes. After the lapse of a few months, Andrew returned into Europe. The remaining chiefs carried on the war with vigour, and, in 1220, made themselves masters of Damietta, the strongest city in Egypt; but their prosperity was of a short duration; for, in the following year, their fleet was totally ruined by that of the Saracens, their provisions were cut off, and their army reduced to the greatest difficulties. This irreparable loss, being followed by that of Damietta, blasted all their hopes, and removed the flattering prospects which their successful beginnings had presented to their expectations.[b]

V. The legates and missionaries of the court of Rome still continued to animate the languishing zeal of the European princes in behalf of the Christian cause in Palestine, and to revive the spirit of crusading, which so many calamities and disasters had almost totally extinguished. At length, in consequence of their lively remonstrances, a new army was raised, and a new expedition undertaken, which excited great expectations, and drew the attention of Europe so much the more, as it was generally believed that this army was to be commanded by the emperor Frederic II. That prince had, indeed, obliged himself by a solemn promise, made to the Roman pontiff, to undertake the direction of this enterprise; and what added a new degree of force to this engagement, and seemed to render the violation of it impossible, was the marriage that he had contracted, in 1223, with Jolanda, daughter of John, count of Brienne, and king of Jerusalem; by which alliance that kingdom was to be added to his European dominions. Notwithstanding these inducements, he postponed his voyage under various pretences, and did not set out until the year 1228, when, after having been excommunicated on account of his delay, by the incensed pontiff Gregory IX,[c] he followed with a small train of attendants the troops, who expected, with the most anxious impatience, his arrival in Palestine. No sooner did he land in that disputed kingdom, than, instead of carrying on the war with vigour, he turned all his thoughts toward peace, and, without consulting the other princes and chiefs of the crusade, concluded, in 1229, a treaty of peace, or rather a truce of ten years, with Malec-al-Camel, sultan of Egypt. The principal article of this treaty was, that Frederic should be put in possession of the city and kingdom of Jerusalem. This condition was immediately executed; and the emperor, entering the city with great pomp, accompanied by a numerous train, placed the crown upon his head with his own hands; and, having thus settled affairs in Palestine, he returned without delay into Italy, to appease the discords and commotions which the vindictive and ambitious pontiff had excited in his absence. Notwithstanding all the reproaches that were cast upon the emperor by the pope and his creatures, this expedition was, in reality, the most successful of any that had been undertaken against the infidels.[d]

VI. The expeditions that followed this were less important, and also less successful. In 1239, Theobald VI.,[e] count of Champagne and king of Navarre, set out from Marseilles for the Holy Land, accompanied by several French and German princes, as did also, in the following year, Richard, earl of Cornwall, brother to Henry III., king of England. The issue of these two expeditions by no means corresponded with the preparations which were made to render them successful. The former failed through the influence of the emperor's[f] ambassadors in Palestine, who renewed the truce with the Moslems; while on the other hand, a considerable body of Christians were defeated at Gaza, and such as escaped the carnage returned into Europe. This fatal event was principally occasioned by the discord that reigned between the templars and the knights of St. John of Jerusalem. Hence it came to pass, that the arrival of Richard, which had been industriously retarded by Gregory, and which had revived, in some degree, the hopes of the vanquished, was ineffectual to repair their losses; and all that this prince could do, was to enter, with the consent of the allies, into a truce, upon as good conditions as the declining state of their affairs would admit. This truce was accordingly concluded with the sultan of Egypt in 1241; after which Richard immediately set sail for Europe.[g]

---

[a] See, for a full account of this empire, Du Fresne, Histoire de l'Empire de Constantinople sous les Empereurs François; in the former part of which we find the Histoire de la Conquête de la Ville de Constantinople par les François, written by Godfrey de Ville-Hârduin, one of the French chiefs concerned in the expedition. This work makes a part of the Byzantine history. See also Claude Fontenay, Histoire de l'Eglise Gallicane, tom. x. Guntheri Monachi Histor. captæ à Latinis Constantinopoleos, in Henr. Canisii Lect. Antiq. tom. iv.—Innocentii III. Epistol. à Baluzio edit.

[b] See Jac. de Vitriaco, Hist. Orient. et Marinus Sanutus, Secret. fidel. Crucis inter Bongar. de sacris bellis Script. seu Gesta Dei per Francos.

☞ [c] This papal excommunication, which was drawn up in the most outrageous and indecent language, was so far from exciting Frederic to accelerate his departure for Palestine, that it produced no effect upon him at all, and was, on the contrary, received with the utmost contempt. He defended himself by his ambassador at Rome, and showed that the reasons of his delay were solid and just, and not mere pretexts, as the pope had pretended. At the same time, he wrote a remarkable letter to Henry III. king of England, in which he complained of the insatiable avarice, the boundless ambition, the perfidious and hypocritical proceedings of the Roman pontiffs. See Fleury, Hist. Eccles. liv. lxxix. tom. xvi.

[d] See the writers who have composed the history of the holy wars, and of the life and exploits of Frederic II. See also Muratori's Annales Ital and the various authors of the Germanic History.

☞ [e] Dr. Mosheim calls him, by a mistake, Theobald V., unless we attribute this fault to an error of the press.

☞ [f] This was Frederic II. who had a great party in Palestine, and did not act in concert with the clergy and the creatures of his bitter enemy, Gregory IX.; from which division the Christian cause suffered much.

[g] All these circumstances are accurately related and illustrated by the learned George Christ. Gebaureus, in his Historia Ricardi Imperatoris, lib. i. p. 34.—It appears, however, by the Epistolæ Petri de Vineis, that Richard was created, by Frederic, his lord lieutenant of the kingdom of Jerusalem; and this furnishes a probable reason why Gregory used all possible means to retard Richard's voyage.

VII. The affairs of the Christians in the east daily declined. Intestine discords and ill-conducted expeditions had reduced them almost to extremities, when Louis IX., king of France, who was canonised after his death, and is still worshipped with the utmost devotion, attempted their restoration. It was in consequence of a vow, which this prince had made in the year 1248, when he was seized with a dangerous illness, that he undertook this arduous task; and, in the execution of it, he set sail for Egypt with a formidable army and a numerous fleet, from a notion that the conquest of this province would enable him to carry on the war in Syria and Palestine with greater facility and success. The first attempts of the zealous monarch were crowned with victory; for Damietta, that famous Egyptian city, yielded to his arms; but the smiling prospect was soon changed, and the progress of the war presented one uniform scene of calamity and desolation. The united horrors of famine and pestilence overwhelmed the royal army, whose provisions were cut off by the Mohammedans, in 1250; Robert, earl of Artois, the king's brother, having surprised the Saracen army, and, through an excess of valour, pursued them too far, was slain in the engagement; and, a few days after, Louis, two of his brothers,[a] and the greatest part of his army, were made prisoners in a bloody action, after a bold and obstinate resistance. This valiant monarch, who was endowed with true greatness of mind, and who was extremely pious, though after the manner that prevailed in this age of superstition and darkness, was ransomed at an immense price;[b] and, after having spent about four years in Palestine, returned into France, in 1254, with a handful of men,[c] the miserable remains of his formidable army.

VIII. No calamities could deject the courage or damp the invincible spirit of Louis; nor did he look upon his vow as fulfilled by what he had already done in Palestine. He therefore resolved upon a new expedition, fitted out a formidable fleet, with which he set sail for Africa, accompanied by a splendid train of princes and nobles, and proposed to begin in that part of the world his operations against the infidels, that he might either convert them to the Christian faith, or draw from their treasures the means of carrying on more effectually the war in Asia. Immediately after his arrival upon the African coast, he made himself master of the fort of Carthage; but this success was soon followed by a fatal change in his affairs. A pestilential disease broke out in the fleet, in the harbour of Tunis, carried off the greatest part of the army, and seized, at length, the monarch himself, who fell a victim to its rage, on the 25th of August, 1270.[d] Louis was the last of the European princes that embarked in the holy war; the dangers and difficulties, the calamities and disorders, and the enormous expenses that accompanied each crusade, disgusted the most zealous, and discouraged the most intrepid promoters of these fanatical expeditions. In consequence of this, the Latin empire in the east declined apace, notwithstanding the efforts of the Roman pontiffs to maintain and support it; and in the year 1291, after the taking of Ptolemais by the Mohammedans, it was entirely overthrown.[e] It is natural to inquire into the true causes that contributed to this unhappy revolution in Palestine; and these causes are evident. We must not seek for them either in the counsels or in the valour of the infidels, but in the dissensions that reigned in the Christian armies, in the profligate lives of those who called themselves the champions of the cross, and in the ignorance, obstinacy, avarice, and insolence, of the pope's legates.

IX. Christianity had not yet tamed the ferocity, or conquered the pagan superstitions and prejudices, that still prevailed in some of the western provinces. Among others, the Prussians, a fierce and savage nation, retained the idolatrous worship of their ancestors with the most obstinate perseverance; nor did the arguments and exhortations employed by the ecclesiastics, who were sent from time to time to convert them, produce the least effect upon their stubborn and intractable spirits. The brutish firmness of these pagans induced Conrad, duke of Masovia, to have recourse to more forcible methods than reason and argument, in order to effect their conversion. For this purpose, he addressed himself, in the year 1230, to the knights of the Teutonic order of St. Mary, (who, after their expulsion from Palestine, had settled at Venice,) and engaged them, by pompous promises, to undertake the conquest and conversion of the Prussians. The knights accordingly arrived in Prussia, under the command of Herman de Saltza, and, after a most cruel and obstinate war of fifty years with that resolute people, obliged them to acknowledge the sovereignty of the Teutonic order, and to embrace the Christian faith.[f] After having established Christianity, and fixed their own dominion in Prussia, these booted apostles made several incursions into the neighbouring countries, and particularly into Lithuania, where they pillaged, burned, massacred, and ruined all before them, until they forced the inhabitants of that miserable province to profess a feigned submission to the Gospel, or rather to the furious and unrelenting missionaries, by whom it was propagated in a manner so contrary to its divine maxims, and to the benevolent spirit of its celestial author.[g]

X. In Spain the cause of the Gospel gained ground. The kings of Castile, Leon, Navarre, and Arragon, waged perpetual war with the Saracen princes, who held still under their dominion the kingdoms of Valencia, Granada, and Murcia, together with the province of Andalu

[a] Alphonsus, earl of Poictiers, and Charles, earl of Anjou.

[b] The ransom, which, together with the restoration of Damietta, the king was obliged to pay for his liberty, was 800,000 gold bezants, and not 80,000, as Collier erroneously reckons. This sum, which was equal then to 500,000 livres of French money, would, in our days, amount to the value of 4,000,000 of livres, that is, to about 170,000*l.* sterling.

[c] Of 2,800 illustrious knights, who set out with Louis from France, there remained about 100 when he sailed from Palestine. See Joinville's Hist. de S. Louis.

[d] Among the various histories that deserve to be consulted for a more ample account of this last crusade, the principal place is due to the Hist. de S. Louis IX. du nom, Roy de France, écrite par Jean Sr. de Joinville, enrichie de nouvelles Dissertations et Observations Historiques, par Charles du Fresne, Paris, 1688. See also Filleau de la Chaise, Histoire de S. Louis, Paris, 1688, 2 vols. 8vo.—Menconis Chronicon, in Ant. Matthæi Analect. veteris Ævi, tom. iii.—Luc. Wadding, Annales Minorum, tom. iv.—Boulay, Hist. Acad. Paris. tom. iii.—Pierre Claude Fontenay, Histoire de l'Eglise Gallicane, tom. xi.

[e] Ant. Matthæi Analecta veteris Ævi, tom. v.—Jac. Echardi Scriptor. Dominican. tom. i.—Imola in Dantem, in Muratorii Antiq. Italicæ medii Ævi. tom. i.

[f] See Matthæi Analecta vet. Ævi, tom. iii. p. 18. tom. v. p. 684—689.—Chronicon Prussiæ by Peter of Duisburg.—Hartknock's History of the Prussian Church, written in the German language, book i. chap. i., and Antiq. Prussiæ, Diss. xiv.—Baluzii Miscell. tom. vii.—Wadding's Annales Minor. tom. iv.—Hist. de Pologne par Solignac, tom. ii.

[g] Beside the authors mentioned in the preceding note, see Ludwig's Reliquiæ Manuscriptorum omnis Ævi, tom. i.

sia; and this war was carried on with such success, that the Saracen dominion declined apace, and was daily reduced within narrower bounds, while the limits of the church were extended on every side. The princes who chiefly contributed to this happy revolution were Ferdinand, king of Leon and Castile, who, after his death, obtained a place in the kalendar, his father Alphonso IX., king of Leon, and James I., of Arragon.[a] The last, more especially, distinguished himself eminently by his fervent zeal for the advancement of Christianity; for no sooner had he made himself master of Valencia, in the year 1236, than he employed, with the greatest pains and assiduity, every possible method of converting to the faith his Arabian subjects, whose expulsion would have been an irreparable loss to his kingdom. For this purpose he ordered the Dominicans, of whose ministry he principally made use in this salutary work, to learn the Arabic tongue; and he founded public schools at Majorca and Barcelona, in which a considerable number of youths were educated in a manner that might enable them to preach the Gospel in that language. When these pious efforts were found to be ineffectual, pope Clement IV. exhorted the king to drive the Mohammedans out of Spain. The obsequious prince attempted to follow the counsel of the inconsiderate pontiff; in the execution of which, however, he met with great difficulty, from the opposition of the Spanish nobles on one hand, and from the obstinacy of the Moors on the other.[b]

CHAPTER II.

Concerning the calamitous Events that happened to the Church during this Century.

I. THE accounts we have already given of the Tartarian conquests, and of the unhappy issue of the crusades, will be sufficient to suggest a lively idea of the melancholy condition to which the Christians were reduced in Asia; and, if the Saracens had been infected with the same odious spirit of persecution that possessed the crusards, there would not perhaps have remained a single Christian in that part of the world. But, though these infidels were chargeable with various crimes, and had frequently treated the Christians in a rigorous and injurious manner, they looked with horror upon those scenes of persecution, which the Latins exhibited as the exploits of heroic piety, and considered it as the highest and most atrocious mark of injustice and cruelty, to force unhappy men, by fire and sword, to abandon their religious principles, or to put them to death merely because they refused to change their opinions. After the destruction of the kingdom of Jerusalem, many of the Latins remained still in Syria, and, retiring into the dark and solitary recesses of mount Libanus, lived there in a savage manner, and lost, by degrees, all sense of religion and humanity, as appears from the conduct and characters of their descendants, who still inhabit the same uncultivated wilds, and who seem almost entirely destitute of all know ledge of God and religion.[c]

II. The Latin writers of this age complain in many places of the growth of infidelity, of daring and licentious writers, some of whom publicly attacked the doctrines of Christianity, while others went so far as atheistically to call in question the perfections and government of the Supreme Being. These complaints, however they might have been exaggerated in some respects, were yet far from being entirely destitute of foundation; and the superstition of the age was too naturally adapted to create a number of infidels and libertines, among men who had more capacity than judgment, more wit than solidity. Persons of this character, when they fixed their attention only upon that absurd system of religion, which the Roman pontiffs and their dependants exhibited as the true religion of Christ, and maintained by the odious influence of bloody persecution, were, for want of the means of being better instructed, unhappily induced to consider the Christian religion as a fable, invented and propagated by greedy and ambitious priests, in order to fill their coffers, and to render their authority respectable. The philosophy of Aristotle, which flourished in all the European schools, and was looked upon as the very essence of right reason, contributed much to support this delusion, and to nourish a proud and presumptuous spirit of infidelity. This quibbling and intricate philosophy led many to reject some of the most evident and important doctrines both of natural and revealed religion, such as the doctrine of a divine providence governing the universe, the immortality of the soul, the scriptural account of the origin of the world, and various points of less moment. Not only were these doctrines rejected, but the most pernicious errors were industriously propagated in opposition to them, by a set of Aristotelians, who were extremely active in gaining proselytes to their impious jargon.[d]

III. If the accusations brought against Frederic II. by pope Gregory IX. deserve any credit, that prince may be ranked among the most inveterate and malignant ene-

[a] See Joh. Ferreras, History of Spain, vol. iv.

[b] See Geddes' History of the Expulsion of the Morescoes, in his Miscellaneous Tracts, vol. i.

[c] A certain tribe called Derusi, or Drusi, who inhabit the recesses of the mounts Liban and Anti-Liban, pretend to a descent from the ancient Franks, who were once masters of Palestine. This derivation is, indeed, doubtful. It is however certain, that there still remain in these countries descendants of those whom the holy war led from Europe into Palestine, though they do very little honour to their ancestors, and have nothing of Christians but the name.

[d] See Sti. Thomæ Summa contra Gentes, and Bernardi Monetæ Summa contra Catharos et Waldenses. The latter writer, in the work now mentioned, combats, with great spirit, those enemies of Christianity who appeared in his time. In the fourth chapter of the fifth book, p. 416, he disputes, in an ample and copious manner, against those who affirmed, that the soul perished with the body; refutes, in the eleventh chapter, p. 477, those Aristotelian philosophers, who held, that the world had existed from all eternity, and would never have an end: and, in the fifteenth chapter, p. 554, he attacks those, who, despising the authority of the sacred writings, deny the existence of human liberty, and maintain, that all things, and even the crimes of the wicked, are the effects of an absolute and irresistible necessity. Add to these authors, Tempier's Indiculus Errorum, qui a nonnullis Magistris Lutetiæ publice privatimque docebantur, Anno 1277, in Bibliotheca Patrum Maxima, tom. xxv. p. 233; as also Boulay's Hist. Acad. Paris. tom. iii. p. 433, and Gerard du Bois' Hist. Eccles. Paris, tom. ii. p. 501. The tenets of these doctors will, no doubt, appear of a surprising nature; for they taught, "that there was only one intellect among all the human race; that all things were subject to absolute fate or necessity; that the universe was not governed by a divine providence; that the world was eternal and the soul mortal:" and they maintained these and the like monstrous errors, by arguments drawn from the philosophy of Aristotle. But, at the same time, to avoid the just resentment of the people, they held up, as a buckler against their adversaries, that most dangerous and pernicious distinction between theological and philosophical truth, which has been since used, with the most cunning and bad faith, by the more recent Aristotelians of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. "These things," say they, (as we learn from Tempier, who was bishop of Paris,) "are true in philosophy, but not according to the catholic faith." Vera sunt hæc secundum philosophiam, non secundum fidem catholicam.

mies of the Christian religion, since he was charged by the pontiff with having said, that the world had been deceived by three impostors, Moses, Christ, and Mohammed.[a] This charge was answered by a solemn and public profession of his faith, which the emperor addressed to all the kings and princes of Europe, to whom also had been addressed the accusation brought against him. The charge, however, was founded upon the testimony of Henry Raspon, landgrave of Thuringia, who declared that he had heard the emperor pronounce the abominable blasphemy above mentioned.[b] It is, after all, difficult to decide with sufficient evidence upon this point. Frederic, who was extremely passionate and imprudent, may, perhaps, in a fit of rage, have suffered some such expression as this to escape his reflection; and this is rendered probable by the company he frequented, and the number of learned Aristotelians who were always about his person, and might suggest matter enough for such impious expressions, as that now under consideration. It was this affair that gave occasion, in after-times, to the invention of that fabulous account,[c] which supposes the detestable book concerning the three impostors to have been composed by the emperor himself, or by Peter de Vineis, a native of Capua, a man of great credit and authority, whom that prince[d] had chosen for his prime minister, and in whom he placed the highest confidence.

[a] Matthew Paris, Historia Major, pag. 408, 439.—Petr. de Vineis Epistolarum, lib. i.

[b] Herm. Gigantis Flores Temporum, p. 126.—Chr. Fred. Ayrmann, Sylloge Anecdotor. tom. i. p. 639.

[c] See Casim. Oudini Comment. de Scriptoribus Ecclesiasticis, tom. iii. p. 66.—Alb. Henr. de Sallengre, Memoires d'Histoire et de Literature, tom. i. part i. p. 386.

[d] The book entitled Liber de iii. Impostoribus, sive Tractatus de Vanitate Religionum, is really a book which had no existence at the time that the most noise was made about it, and was spoken of by multitudes before it had been seen by any one person. Its supposed existence was probably owing to an impious saying of Simon Tournay, doctor of divinity in the university of Paris in the thirteenth century, which amounts to this: "That the Jews were seduced out of their senses by Moses, the Christians by Jesus, and the Gentiles by Mohammed." This, or some expressions of a similar kind, were imputed to the emperor Frederic, and other persons, perhaps without any real foundation; and the imaginary book to which they have given rise, has been attributed by different authors to Frederic, to his chancellor Peter de Vineis, to Alphonso, king of Castile, to Boccace, Poggio, the Aretins, Pomponace, Machiavel, Erasmus, Ochinus, Servetus, Rabelais, Giordano Bruno, Campanella, and many others. In a word, the book was long spoken of before any such work existed; but the rumour that was spread abroad encouraged some profligate traders in licentiousness to compose, or rather compile, a bundle of miserable rhapsodies, under the famous title of the Three Impostors, in order to impose upon such as are fond of these pretended rarities. Accordingly, the Spaccio della Bestia Triomphante of Giordano Bruno, and a wretched piece of Impiety called the Spirit of Spinoza, were the ground-work of materials from which these hireling compilers, by modifying some passages, and adding others, drew the book which now passes under the name of the Three Impostors, of which I have seen two copies in manuscript, but no printed edition. See La Monnoye's Dissertation sur le Livre des Trois Imposteurs, published at Amsterdam in 1715, at the end of the fourth volume of the Menagiana. See also an answer to this Dissertation, which was impudently exposed to the public eye, in 1716, from the press of Scheurleer at the Hague, and which contains a fabulous story of the origin of the book in question. Whoever is desirous of a more ample and a very curious account of this matter, will find it in the late Prosper Marchand's Dictionaire Historique, vol. ii. at the article Imposteurs.

PART II.

THE INTERNAL HISTORY OF THE CHURCH.

CHAPTER I.

Concerning the state of Learning and Philosophy during this Century.

I. The Greeks, amidst the dreadful calamities, discords, and revolutions, that distracted and perplexed their unhappy country, had neither that spirit, nor that leisure, which are necessary for the culture of the arts and sciences. Yet, under all these disadvantages, they retained a certain portion of their former spirit, and did not entirely abandon the cause of learning and philosophy, as appears from the writers that arose among them during this century. Their best historians were Nicetas Choniates, Georgius Acropolita, Gregorius Pachymeres, and Joel, whose Chronology is yet extant. We learn from the writings of Gregory Pachymeres, and Nicephorus Blemmida, that the Peripatetic philosophy was not without its admirers among the Greeks, though the Platonic was most in vogue. The greatest part of the Grecian philosophers, following the example of the later Platonists, whose works were the subject of their constant meditation, were inclined to reduce the wisdom of Plato and the subtleties of the Stagirite into one system, and to reconcile, as well as they could, their jarring principles. It is not necessary to exhibit a list of those authors, who wrote the lives and discourses of the saints, or distinguished themselves in the controversy with the Latin church, or of those who employed their learned labours in illustrating the canon law of the Greeks. The principal Syrian writer, which this century produced, was Gregory Abul-Faraj, primate of the Jacobites, a man of true genius and universal learning, who was a judicious divine, an eminent historian, and a good philosopher.[a] George Elmacin, who composed the history of the Saracens, was also a writer of no mean reputation.

II. The sciences carried a fairer aspect in the western world, where every branch of erudition was cultivated with assiduity and zeal, and, in consequence, flourished with increasing vigour. The European princes had learned, by a happy experience, how much learning and the arts contribute to the grandeur and happiness of a nation; and therefore they invited into their dominions learned men from all parts of the world, nourished the arts in their bosoms, excited the youth to the love of letters, by crowning their progress with the most noble rewards, and encouraged every effort of genius, by conferring, upon such as excelled, the most honourable distinctions. Among these patrons and protectors of learning, the emperor, Frederic II., and Alphonso X., king of Leon and Castile (two princes as much distinguished by their own learning, as by the encouragement they granted to men of genius,) acquired the highest renown, and rendered their names immortal. The former founded the academy of Naples, had the works of Aristotle translated into Latin, assembled about his person all the learned men whom he could engage by his munificence to repair to his court, and gave other undoubted proofs of his zeal for the advancement of the arts and sciences.[b] The latter obtained an illustrious and permanent renown by several learned productions, but more especially by his famous Astronomical tables.[c] In consequence then of the protection that was given to the sciences in this century, academies were erected almost in every city; peculiar privileges of various kinds were granted to the youth that frequented them; and these learned societies acquired, at length, the form of political bodies; that is to say, they were invested with a certain jurisdiction, and were governed by their own laws and statutes.

III. In the public schools or academies that were founded at Padua, Modena, Naples, Capua, Toulouse, Salamanca, Lyons, and Cologne, the whole circle of science was not taught, as in our times. The application of the youth, and the labours of their instructors, were limited to certain branches of learning; and thus the course of academical education remained imperfect. The academy of Paris, which surpassed all the rest, both with respect to the number and abilities of its professors, and the multitude of students by whom it was frequented, was the first learned society which extended the sphere of education, received all the sciences into its bosom, and appointed masters for every branch of erudition. Hence it was distinguished, before any other academy, with the title of an university, to denote its embracing the whole body of science; and, in process of time, other schools of learning were ambitious of forming themselves upon the same model, and of being honoured with the same title. In this famous university, the doctors were divided into four colleges or classes, according to the branches of learning they professed; and these classes were called, in aftertimes, faculties. In each of these faculties, a doctor was chosen by the suffrages of his colleagues, to preside during a fixed period in the society; and the title of dean was given to those who successively filled that eminent office.[d] The head of the university, whose inspection and juris-

[a] See Bayle's Dictionary, at the article Abulpharage; as also Jos. Simon. Assemani Bibliotheca Orientalis, Vatican. tom. ii. caput xlii. p. 244.

☞ Abulpharagius, or Abul-Faraj, was a native of Malatia, a city in Armenia, near the source of the river Euphrates, and acquired a vast reputation in the east, on account of his extensive erudition. He composed an Abridgment of Universal History, from the beginning of the world to his own times, which he divided into ten parts, or dynasties. The first comprehends the history of the ancient patriarchs from Adam to Moses. The second, that of Joshua and the other judges of Israel. The third, fourth, fifth, and sixth, contain the history of the kings of Israel, of the Chaldean princes, of the Persian Magi, and of the Grecian monarchs. The seventh relates to the Roman history; the eighth to that of the Greek emperors of Constantinople. In the ninth he treats of the Arabian princes; and in the tenth of the Moguls. He is more to be depended upon in his history of the Saracens and Tartars, than in his accounts of other nations. The learned Dr. Edward Pocock translated this work into Latin, and published his translation in 1663-4, with a supplement, which carries on the history of the oriental princes, where Abul-Faraj left it. The same learned translator had obliged the public, in 1650, with an abridgment of the ninth dynasty, under the following title: "Specimen Historiæ Arabum, sive Gregorii Abulfaragii Malatiensis de Origine et Moribus Arabum succincta Narratio."

[b] Boulay, Hist. Acad. Paris. tom. iii. p. 115. Giannone, Historia di Napoli, tom. ii. p. 497. Add to these the observations of Jo. Alb. Fabricius, Biblioth. Latin. medii Ævi, tom. ii. p. 618.

[c] Nic. Antonii Bibliotheca vetus Hispan. lib. viii. c. v. p. 217. Jo. de Ferreras, Histoire d'Espagne, tom. iv. p. 347.

[d] This arrangement was executed about the year 1260. See Du Boulay, Histor. Acad. Paris. tom. iii. p. 557, 564.

diction extended to all branches of that learned body, was dignified with the name of chancellor; and that high and honourable place was filled by the bishop of Paris, to whom an assistant was afterwards joined, who shared the administration with him, and was invested with an extensive authority.[a] The college set apart for the study of divinity was first erected and endowed, in the year 1250, by an opulent and pious man, whose name was Robert de Sorbonne, (a particular friend and favourite of St. Louis,) whose name was adopted, and is still retained by that theological society.[b]

IV. Such as were desirous of being chosen professors in any of the faculties or colleges of this university were obliged to submit to a long and tedious course of probation, and to suffer the strictest examinations, and to give, during several years, undoubted proofs of their learning and capacity, before they were received in the character of public teachers. This severe discipline was called the academical course; and it was wisely designed to prevent the number of professors from multiplying beyond measure, and also to prevent such as were destitute of erudition and abilities from assuming an office, which was justly looked upon as of high importance. They who had satisfied all the demands of this academical law, and had gone through the formidable trial with applause, were solemnly invested with the dignity of professors, and were saluted masters with a certain round of ceremonies, that were used in the societies of illiterate tradesmen, when their company was augmented by a new candidate. This vulgar custom had been introduced, in the preceding century, by the professors of law in the academy of Bologna; and, in this century, it was transmitted to that of Paris, where it was first practised by the divinity-colleges, and afterwards by the professors of physic and of the liberal arts. In this account of the trial and installation of the professors of Paris, we may perceive the origin of what we now call academical degrees, which, like all other human institutions, have miserably degenerated from the wise ends for which they were at first appointed, and grow more insignificant from day to day.[c]

V. These public institutions, consecrated to the advancement of learning, were attended with remarkable success; but that branch of erudition, which we call humanity or polite literature, derived less advantage from them than the other sciences. The industrious youth either applied themselves entirely to the study of the civil and canon laws, which was a sure path to preferment, or employed their labours in philosophical researches, in order to the attainment of a shining reputation, and of the applause that was lavished upon such as were endowed with a subtle and metaphysical genius. Hence arose the bitter complaints of the pontiffs and other bishops, of the neglect and decline of the liberal arts and sciences; and hence also the zealous, but unsuccessful efforts they used to turn the youth from jurisprudence and philosophy, to the study of humanity and philology.[d] Notwithstanding all this, the thirteenth century produced several writers, who were very far from being contemptible, such as William Brito,[e] Walter Mapes,[f] Matthew of Vendosme, Alain de l'Isle,[g] Guntherus, James of Vitri, and several others, who wrote with ease, and were not altogether destitute of elegance. Among the historians, the first place is due to Matthew Paris, a writer of the highest merit, both in point of knowledge and prudence, to whom we may add Roderic Ximenes, Rigord,[h] Vincent of Beauvais, Robert of St. Marino,[i] Martinus, a native of Poland, Gervase of Tilbury,[k] Conrad of Lichtenau, and William Nangius, whose names are worthy of being preserved from oblivion. The writers who have laboured to transmit to posterity the lives and exploits of the saints, have rather related the superstitions and miseries of the times, than the actions of those holy men. Among these biographers, James of Vitri, mentioned above, makes the greatest figure; he also composed a History of the Lombards, that is full of insipid and trifling stories.[l]

VI. Roger Bacon,[m] John Balbi, and Robert Capito, with other learned men, whose number, however, was inconsiderable, applied themselves to the study of Greek literature. The Hebrew language and theology were much less cultivated; though it appears that Bacon and Capito, already mentioned, and Raymond Martin, author of an excellent treatise, entitled, Pugio Fidei Christianæ, or, The Dagger of the Christian Faith, were extremely well versed in that species of erudition. Many of the Spaniards, and more particularly the Dominican friars, made themselves masters of the Arabian learning and language, as the kings of Spain had charged the latter with the instruction and conversion of the Jews and Saracens who resided in their dominions.[n] As to the Latin grammarians, the best of them were extremely barbarous and insipid, and equally destitute of taste and knowledge. To be convinced of this, we have only to

[a] See Herm. Conringii Antiquitates Academicæ, a work, however, susceptible of considerable improvements. The important work mentioned in the preceding note, and which is divided into six volumes, deserves to be principally consulted in this point, as well as in all others that relate to the history and government of the university of Paris; add to this, Claud. Hemeræi Liber de Academia Parisiensi, qualis primo fuit in insula et episcoporum scholis, Lutet. 1637, in 4to.

[b] See Du Boulay, Hist. Acad. Paris. tom. iii. p. 223. - Du Fresne's Annotations upon the Life of St. Louis, written by Joinville, p. 36.

[c] Beside the writers above mentioned, see Jo. Chr. Itterus, de Gradibus Academicis.--Just. Hen. Böhmer, Præf. ad Jus Canonicum, p. 14.—Ant. Wood, Antiquit. Oxoniens. tom. i. p. 24.—Boulay, Histor. Acad. Paris, tom. ii. p. 256, 682, &c.

[d] Boulay, Hist. Acad. Paris. tom. iii. p. 265, where there is an epistle of Innocent III., who seems to take this matter seriously to heart.—Ant. Wood, Antiq. Oxon. tom. i. p. 124.—Imola in Dantem, in Muratori's Antiquit. Ital. medii Ævi, tom. i. p. 1262.

[e] See Hist. de l'Acad. des Inscript. et des Belles Lettres, t. xvi. p. 255.

[f] Jo. Wolff, Lectiones Memorabil. tom. i. p 430.

[g] Called in Latin, Alanus ab Insulis.

[h] See the Histoire de l'Academie des Inscriptions et des Belles Lettres, tom. xvi. p. 243, which also gives an ample account of William of Nangis, page 292

[i] See Le Bœuf, Memoires pour l'Histoire d'Auxerre, tom. ii. p. 490, where there is also a learned account of Vincent of Beauvais, p. 494.

[k] Gervase of Tilbury was nephew to Henry II., king of England, and was in high credit with the emperor Otho IV., to whom he dedicated a description of the world and a Chronicle, both of which he had himself composed. He wrote also a History of England, and one of the Holy Land, with several treatises upon different subjects.

[l] See Schelhornii Amœnitates Literariæ, tom. xi. p. 324.

[m] This illustrious Franciscan, in point of genius and universal learning, was one of the greatest ornaments of the British nation, and, in general, of the republic of letters. The astonishing discoveries he made in astronomy, chemistry, optics, and mathematics, made him pass for a magician in the ignorant and superstitious times in which he lived, while his profound knowledge in philosophy, theology, and the Greek and Oriental languages, procured him, with more justice, the title of the *admirable* or *wonderful doctor*. Among other discoveries, he is said to have made that of the composition and force of gunpowder, which he describes clearly in one of his letters; and he proposed much the same correction of the calendar, which was executed about 300 years after by Gregory III. He composed an extraordinary number of books, of which a list may be seen in the General Dictionary.

[n] See Rich. Simon's Lettres Choisies, tom. iii. p. 112, and Nic. Antonii Bibliotheca vetus Hispanica.

cast an eye upon the productions of Alexander de Villa Dei, who was looked upon as the most eminent of them all, and whose works were read in almost all the schools from this period until the sixteenth century. This pedantic Franciscan composed, in the year 1240, what he called a Doctrinale, in Leonine verse, full of the most wretched quibbles, and in which the rules of grammar and criticism are delivered with the greatest confusion and obscurity, or, rather, are covered with impenetrable darkness.

VII. The various systems of philosophy that were in vogue before this century, lost their credit by degrees, and submitted to the triumphant doctrine of Aristotle, which erected a new and despotic empire in the republic of letters, and reduced the whole ideal world under its lordly dominion. Several of the works of this philosopher, and more especially his metaphysical productions, had been, so early as the beginning of this century, translated into Latin at Paris, and were from that time explained to the youth in the public schools.[a] But when it appeared, that Almeric[b] had drawn from these books his erroneous sentiments concerning the divine nature, they were prohibited and condemned as pernicious and pestilential, by a public decree of the council of Sens, in the year 1209.[c] The logic of Aristotle, however, recovered its credit some years after this, and was publicly taught in the university of Paris in the year 1215; but the natural philosophy and metaphysics of that great man were still under the sentence of condemnation.[d] It was reserved for the emperor Frederic II. to restore the Stagirite to his former glory, which this prince effected by employing a number of learned men, whom he had chosen with the greatest attention and care,[e] and who were profoundly versed in the knowledge of the languages, to translate into Latin, from the Greek and Arabic, certain books of Aristotle, and of other ancient sages. This translation, which was recommended, in a particular manner, to the academy of Bologna by the learned emperor, raised the credit of Aristotle to the greatest height, and gave him an irresistible and despotic authority in all the European schools. This authority was still farther augmented by the translations which were made of some of the books of the Grecian sage by several Latin interpreters, such as Michael Scot, Philip of Tripoli, William Fleming, and others; though these men were quite unequal to the task they undertook, and had neither such knowledge of the languages, nor such an acquaintance with philosophy, as were necessary to the successful execution of such a difficult enterprise.[f]

VIII. The Aristotelian philosophy received the very last addition that could be made to its authority and lustre, when the Dominican and Franciscan friars adopted its tenets, taught it in their schools, and illustrated it in their writings. These two mendicant orders were looked upon as the chief depositories of all learning, both human and divine; and were followed, with the utmost eagerness and assiduity, by all such as were ambitious of being distinguished from the multitude by superior knowledge. Alexander Hales, an English Franciscan, who taught philosophy at Paris, and acquired, by the strength of his metaphysical genius, the title of the Irrefragable Doctor,[g] and Albert the Great, a German of the Dominican order, and bishop of Ratisbon, a man of great abilities, and an universal dictator at this time,[h] were the first eminent writers who illustrated, in their learned productions, the Aristotelian system. But it was the disciple of Albert, Thomas Aquinas, the Angelic Doctor, and the great luminary of the scholastic world, that contributed most to the glory of the Stagirite,[i] by inculcating, illustrating, and enforcing his doctrines, both in his lectures and in his writings; and principally by engaging one of his learned colleagues to give, under his inspection, a new translation of the works of the Grecian sage, which far surpassed the former version in exactness, perspicuity, and elegance.[k] By these means the philosophy of Aristotle, notwithstanding the hostile efforts of several divines, and even of the Roman pontiffs themselves, who beheld its progress with an unfriendly eye, triumphed in all the Latin schools, and absorbed all the other systems that had flourished before this literary revolution.

IX. There were, however, at this time in Europe se-

[a] Franc. Patricii Discussiones Peripateticæ, tom. i. lib. xi. p. 145. Jo. Launoius de varia Aristot. fortuna in Acad. Parisiensi, cap. i. p. 127, ed. Elswich. It is commonly reported, that the books of Aristotle here mentioned, were translated from Arabic into Latin. But we are told positively, that these books were brought from Constantinople, and translated from Greek into Latin. See Rigord's work de gestis Philippi regis Franc. *ad annum* 1209, in Andr. Chesnii Scrip. Hist. Franc. p. 119.

[b] Almeric, or Amauri, does not seem to have entertained any enormous errors. He held, that every Christian was obliged to believe himself a member of Jesus Christ, and attached, perhaps, some extravagant and fanatical ideas to that opinion; but his followers fell into more pernicious notions, and adopted the most odious tenets, maintaining, that the power of the Father continued no longer than the Mosaic dispensation; that the empire of the Son extended only to the thirteenth century; and that then the reign of the Holy Ghost commenced, when all sacraments and external worship were to be abolished, and the salvation of Christians was to be accomplished merely by internal acts of illuminating grace. Their morals also were as infamous as their doctrine was absurd; and, under the name of charity, they comprehended and committed the most criminal acts of impurity and licentiousness.

[c] Dr. Mosheim has fallen here into two slight mistakes. It was at Paris, and not at Sens, and in the year 1210, and not 1209, that the metaphysical books of Aristotle were condemned to the flames. The works quoted here by our author, are those of Launoy, de varia Aristotelis fortuna in Acad. Paris. cap. iv. p. 195, and Syllabus rationum quibus Durandi causa defenditur, tom. i. op.

[d] Nat. Alexander, Select. Histor. Ecclesiast. Capita, tom. viii. cap. iii. sect. 7, page 76.

[e] Petr. de Vineis, Epist. lib. iii. ep. lxvii. p. 503. This epistle is addressed "ad magistros et scholares Bononienses;" *i. e.* "to the masters and scholars of the academy of Bologna:" but it is more than probable, that the emperor sent letters upon this occasion to the other European schools. It is a common opinion, that this learned prince had all the works of Aristotle, that were then extant, translated into Latin about the year 1220; but this cannot be deduced from the letter above mentioned, or from any other sufficient testimony that we know of.

[f] See Wood's account of the interpreters of Aristotle, in his Antiquitat. Oxon. tom. i. p. 119; as also Jebb's preface to the Opus Majus of the famous Roger Bacon, published at London in folio, in the year 1733. We shall give here the opinion which Bacon had of the translators of Aristotle, in the words of that great man, who expresses his contempt of these wretched interpreters in the following manner: "Si haberem potestatem supra libros Aristotelis, (Latine conversos,) ego facerem omnes cremari, quia non est nisi temporis amissio studere in illis, et causa erroris et multiplicatio ignorantiæ, ultra id quod valet explicari."

[g] See Wadding's Annales Minorum, tom. iii. p. 233. Du Boulay, Histor. Acad. Paris. tom. iii. p. 200, 673.

[h] Jo. Alb. Fabricii Biblioth. Latina medii Ævi, tom. i. p. 113.

[i] The Dominicans maintain, that this Angelic Doctor was the Jewel of Albert the Great, and their opinion seems to be founded in truth. See Antoine Touron, Vie de St. Thomas, p. 99. The Franciscans, however, maintain as obstinately, that Alexander Hales was the master of Thomas. See Wadding's Annales Minorum, tom. iii. p. 133.

[k] It has been believed by many, that William de Moerbeka, a native of Flanders, of the Dominican order, and archbishop of Corinth, was the author of the new Latin translation of the works of Aristotle, which was carried on and finished under the auspicious inspection of Thomas Aquinas. See J. Echard, Scriptores Dominican. tom. i. p. 388, 469. Casim. Oudinus, Comm. de Scriptor. Eccles. tom. iii. p. 468. Jo. Franc. Foppens, Bibliotheca Belgica, tom. i. p. 416. Others, however, suppose, though indeed with less evidence, that this translation was composed by Henry Kosbein, who was also a Dominican.

veral persons of superior genius and penetration, who, notwithstanding their respect for Aristotle, considered the method of treating philosophy, which his writings had introduced, as dry, inelegant, and fit only to confine and damp the efforts of the mind in the pursuit of truth; and who, consequently, were desirous of enlarging the sphere of science by new researches and discoveries.[a] At the head of these noble adventurers we may justly place Roger Bacon, a Franciscan friar of the English nation, known by the appellation of the *admirable doctor*, who was renowned on account of his most important discoveries, and who, in natural philosophy, mathematics, chemistry, the mechanic arts, and the learned languages, soared far beyond the genius of the times.[b] With him we may associate Arnold of Villa Nova, whose place of nativity is fixed by some in France, by others in Spain, and who acquired a shining reputation by his knowledge in chemistry, poetry, philosophy, languages, and physic;[c] as also Peter d'Abano, a physician of Padua, who was surnamed the *Reconciler*, from a book which he wrote in the hope of terminating the dissensions and contests that reigned among the philosophers and physicians,[d] and who was profoundly versed in the sciences of philosophy, astronomy, physic, and mathematics.[e] It must, however, be observed, to the eternal dishonour of the age, that the only fruits which these great men derived from their learned labours, and their noble, as well as successful efforts for the advancement of the arts and sciences, were the furious clamours of an enraged and superstitious multitude, who looked upon them as heretics and magicians, and thirsted so eagerly after their blood, that they escaped with difficulty the hands of the public executioner. Bacon was confined many years in a comfortless prison; and the other two were, after their death, brought before the tribunal of the inquisition, and declared worthy of being committed to the flames for the novelties they had introduced into the republic of letters.

X. The state of theology, and the method of teaching and representing the doctrines of Christianity that now prevailed, shall be mentioned in their place. The civil and canon laws held the first rank in the circle of the sciences, and were studied with peculiar zeal and application by almost all who were ambitious of literary glory. But these sciences, notwithstanding the assiduity with which they were cultivated, were far from being then brought to any tolerable degree of perfection. They were disfigured by the jargon that reigned in the schools, and were corrupted and rendered intricate by a multitude of trivial commentaries that were intended to illustrate and explain them. Some employed their labours in collecting the letters of the Roman pontiffs, which are commonly known under the title of *Decretals*,[f] and which were deemed a very important branch of ecclesiastical law. Raimond of Pennafort, a native of Barcelona, was the most famous of all these compilers, and acquired a considerable reputation by his collection of the Decretals in five books, which he undertook at the desire of Gregory IX., and which has been since honoured with the name of that pontiff, who ordered it to be added to the Decretals of Gratian, and to be read in all the European colleges.[g] Toward the conclusion of this century, Boniface VIII. caused a new collection to be made, which was entitled, *The Sixth Book of Decretals*, because it was added to the five already mentioned.

CHAPTER II.

Concerning the Doctors and Ministers of the Church, and its Form of Government, during this Century.

I. BOTH the Greek and Latin writers, provoked beyond measure by the flagitious lives of their spiritual rulers and instructors, complain loudly of their licentious manners, and load them with the severest reproaches; nor will these complaints and reproaches appear excessive to such as are acquainted with the history of this corrupt and superstitious age.[h] Several eminent men attempted to stem this torrent of licentiousness, which from the heads of the church had carried its pernicious streams through all the members; but their power and influence were unequal to such a difficult and arduous enterprise. The Grecian emperors were prevented from executing any project of this kind by the infelicity of the times, and the various calamities and tumults, which not only reigned in their dominions, but even shook their thrones, while the power and opulence of the Roman pontiffs, and the superstition of the age, prevented the Latins from accomplishing, or even attempting, a reformation in the church.

II. In the history of the popes, we meet with a lively and horrible picture of the complicated crimes that dishonoured the ministers of the church, who were peculiarly required, by their sacred office, to exhibit to the world dis-

[a] Bacon's contempt of the learning that was in vogue in his time may be seen in the following passage, quoted by Jebb, in his preface to the Opus Majus of that great man: "Nunquam fuit tanta apparentia sapientiæ, nec tantum exercitium studii in tot facultatibus, in tot regionibus, sicut jam a quadraginta annis: ubique enim doctores sunt dispersi . . . . in omni civitate, et in omni castro, et in omni burgo, præcipue per duos ordines studentes (he means the Franciscans and Dominicans, who were almost the only religious orders that distinguished themselves by an application to study) quod non accidit, nisi a quadraginta annis aut circiter, cum tamen nunquam fuit tanta ignorantia, tantus error . . . Vulgus studentium languet et asininat circa mala translata (by these wretched versions he understands the works of Aristotle, which were most miserably translated by ignorant bunglers) et tempus et studium amittit in omnibus et expensas. Apparentia quidem sola tenet eos, et non curant quid sciant, sed quid videantur scire coram multitudine insensatâ." Thus, according to Bacon, in the midst of the most specious appearance of science, the greatest ignorance and the grossest errors reigned almost universally.

[b] That Bacon deserves this high rank in the learned world appears evidently from his book entitled Opus Majus, which was dedicated to pope Clement IV., and which Jebb published at London in 1733, from a manuscript that still exists in the university of Dublin, enriching it with a learned preface and a considerable number of judicious observations. The other works of Bacon, which are very numerous, lie for the most part concealed in the libraries of the curious. For a farther account of this eminent man, see Wood's Antiq. Oxon. tom. i. p. 136.—Wadding, Annal. Minor. t. iv. p. 161, t. v. p. 51.—Thom. Gale, ad Jamblichum de Mysteriis Ægyptior. p. 255.—General Hist. and Crit. Dictionary.

[c] See Nic. Antonii Biblioth. vetus Hispan. tom. ii. lib. ix. c. i.—Pierre Joseph, Vie d'Arnaud de Ville-neuve, Aix, 1719.—Niceron, Memoires des Hommes illustres, tom. xxxiv.—Nicol. Eymerici Directorium Inquisitorum, pag. 282, where, among other things, we have an account of his errors.

[d] This book was entitled, Conciliator Differentiarum Philosophorum et Medicorum.

[e] There is a very accurate account of this philosopher given by Joh. Maria Mazzuchelli, Notizie Storiche e Critiche intorno alla Vita di Pietro d'Abano, in Angeli Calogeræ Opus. Scientifici e Philologici, t. xiii.

[f] See Boulay, Hist. Acad. Paris. tom. iii.

[g] Ger. à Maestricht, Historia juris Ecclesiastici, sect. 353.—Jo. Chifflet, de Juris utriusque Architectis, cap. vi.—Echard et Quetif, Scriptor. Dominican. t. i.—Acta Sanctor. Antwerp. t. i. Januarii ad d. vii.

[h] See the remarkable letter of pope Gregory IX. to the archbishop of Bourges, which was written in 1227, with a design to reprove and reform the vices which had infected all the various orders of the clergy, and which is published by Dion. Sammarthanus, in his Gallia Christiana, tom. ii. in Append.—See also Du Fresne, Annotat. in Vitam Ludovici Sti.

tinguished models of piety and virtue. Such members of the sacerdotal order as were advanced to places of authority in the church, behaved rather like tyrants than rulers, and showed manifestly, in all their conduct, that they aimed at an absolute and unlimited dominion. The popes, more especially, inculcated this pernicious maxim, "That the bishop of Rome is the supreme lord of the universe, and that neither princes nor bishops, civil governors nor ecclesiastical rulers, have any lawful power in church or state, but what they derive from him." This extravagant maxim, which was considered as the sum and substance of papal jurisprudence, the pontiffs obstinately maintained, and left no means unemployed, that perfidy or violence could suggest, to give it the force of an universal law. It was in consequence of this arrogant pretension, that they not only claimed the right of disposing of ecclesiastical *benefices*, as they are commonly called, but also of conferring civil dominion, and of dethroning kings and emperors, according to their good pleasure. It is true, this maxim was far from being universally adopted; many placed the authority of councils above that of the pontiffs, and such of the European kings and princes as were not ingloriously blinded and enslaved by the superstition of the times, asserted their rights with dignity and success, excluded the pontiffs from all concern in their civil transactions, and even reserved to themselves the supremacy over the churches that were established in their dominions.[a] In thus opposing the haughty pretensions of the lordly pontiffs, it was, indeed, necessary to proceed with mildness, caution, and prudence, on account of the influence which those spiritual tyrants had usurped over the minds of the people, and the power they had of alarming princes, by exciting their subjects to rebellion.

III. In order to establish their authority, both in civil and ecclesiastical matters, upon the firmest foundations, the Roman pontiffs assumed to themselves the power of disposing of the various offices of the church, whether of a higher or more subordinate nature, and of creating bishops, abbots, and canons, according to their fancy. Thus we see the heads of the church, who formerly disputed with such ardour against the emperors in favour of the free election of bishops and abbots, overturning now all the laws that related to the election of these spiritual rulers, reserving for themselves the revenues of the richest benefices, conferring vacant places upon their clients and their creatures, and often deposing bishops who had been duly and lawfully elected, and substituting others for them with a high hand.[b] The hypocritical pretexts for all these arbitrary proceedings were an ardent zeal for the welfare of the church, and an anxious concern, lest devouring *heretics* should get a footing among the flock of Christ.[c] The first pontiff who usurped such an extravagant extent of authority, was Innocent III., whose example was followed by Honorius III., Gregory IX., and several of their successors. But it was keenly opposed by the bishops, who had hitherto enjoyed the privilege of nominating to the smaller benefices, and still more effectually by the kings of England and France, who employed the force of warm remonstrances and vigorous edicts to stop the progress of this new jurisprudence.[d] Louis IX. king of France, now the tutelar saint of that nation, distinguished himself by his noble opposition to these papal encroachments. In 1268, before he set out for the Holy Land, he secured the rights of the Gallican church against the insidious attempts of the popes, by that famous edict, known in France by the name of the *pragmatic sanction*.[e] This resolute and prudent measure rendered the pontiffs more cautious and slow in their proceedings, but did not deter them from the prosecution of their purpose. For Boniface VIII. maintained, in the most express and impudent terms, that the universal church was under the dominion of the pontiffs, and that princes and lay patrons, councils and chapters, had no more power in spiritual things, than what they derived from Christ's vicar upon earth.

IV. The legates, whom the pontiffs sent into the provinces, to represent their persons, and execute their orders, imitated perfectly the avarice and insolence of their masters. They violated the privileges of the chapters; disposed of the smaller, and sometimes of the more important ecclesiastical benefices, in favour of such as had gained them by bribes, or the like considerations;[f] extorted money from the people, by the vilest and most iniquitous means; seduced the unwary by forged letters and other stratagems of that nature; excited tumults among the multitude, and were, themselves, the ringleaders of the most furious and rebellious factions; carried on, in the most scandalous manner, the impious traffic of relics and indulgences, and distinguished themselves by several acts of profligacy still more heinous than the practices now mentioned. Hence we find the writers of this age complaining unanimously of the flagitious conduct and the enormous crimes of the pope's legates.[g] We even see pope Alexander IV. enacting, in 1256, a severe law against the avarice and frauds of these corrupt ministers,[h] which, however, they easily evaded, by their friends and their credit at the court of Rome.

V. From the ninth century to this period, the wealth and revenues of the pontiffs had not received any considerable augmentation; but at this time they were vastly increased under Innocent III., and Nicolas III., partly by the events of war, and partly by the munificence of kings and emperors. Innocent, as soon as he was seated in the papal chair, reduced under his jurisdiction the præfect of Rome, who had hitherto been considered as subject to the emperor, to whom he had taken an oath of allegiance in entering upon his office. He also seized the territories of Ancona, Spoleto, and Assisi, the town of Montebello, and various cities and fortresses which had, according to him, been unjustly alienated from the patrimony of St. Peter.[i] On the other hand, Frederic II.,

[a] As a specimen of this, the reader may peruse the letters of Innocent III. and the emperor Otho IV., which have been collected by the learned George Christ. Gebauer, in his history of the emperor Richard, written in German. Other princes, and more especially the kings of England and France, displayed, in the defence of their rights and privileges, the same zeal that animated Otho.

[b] Many examples of this may be taken from the history of this century. See Steph. Baluzii Miscellan. tom. vii.—Gallia Christiana tom. i. Append.—Wadding, Annal. Minor. in Diplomat.—Wood, Antiquit. Oxon. tom. i.

[c] See the Epistle of Innocent IV. in Baluz. Miscellan. tom. vii

[d] Boulay, Histor. Acad. Paris. tom. iii. iv.

[e] Boulay, tom. iii.

[f] See Baluzii Miscellanea, tom. vii.

[g] See that judicious and excellent writer Matth. Paris, in his Historia Major, p. 313, 316, 549, and particularly p. 637, where we find the following remarkable words: "Semper solent legati, et omnes nuncii papales, regna quæ ingrediuntur depauperare, vel aliquo modo perturbare." See also Boulay, Hist. Acad. Paris. tom. iii. p. 659.

[h] This edict is published by Lami, in his Deliciæ Eruditorum, tom. ii. page 300.

[i] See Franc. Pagi, Breviar. Romanor. Pontif. tom. iii. p. 161.—Muratori, Antiq. Ital. tom. i. p. 328.

who was extremely desirous that the pope should espouse his quarrel with Otho IV., loaded the Roman see with the richest marks of his munificence and liberality, and not only made a noble present in valuable lands to the pope's brother,[a] but also permitted Richard, count of Fundi, to bequeath all his possessions to the Roman see,[b] and confirmed the immense donation that had formerly been made to it by the opulent Matilda. Such was the progress that Innocent III. made, during his pontificate, in augmenting the splendour and wealth of the church. Nicolas III. followed his example with the warmest emulation, and, in 1278, gave a remarkable proof of his arrogance and obstinacy, in refusing to crown the emperor Rodolphus I. before he had acknowledged and confirmed, by a solemn treaty, all the pretensions of the Roman see, of which, if some were plausible, many were altogether groundless, or, at least, extremely dubious. This agreement, to which all the Italian princes subject to the emperor were obliged to accede, was no sooner concluded, than Nicolas reduced under his temporal dominion several territories in Italy, that had formerly been annexed to the imperial crown, particularly Romania and Bologna. It was therefore under these two pontiffs that the see of Rome arrived, partly by force, and partly by artifice, at that high degree of grandeur and opulence, which it yet maintains in our times.[c]

VI. Innocent III., who remained at the head of the church until the year 1216, followed the steps of Gregory VII., and not only usurped the despotic government of the church, but also claimed the empire of the world, and entertained the extravagant idea of subjecting all the kings and princes of the earth to his lordly sceptre. He was a man of learning and application; but his cruelty, avarice, and arrogance,[d] clouded the lustre of any good qualities which his panegyrists have thought proper to attribute to him. In Asia and Europe, he disposed of crowns and sceptres with the most wanton ambition. In Asia, he gave a king to the Armenians: in Europe, he usurped the same exorbitant privilege in 1204, and conferred the regal dignity upon Primislaus, duke of Bohemia.[e] The same year, he sent to Johannicius, duke of Bulgaria and Wallachia an extraordinary legate, who, in the name of the pontiff, invested that prince with the ensigns and honours of royalty, while, with his own hand, he crowned Peter II., of Arragon, who had rendered his dominions subject and tributary to the church, and saluted him publicly at Rome, with the title of king.[f] We omit many other examples of this phrenetic pretension to universal empire, which might be produced from the letters of this arrogant pontiff, and many other acts of despotism, which Europe beheld with astonishment, but also, to its eternal reproach, with the ignominious silence of a passive obedience.

VII. The ambition of this pope was not satisfied with the distribution and government of these petty kingdoms. He extended his views farther, and resolved to render the power and majesty of the Roman see formidable to the greatest European kings, and even to the haughty emperors themselves. When the empire of Germany was disputed, about the commencement of this century, between Philip, duke of Suabia, and Otho IV. third son of Henry the Lion, he espoused at first the cause of Otho, thundered out his excommunications against Philip, and on the death of the latter (which happened in 1209,) placed the imperial diadem upon the head of his adversary. But, as Otho was by no means disposed to submit to this pontiff's nod, or to satisfy to the full his ambitious desires, he incurred his lordly indignation; and Innocent, declaring him, by a solemn excommunication, unworthy of the empire, raised in his place Frederic II. his pupil, the son of Henry VI. and king of the two Sicilies, to the imperial throne, in 1212.[g] The same pontiff excommunicated Philip Augustus, king of France, for having dissolved his marriage with Ingelburga a princess of Denmark, and espoused another in her place; nor did he cease to pursue this monarch with his anathemas, until he engaged him to receive the divorced queen, and to restore her to her lost dignity.[h]

VIII. But of all the European princes, none felt, in so dishonourable and severe a manner, the despotic fury of this insolent pontiff, as John, surnamed *Sans-Terre*, or *Lackland*, king of England. This prince vigorously opposed the measures of Innocent, who had ordered the monks of Canterbury to choose Stephen Langton (a Roman cardinal of English descent) archbishop of that see, notwithstanding the election of John de Grey to that high dignity, which had been regularly made by the convent, and had been confirmed by royal authority.[i] The pope after having consecrated Langton at Viterbo, wrote a soothing letter in his favour to the king, accompanied with four rings, and a mystical comment upon the precious stones with which they were enriched. But this present was not sufficient to avert the just indignation of the offended monarch, and he sent troops to drive out of the kingdom the monks of Canterbury, who had been engaged by the pope's menaces to receive Langton as their archbishop. He also declared to the pontiff, that, if he persisted in imposing a prelate upon the see of Canterbury, in opposition to a regular election already made, the consequences of such presumptuous obstinacy would, in the issue, prove fatal to the papal authority in England. Innocent was so far from being terrified by this menacing remonstrance, that, in 1208, he sent orders to the bishops of London, Worcester, and Ely, to lay the kingdom under an interdict, in case of the monarch's refusal to yield, and to receive Langton. John, alarmed at this terrible menace, and unwilling to break entirely with the pope, declared his readiness to confirm the elec-

[a] This brother of the pontiff was called Richard. See, for an account of this transaction, Muratori's fifth volume, p. 652.

[b] Odor. Raynaldus, Continuat. Annal. Baronii, ad annum 1212.

[c] Raynaldus ad annum 1278. The papal grandeur and opulence, however, were seriously impaired by the fury of the French revolution, and, although the success of the allied powers replaced the pontiff on his throne, his power is now at a low ebb.—EDIT.

[d] See Matth. Paris. Hist. Maj.

☞ [e] Other historians affirm, that the emperor Philip was the potentate who conferred the royal dignity upon Primislaus, in order to strengthen his party against Otho.

[f] Murat. Ant. Ital. medii Ævi, t. vi. J. de Ferreras, Hist. d'Espagne, t. iv.

[g] All this is amply illustrated in the Orig. Guelphicæ, tom. iii. lib. vii.

[h] Boulay, Histor. Acad. Paris. tom. iii.—Daniel, Histoire de la France, tom. iii.—Gerard du Bois, Histor. Eccles. Paris. tom. ii.

☞ [i] Dr. Mosheim passes lightly over this rupture between king John and Innocent III. mentioning in a few lines the interdict under which England was laid by that pontiff, the excommunication of the king's person, and the impious act by which the English were declared to be absolved from their allegiance. The translator, however, thought this event of too great importance to be treated with such brevity, and has therefore, taken the liberty to enlarge considerably this eighth section, which contains only twelve lines in the original.

tion made at Rome; but in the act that was drawn up for this purpose, he wisely inserted a clause to prevent any interpretation of this compliance, that might be prejudicial to his rights, dignity, and prerogative. This exception was rejected, and the interdict was proclaimed. A stop was immediately put to divine service; the churches were shut in every parish; all the sacraments were suspended except that of baptism; the dead were buried in the highways without the usual rites or any funeral solemnity. But, notwithstanding this interdict, the Cistertian order continued to perform divine service; and several learned and respectable divines, among whom were the bishops of Winchester and Norwich, protested against the injustice of the pope's proceedings.

The interdict not producing the effects that were expected from it, the pontiff proceeded to a still farther degree of severity and presumption, and denounced a sentence of excommunication against the person of the English monarch. This sentence, which was issued in 1209, was followed about two years after by a bull, absolving all his subjects from their oath of allegiance, and ordering all persons to avoid him, on pain of excommunication. But it was in 1212, that Innocent carried his impious tyranny to the most enormous length, when, assembling a council of cardinals and prelates, he deposed John, declared the throne of England vacant, and authorized Philip Augustus, king of France, to execute this sentence, undertake the conquest of England, and unite that kingdom to his dominions for ever. He, at the same time, published another bull, exhorting all Christian princes to contribute whatever was in their power to the success of this expedition, and promising, to such as would assist Philip in this grand enterprise, the same indulgences that were granted to those who carried arms against the infidels in Palestine. The French monarch entered into the views of the pontiff, and made immense preparations for the invasion of England. John, on the other hand, assembled his forces, and was putting himself in a posture of defence, when Pandulf, the pope's legate, arrived at Dover, and proposed a conference in order to prevent the approaching rupture, and to avert the storm. This artful legate terrified the king, who met him at that town, with an exaggerated account of the armament of Philip on the one hand, and of the disaffection of the English on the other; and persuaded him that there was no possible way left of saving his dominions from the formidable arms of the French king, but that of putting them under the protection of the Roman see. John, finding himself in such a perplexing situation, and full of diffidence both in the nobles of his court and in the officers of his army, complied with this dishonourable proposal, did homage to Innocent, resigned his crown to the legate, and then received it as a present from the see of Rome, to which he rendered his kingdoms tributary, and swore fealty as a vassal and feudatory.[a] In the act by which he resigned, thus scandalously, his kingdoms to the papal jurisdiction, he declared that he had neither been compelled to this measure by fear nor by force; but that it was his own voluntary deed, performed by the advice, and with the consent, of the barons of his kingdom. He obliged himself and his heirs to pay an annual sum of seven hundred marks for England, and three hundred for Ireland, in acknowledgment of the pope's supremacy and jurisdiction; and consented that he or such of his successors as should refuse to pay the submission now stipulated, to the see of Rome, should forfeit all right to the British crown.[b] "This shameful ceremony was performed (says a modern historian[c]) on Ascension-day, in the house of the Templars at Dover, in the midst of a great concourse of people, who beheld it with confusion and indignation. John, in doing homage to the pope, presented a sum of money to his representative, which the proud legate trampled under his feet, as a mark of the king's dependance. Every spectator glowed with resentment, and the archbishop of Dublin exclaimed aloud against such intolerable insolence. Pandulf, not satisfied with this mortifying act of superiority, kept the crown and sceptre five whole days, and then restored them as a special favour of the Roman see. John was despised before this extraordinary resignation; but now he was looked upon as a contemptible wretch, unworthy to sit upon a throne, while he himself seemed altogether insensible of his disgrace."

IX. Innocent III. was succeeded in the pontificate by Cencio Savelli, who, assuming the title of Honorius III., ruled the church above ten years, and whose government, though not signalized by such audacious exploits as those of his predecessor, disclosed an ardent zeal for maintaining the pretensions, and supporting the despotism, of the Roman see. It was in consequence of this zeal that the new pontiff opposed the measures, and drew upon himself the indignation of Frederic II. that magnanimous prince, on whose head he himself had placed, in 1220, the imperial crown. This spirited prince, following the steps of his illustrious grandfather, had formed the resolution of confirming the authority, and extending the jurisdiction of the emperors in Italy, of depressing the small states of Lombardy, and reducing to narrower limits the immense credit and opulence of the pontiffs and bishops; and it was with a view to the execution of these grand projects, that he deferred the execution of the solemn vow, by which he had engaged himself to lead a formidable army against the infidels of Palestine. The pontiff, on the other hand, urged with importunity the emperor's departure; encouraged, animated, and strengthened, by secret succours, the Italian states that opposed his pretensions; and resisted the progress of his power by all the obstacles which the most fertile invention could suggest. These contests, however, had not yet brought on an open rupture.

X. In 1227, Hugolin, bishop of Ostia, whose advanced age had not extinguished the fire of his ambition, or diminished the firmness and obstinacy of his spirit, was raised to the pontificate, assumed the title of Gregory IX., and kindled the feuds and dissensions, that had already secretly subsisted between the church and the empire, into an open and violent flame. No sooner was he placed in the papal chair, than, in defiance of justice and order he excommunicated the emperor for delaying his expedition against the Saracens to another year, though the

[a] For a full account of this shameful ceremony, see Matthew Paris, Historia Major; Boulay's Hist. Acad. Paris, tom. iii. and Rapin's Histoire d'Angleterre, tom. ii.

[b] *Cadet a jure regni*, is the expression used in the charter of resignation, which may be seen at length in the Historia Major of Matthew Paris.

[c] Dr. Smollet.

postponement manifestly arose from a fit of sickness, which seized that prince when he was ready to embark for Palestine. In 1228, Frederic at last set out, and arrived in the Holy Land; but, instead of carrying on the war with vigour, as we have already had occasion to observe, he entered into a truce with Saladin, and contented himself with the recovery of Jerusalem. The pretended vicar of Christ, forgetting (or rather unwilling to persuade himself) that his master's "kingdom was not of this world," made war upon the emperor in Apulia during his absence,[a] and used his utmost efforts to arm against him all the European powers. Frederic, having received information of these perfidious and violent proceedings, returned into Europe, in 1229, defeated the papal army, retook the places he had lost in Sicily and in Italy, and, in the succeeding year, made his peace with the pontiff, from whom he received a public and solemn absolution. This peace, however, was not of long duration; for the emperor could not tamely bear the insolent proceedings and the imperious temper of Gregory. He therefore broke all measures with that headstrong pontiff, distressed the states of Lombardy that were in alliance with the see of Rome, seized the island of Sardinia, (which Gregory regarded as a part of his spiritual patrimony,) and erected it into a kingdom for his son Entius. These, with other steps that were equally provoking to the pope's avarice and ambition, drew the thunder of the Vatican anew upon the emperor's head. Frederic was publicly excommunicated in 1239, with all the circumstances of severity that vindictive rage could invent, and was charged with the most flagitious crimes, and the most impious blasphemies, by the exasperated pontiff, who sent a copy of this terrible accusation to all the courts of Europe. The emperor, on the other hand, defended his injured reputation by solemn declarations in writing, while, by his victorious arms, he avenged himself of his adversaries, maintained his ground, and reduced the pontiff to the greatest difficulties. To extricate himself from these perplexities, the latter convened, in 1240, a general council at Rome, with a view of deposing Frederic by the unanimous suffrages of the cardinals and prelates who were to compose that assembly. But the emperor disconcerted that audacious project by defeating, in 1241, a Genoese fleet, on board of which the greatest part of these prelates were embarked, and by seizing, with all their treasures, the reverend fathers, who were all committed to close confinement. This disappointment, attended with others which gave an unhappy turn to his affairs, and blasted his most promising expectations, dejected and consumed the despairing pontiff, and apparently contributed to the conclusion of his days, which happened soon after this remarkable event.[b]

XI. Geoffry, bishop of Milan, who succeeded Gregory IX., under the title of Celestine IV., died before his consecration, and after a vacancy of twenty months, the apostolic chair was filled by Sinibald, one of the counts of Fieschi, who was raised to the pontificate in 1243, assumed the denomination of Innocent IV., and yielded to none of his predecessors in arrogance and fury.[c] His elevation, however, offered at first a prospect of peace, as he had formerly been attached to the interests of the emperor; and accordingly the conferences were opened, and a reconciliation was proposed; but the terms offered by the new pope were too imperious and extravagant, not to be rejected with indignation.[d] Hence it was that Innocent, not thinking himself safe in any part of Italy, set out from Genoa, the place of his birth, for Lyons, in 1244, and assembling there a council in the following year, deposed Frederic, in presence of its members, though not with their approbation, and declared the imperial throne vacant.[e] This unjust and insolent decree was regarded with such veneration, and looked upon as so weighty by the German princes, seduced and blinded by the superstition of the times, that they proceeded instantly to a new election, and raised first, Henry, landgrave of Thuringia, and, after his death, William, count of Holland, to the head of the empire. Frederic, whose firm and heroic spirit supported without dejection these cruel vicissitudes, continued to carry on the war in Italy, until a violent dysentery put an end to his life, on the 13th of December, 1250. On the death of his formidable and magnanimous adversary, Innocent returned into Italy,[f] hoping now to enjoy with security the fruits of his ambition. It was principally from this period, that the two famous factions, called *Guelphs* and *Guibellines*, of which the latter espoused the cause of the emperors, and the former that of the pontiffs, involved all the Italian states in the most calamitous dissensions, though their origin is much earlier than this century.[g]

XII. Raynald, count of Segni and bishop of Ostia, was raised to the pontificate after the death of Innocent, in the year 1254, and is distinguished in the list of the popes by the name of Alexander IV. During the six years and five months that he governed the see of Rome, his time was less employed in civil affairs, than in regulating the internal state of the church, if we except the measures he took for the destruction of Conradin, grandson of Frederic II. and for composing the tumults that had so long prevailed in Italy. The mendicant friars, in particular, and among them the Dominicans and Franciscans, were much favoured by this pontiff, and received several marks of his peculiar bounty.

He was succeeded in the Roman see, A. D. 1261, by Urban IV. a native of Troyes, of obscure birth, who, before his elevation to the pontificate, was patriarch of Jerusalem, and after that period was more distinguished by his institution of the Festival of the Body of Christ, than by any other circumstance in the course of his reign.

☞ [a] Under the feeble reign of Henry III. the pope drew immense sums out of England for the support of this impious war, and carried his audacious avarice so far, as to demand a fifth part of the ecclesiastical revenues of the whole kingdom.

[b] Beside the original and authentic writers collected by Muratori, in his Scriptores rerum Italicarum, and the German and Italian historians, few or none of whom are absolutely free from partiality in their accounts of these unhappy contests between the empire and the papacy, see Petrus de Vineis, Epistol. lib. i. and Matthew Paris, in his Historia Major. Add to these Raynaldi Annal.—Muratori, Annal. Italiæ, tom. vii. et Antiquit. Italic. medii Ævi, tom. iv. p. 325, 517. It must, however, be observed, that this branch of history stands yet in need of farther illustration.

[c] See the Hist. Maj. of Matthew Paris, ad annum 1254.

☞ [d] These preliminary conditions were, 1st, That the emperor should give up entirely to the church the inheritance which was left to it by Matilda; and, 2dly, That he would oblige himself to submit to whatever terms the pope should think fit to propose, as conditions of peace.

[e] This assembly is placed in the list of *œcumenical* or general councils; but it is not acknowledged as such by the Gallican church.

[f] Beside the writers already mentioned, see Nicol. de Curbio, Vit. Innocentii IV. in Baluzii Miscellan. tom. vii.

[g] See Murat. Diss. de Guelph. et Guibel. in his Ant. Ital. med. Æv. t. iv.

He had, indeed, formed several important projects; but their execution was prevented by his death, which happened in 1264, after a short reign of three years. His successor, Guy Fulcodi, or Clement IV. a native of France, and bishop of Sabino, who was raised to the see of Rome in 1265, did not enjoy much longer that high dignity. His name, however, makes a greater figure in history, and was rendered famous in many respects, and more especially by his conferring of the kingdom of Naples upon Charles of Anjou, brother to Louis IX. king of France. The consequences of this donation, and the melancholy fate of Conradin, the last descendant of Frederic II., (who, after an unfortunate battle fought against Charles, was publicly beheaded by the barbarous victor, if not by the counsel, yet certainly with the consent, of the Roman pontiff,) are well known to such as have the smallest acquaintance with the history of these unhappy times.

XIII. Upon the death of Clement IV.,[a] there arose warm and vehement contests among the cardinals concerning the election of a new pontiff. These debates, which kept the Roman see vacant during the space of almost three years, were at length terminated in favour of Theobald, a native of Placentia, and archbishop of Liege, who was raised to the pontificate in 1271, and assumed the title of Gregory X.[b] This devout ecclesiastic was in the Holy Land when he received the news of his election; and, as he had been an eye-witness of the miserable condition of the Christians in that country, he had nothing so much at heart, as the desire of contributing to their relief. Hence it was, that, immediately after his consecration, he summoned a council at Lyons, in 1274, in which the relief and maintenance of the Christians in Palestine, and the re-union of the Greek and Latin churches, were the two points that were to come principally under deliberation. This assembly is acknowledged as the fourteenth general council, and is rendered particularly remarkable by the new regulations that were introduced into the manner of electing the Roman pontiff, and more especially by the famous law, which is still in force, and by which it was enacted, that the cardinal electors should be shut up in the conclave during the vacancy of the pontificate. With respect to the character and sentiments of the new pope we shall only observe, that, though he seemed to be actuated by a milder spirit than many of his predecessors, he inculcated, without the least hesitation, the odious maxim of Gregory VII., which declared the bishop of Rome lord of the world, and, in a more particular manner, of the Roman empire. It was in consequence of this presumptuous system, that, in 1271, he wrote an imperious and threatening letter to the German princes; in which, deaf to the pretensions and remonstrances of Alphonso, king of Castile,[c] he ordered them to elect an emperor without delay, assuring them, that, if they did not do it immediately, he would do it for them. This letter produced the intended effect; an electoral diet was assembled at Franckfort, and Rodolphus, count of Hapsburg, was raised to the imperial throne.

XIV. Gregory X. was succeeded, in 1276, by Peter of Tarentaise, of the Dominican order, and bishop of Ostia, who assumed the name of Innocent V., and died about four months after his election. Ottoboni, a native of Genoa, and cardinal of St. Adrian, was chosen in his place, took the title of Adrian V.,[d] and, after having ruled the church during five weeks, was succeeded by Peter Julian, bishop of Tusculum, who enjoyed that high dignity about eight months, and is distinguished in the papal list by the name of John XXI.[e] The see of Rome continued vacant for about six months after the death of the last-mentioned pontiff, but was at length filled, in November, 1277, by John Caietan, of the family of Ursini, cardinal of St. Nicolas, whose name he adopted for his papal title. This famous pontiff (as has been already observed) augmented greatly both the opulence and authority of the bishops of Rome, and had formed vast projects, which his undaunted courage and his remarkable activity would have enabled him, in all probability, to execute with success, had not death blasted his hopes, and disconcerted his ambitious schemes.

XV. He was succeeded, in 1281, about six months after his departure from this life, by Simon de Brie, who adopted the name of Martin IV., and was not inferior to Nicolas III. in ambition, arrogance, and constancy of mind, of which he gave several proofs during his pontificate. Michael Palæologus, the Grecian emperor, was one of the first princes whom this audacious priest solemnly excommunicated; and the pretext was, that he had broken the peace concluded between the Greek and Latin Churches, at the council of Lyons.[f] The same insult was committed against Peter, king of Arragon, whom Martin not only excluded from the bosom of the church, but also deposed from his throne, on account of his attempt upon Sicily, and made a grant of his kingdom, fiefs, and possessions, to Charles, son of Philip the Bold,[g] king of France. It was during the execution of such daring enterprises as these, and while he was meditating still greater things for the glory of the Roman hierarchy, that a sudden death, in 1285, obliged him to leave his schemes unfinished. They were, however, prosecuted with great spirit by his successor, James Savelli, who chose the denomination of Honorius IV., but was also stopped short in the midst of his career, in 1287, having ruled the church only two years. Jerome d'Ascoli, bishop of Palestrina, who was raised to the pontificate in 1288, and is known by the denomination of Nicolas IV., distinguished himself, during the four years that he remained at the head of the church, by his assiduous application both to ecclesiastical and political affairs. Sometimes we see the disputes of sovereign powers left to his arbitration, and terminated by his decision; at other times, we find him maintaining the pretensions and privileges of the church with the most resolute zeal and

[a] Which happened in November, 1268.

[b] For records of this election, see Wadding, Annal. Minor. t. iv. p. 330.

☞ [c] Alphonso, king of Castile, had been elected emperor in 1256, by the archbishop of Treves, the duke of Saxony, the margrave of Brandenburg, and the king of Bohemia, in opposition to Richard, earl of Cornwall, who was at the same time raised to the same dignity by the archbishops of Mentz and Cologne, the count Palatine of the Rhine, and the duke of Bavaria.

☞ [d] We read, in the Latin, Adrian VI., which is more probably an error of the press, than a fault of the author.

☞ [e] In the original, Dr. Mosheim observes, that these three successors of Gregory were elected and carried off by death in 1276; but here he has fallen into a slight mistake; for John XXI. died on the 16th of May, 1277.

[f] This council had been holden under the pontificate of Gregory X.

[g] Philippe le Hardi, as he is called by the French.

the most obstinate perseverance; and occasionally we see him employing, with the utmost assiduity, every probable method of propagating the Gospel among the Tartars and other eastern nations. But the object, which, of all others, occupied most the thoughts of this vigilant and zealous pontiff, was the desperate state of the Christians in Palestine, who were now reduced to an extremity of misery and weakness. His laborious efforts were therefore employed for the restoration of their former grandeur; they were however employed in vain; and his death, which happened in 1292, disconcerted all the projects he had formed for that purpose.

XVI. The death of this pontiff was followed by a vacancy of two years in the see of Rome, in consequence of the disputes which arose among the cardinals about the election of a new pope. These disputes were at length terminated, and the contending parties united their suffrages in favour of Peter, surnamed De Murrone, from a mountain where he had hitherto lived in the deepest solitude, and with the utmost austerity. This venerable old man, who was in high renown on account of the remarkable sanctity of his life and conversation, was raised to the pontificate, in 1294, and assumed the name of Celestine V. But the austerity of his manners, being a tacit reproach upon the corruption of the Roman court, and more especially upon the luxury of the cardinals, rendered him extremely disagreeable to a degenerate and licentious clergy; and this dislike was so heightened by the whole course of his administration, (which showed that he had more at heart the reformation and purity of the church, than the increase of its opulence and the propagation of its authority,) that he was almost universally considered as unworthy of the pontificate. Hence it was, that several of the cardinals, and particularly Benedict Caietan, advised him to abdicate the papacy, which he had accepted with such reluctance; and they had the pleasure of seeing their advice followed with the utmost docility. The good man resigned his dignity in the fourth month after his election, and died in 1296, in the castle of Fumone, where his tyrannic and suspicious successor kept him in captivity, that he might not be engaged, by the solicitations of his friends, to attempt the recovery of his abdicated honours. His memory was precious to the virtuous part of the church, and he was elevated to the rank of a saint by Clement V. It was from him that the branch of the Benedictine order, called Celestines, yet subsisting in France and Italy, derived its origin.[a]

XVII. Benedict Caietan, who had persuaded the good pontiff now mentioned to resign his place, succeeded him in it, in 1294, with the name of Boniface VIII. We may say, with truth, of this unworthy prelate, that he was born to be a plague both to church and state, a disturber of the repose of nations, and that his attempts to extend and confirm the despotism of the Roman pontiffs, were carried to a length that approached to phrensy. As soon as he entered upon his new dignity, he claimed a supreme and irresistible dominion over all the powers of the earth, both spiritual and temporal, terrified kingdoms and empires with the thunder of his bulls, called princes and sovereign states before his tribunal to decide their quarrels, augmented the papal jurisprudence with a new body of laws, entitled the Sixth Book of the Decretals, declared war against the illustrious family of Colonna, who disputed his title to the pontificate;[b] in a word, exhibited to the church, and to Europe, a lively image of the tyrannical administration of Gregory VII., whom he perhaps surpassed in arrogance.[c] This was the pontiff who, in 1300, instituted the famous jubilee, which, since that time, has been regularly celebrated in the Roman church at fixed periods. But the consideration of this institution, which was so favourable to the progress of licentiousness and corruption, as also the other exploits of Boniface, and his deplorable end, belong to the history of the following century.[d]

XVIII. In the Lateran council that was holden in 1215, a decree had passed, by the advice of Innocent III., to prevent the introduction of new religions, by which were meant new monastic institutions. This decree, however, seemed to be very little respected, either by that pontiff or his successors, since several religious orders, hitherto unknown in the Christian world, were not only tolerated, but were distinguished by peculiar marks of approbation and favour, and enriched with various privileges and prerogatives. Nor will this tacit abrogation of the decree of Innocent appear at all surprising to such as consider the state of the church in this century; for, not to mention many enormities that contributed to the suspension of this decree, we shall only observe, that the enemies of Christianity, and the heretical sects, increased daily every where; and, on the other hand, the secular clergy were more attentive to their worldly advantages than to the interests of the church, and spent in mirth and jollity the opulence with which the piety of their ancestors had enriched that sacred body. The monastic orders also had almost all degenerated from their primitive sanctity, and, exhibiting the most offensive examples of licentiousness and vice to public view, rendered by their flagitious lives the cause of heresy triumphant, instead of retarding its progress. All these things being considered, it was thought necessary to encourage the establishment of new monastic societies, who, by the sanctity of their manners, might attract the esteem and veneration of the people, and diminish the indignation which the tyranny and ambition of the pontiffs had so generally excited; and who, by their diligence and address, their discourses and their arguments, their power and arms, when these violent means were required, might discover, persecute, convert and vanquish, the growing tribe of heretics.

XIX. Of the religious societies that arose in this century, some are now entirely suppressed, while others continue to flourish, and are in high repute. Among the former we may reckon the *Humiliati*, (a title expressive of great humility and self-abasement,) whose origin may be traced to a much earlier period than the present century, though their order was confirmed and new-modelled by Innocent III., who subjected it to the rule of St. Benedict. These humble monks became so shockingly licen-

[a] Helyot, Histoire des Ordres, tom. vi. p. 180.

[b] The reasons which they allege for disputing the title of Boniface to the pontificate were, that the resignation of Celestine was not canonical, and that it was brought about by fraudulent means.

[c] There is a history of this pontiff written by Jo. Rubeus, a Benedictine monk, whose work, which is entitled Bonifacius VIII. e Familiâ Caietanorum principum Romanus pontifex, was published at Rome in the year 1651.

[d] In this account of the popes, I have chiefly followed Daniel Papebroch, Francis Pagi, and Muratori, in his Annales Italiæ, consulting at the same time the original sources collected by the last mentioned author in his Rerum Italicarum Scriptores.

tious in process of time, that, in 1571, pope Pius V. was obliged to dissolve their society.[a] We may also place, in the list of suppressed fraternities, the *Jacobins*, who were erected into a religious order by Innocent III.,[b] and who, in this very century, not long after the council of Lyons, were deprived of their charter; and also the Valli-Scholares, or Scholars of the Valley, so called from their being instituted by the *scholares*, i. e. the four professors of divinity in the university of Paris, and from a deep vale in the province of Champagne, in which they assembled and fixed their residence in 1234.[c] This society, whose foundation was laid about the commencement of this century, was formerly governed by the rule of St. Augustin, but is now incorporated into the order of the Regular Canons of St. Genevieve. To the same class we may refer the order of the blessed Virgin Mary the mother of Christ, which had its commencement in 1266, and was suppressed in 1274;[d] the Knights of Faith and Charity, who undertook to disperse the bands of robbers that infested the public roads in France, and who were favoured with the peculiar protection and approbation of Gregory IX;[e] the Hermits of St. William, duke of Aquitaine;[f] not to mention the Brethren of the Sack, the Bethlehemites, and some orders of inferior note, that started up in this century, which, of all others, was the most remarkable for the number and variety of monastic establishments, that date their origin from it.[g]

XX. Among the convents that were founded in this century, and still subsist, the principal place is due to that of the Servites, i. e. the Servants of the blessed Virgin, whose order was first instituted, A. D. 1233, in Tuscany, by seven Florentine merchants, and afterwards made a great progress under the government of Philip Benizi, its chief. This order, though subjected to the rule of St. Augustin, was erected in commemoration of the most holy widowhood of the blessed Virgin; for which reason its monks wear a black habit,[h] and observe several rules unknown to other monasteries. The prodigious number of Christians, that were made prisoners by the Mohammedans in Palestine, gave rise, toward the conclusion of the 12th century, to the institution of the order named the Fraternity of the Trinity, which, in the following age, received a still greater degree of stability, under the pontificate of Honorius III. and also of Clement IV. The founders of this institution were John de Matha and Felix de Valois, two pious men who led an austere and solitary life at Cerfroy, in the diocese of Meaux. The monks of this society are called the Brethren of the Holy Trinity, because all their churches are solemnly dedicated to that profound mystery; they are also styled Mathurins, from having a monastery at Paris, erected in a place where is a chapel consecrated to St. Mathurin, and Brethren of the Redemption of Captives,[i] because the grand design of their institution was to find out means for restoring liberty to the Christian captives in the Holy Land, in which charitable work they were obliged to employ a third part of their revenue. Their manner of life was, at first, extremely abstemious and austere; but its austerity has been from time to time considerably mitigated by the indulgence and lenity of the pontiffs.[k]

XXI. The religious society that surpassed all the rest in purity of manners, extent of fame, number of privileges, and multitude of members, was that of the Mendicant or begging friars, whose order was first established in this century, and who, by the tenour of their institution, were to remain entirely destitute of all fixed revenues and possessions. The present state and circumstances of the church rendered the establishment of such an order absolutely necessary. The monastic orders, who wallowed in opulence, were, by the corrupting influence of their ample possessions, lulled in a luxurious indolence. They lost sight of all their religious obligations, trampled upon the authority of their superiors, suffered heresy to triumph unrestrained, and the sectaries to form various assemblies; in short, they were incapable of promoting the true interests of the church, and abandoned themselves, without either shame or remorse, to all sorts of crimes. On the other hand, the enemies of the church, the sects which had left its communion, followed certain austere rules of life and conduct, which formed a strong contrast between them and the religious orders, and contributed to render the licentiousness of the latter still more offensive and shocking to the people. These sects maintained, that voluntary poverty was the leading and essential quality in a servant of Christ; obliged their doctors to imitate the simplicity of the apostles; reproached the church with its overgrown opulence, and the vices and corruptions of the clergy, that flowed thence as from their natural source; and, by their commendation of poverty and contempt of riches, acquired a high degree of respect, and gained a prodigious ascendency over the minds of the multitude. All this rendered it absolutely necessary to introduce into the church a set of men, who, by the austerity of their manners, their contempt of riches, and the external gravity and sanctity of their conduct and maxims, might resemble those doctors who had gained such reputation to the heretical sects, and who might rise so far above the allurements of worldly profit and pleasure, as not to be seduced, by the promises or threats of kings and princes, from the performance of the duties which they owed to

[a] Helyot His. des Ord. t. vi. p. 152. [b] Mat. Paris. His. Maj. p. 161.
[c] Boulay, Hist. Acad. Paris. tom. iii. p. 15.—Acta Sanct. Mens. Februar. tom. ii. p. 482.
[d] Dion. Sammarthani Gallia Christiana, tom. i. p. 653.
[e] Gallia Christ. tom. i. Append. p. 165.—Martenne, Voyage Liter. de deux Benedictins, tom. ii.
[f] Jo. Bolandi de ordine Eremitar. S. Gulielmi Com. in actis SS. Februar. tom. ii. p. 472.
[g] Matth. Paris, Hist. Major, p. 815, edit. Watts, where, speaking of the prodigious number of convents, founded in England during this century, he expresseth himself thus: "Tot jam apparuerunt ordines in Anglia, ut ordinum confusio videretur inordinata."
[h] Beside the ordinary writers of monastic history, see Pauli Florentini Dialog. de Origine Ordinis Servorum, in Lamii Delic. Eruditorum, tom. i. pag. 1—48.
[i] Broughton and some other writers make a distinction between the Order of the Redemption of Captives, and the Fraternity of the Holy Trinity. They allege, that the latter order was instituted at Rome by St. Philip Neri, in 1548, about 350 years after the first establishment of the former; and that the monks who composed it, were obliged by their vow to take care of the pilgrims who resorted from all parts of the world to Rome, to visit the tombs of St. Peter and St. Paul.
[k] Beside Helyot and the other writers of monastic history, see Touissaint de Plessis, Hist de l'Eglise de Meaux, tom. i. p. 172, and 566. Boulay, Hist. Acad. Paris. tom. ii. p. 523. Ant. Wood, Antiq. Oxon. tom. i. p. 133. In the ancient records, this society is frequently styled the Order of Asses, on account of the prohibition of the use of horses, which made a part of their rule, and which obliged the mendicant monks to ride upon asses. See Car. du Fresne's Notes upon Joinville's Life of St. Louis, p. 81. But at present, through the indulgence of the Roman pontiffs, they are permitted to make use of horses when they find them necessary. An order of the same kind was instituted in Spain, in 1228, by Paul Nolasco, under the title of the Order of St. Mary, for the Redemption of Captives. See the Acta Sanctorum, Januar. tom. ii. p. 980.

the church, or from persevering in their subordination to the Roman pontiffs. Innocent III. was the first of the popes who perceived the necessity of instituting such an order; and accordingly he treated such monastic societies as made a profession of poverty, with the most distinguishing marks of his protection and favour. These associations were also encouraged and patronised by the succeeding pontiffs, when experience had demonstrated their public and extensive utility. But when it became generally known, that they had such a peculiar place in the esteem and protection of the rulers of the church, their number grew to such an enormous and unwieldy multitude, and swarmed so prodigiously in all the European provinces, that they became a burthen, not only to the people, but to the church itself.

XXII. The great inconvenience that arose from the excessive multiplication of the mendicant orders, was remedied by Gregory X., in 1272, in a general council which he assembled at Lyons; for here all the religious orders, that had sprung up after the council holden at Rome in 1215, under the pontificate of Innocent III., were suppressed, and the "extravagant multitude of mendicants," as Gregory called them, were reduced to a smaller number, and confined to the four following societies, or denominations, viz. the Dominicans, the Franciscans, the Carmelites, and the Hermits of St. Augustin.[a] The Carmelite order, which had been instituted in Palestine during the preceding century, was, in this, transplanted into Europe, and, in 1226, was favoured by pope Honorius III. with a place among the monastic societies, which enjoyed the protection and approbation of the church. The Hermits of St. Augustin had for their founder Alexander IV.,[b] who, observing that the hermits were divided into several societies, some of which followed the maxims of the famous William, others the rule of St. Augustin, while others again were distinguished by different denominations, formed the judicious project of uniting them all into one religious order, and subjecting them to the same rule of discipline, even that which bears the name of St. Augustin. This project was put in execution in the year 1256.

XXIII. As the pontiffs allowed to these four Mendicant orders the liberty of travelling wherever they thought proper, of conversing with persons of all ranks, of instructing the youth and the multitude wherever they went;—and as these monks exhibited, in their outward appearance and manner of life, more striking marks of gravity and holiness, than were observable in the other monastic societies,—they arose as it were at once to the very summit of fame, and were regarded with the utmost esteem and veneration in all the countries of Europe. The enthusiastic attachment to these sanctimonious beggars went so far, that, as we learn from the most authentic records, several cities were divided, or cantoned out, into four parts, with a view to these four orders; the first part was assigned to the Dominicans, the second to the Franciscans, the third to the Carmelites, and the fourth to the Augustinians. The people were unwilling to receive the sacraments from any other hands than those of the Mendicants, to whose churches they crowded to perform their devotions, while living, and were extremely desirous to deposit there also their remains after death; all which occasioned grievous complaints among the ordinary priests, who, being entrusted with the cure of souls, considered themselves as the spiritual guides of the multitude. Nor did the influence and credit of the Mendicants end here; for we find in the history of this and of the succeeding ages, that they were employed, not only in spiritual concerns, but also in temporal and political affairs of the greatest consequence, in composing the differences of princes, concluding treaties of peace, concerting alliances, presiding in cabinet-councils, governing courts, levying taxes, and in other occupations, not merely remote from, but absolutely inconsistent with, the monastic character and profession.

XXIV. We must not however imagine, that all the Mendicant friars attained the same degree of reputation and authority; for the power of the Dominicans and Franciscans surpassed greatly that of the other two orders, and rendered them remarkably conspicuous in the eyes of the world. During three centuries, these two fraternities governed, with an almost universal and absolute sway, both state and church, filled the highest posts ecclesiastical and civil, taught in the universities and churches with an authority before which all opposition was silent, and maintained the pretended majesty and prerogatives of the Roman pontiffs against kings, princes, bishops, and heretics, with incredible ardour and equal success. The Dominicans and Franciscans were, before the Reformation, what the Jesuits became after that happy and glorious event,—the very soul of the hierarchy, the engines of the state, the secret springs of all the motions of both, and the authors or directors of every great and important event both in the religious and political world. Dominic, a Spaniard by birth, a native of Calaroga, descendant of the illustrious house of Guzman, and regular canon of Osma, a man of a fiery and impetuous temper, and vehemently exasperated by the commotions and contests which the heretics of different denominations had excited in the church, set out for France with a few companions, in order to combat the sectaries who had multiplied in that kingdom. This enterprise he executed with the greatest vigour, and, we may add, fury, attacking the Albigenses and the other enemies of the church with the power of eloquence, the force of arms, the subtlety of controversial writings, and the terrors of the *inquisition*, which owed its form to this violent and sanguinary priest. Passing thence into Italy, he was honoured by the Roman pontiffs Innocent III. and Honorius III. with the most distinguished marks of their protection and favour; and, after many labours in the cause of the church, obtained from them the privilege of erecting a new fraternity, whose principal objects were the extirpation of error and the destruction of heretics. The first rule which he adopted for this society was that of the Canons of St. Augustin, to which he added several austere precepts and observances. But he afterwards changed the discipline of the canons for that of the monks; and, holding a chapter of the order at Bologna in 1220, he obliged the brethren

[a] Concil. Lugd. II. A. 1274. Can. xxiii. in Jo. Harduini Conciliis, tom. vii. p. 715. "Importuna petentium inhiatio Religionum (so were the religious orders entitled) multiplicationem extorsit, verum etiam aliquorum præsumptuosa temeritas diversorum ordinum, præcipue mendicantium . . effrænatam multitudinem adinvenit . . . Hinc ordines Mendicantes post dictum concilium (*i. e.* the Lateran council of 1215) adinventos . . . perpetuæ prohibitioni subjicimus."

[b] This edict of pope Alexander IV. is to be found in the Bullarium Romanum, tom. i. p. 110.—See also Acta Sanctor Mens. Feb. tom. iii. p. 472.

to take a vow of absolute poverty, and to abandon all their revenues and possessions. He did not live long enough to see the consequences of this reformation; for he died in the following year at Bologna.[a] His monks were, at first, distinguished by the denomination of *preaching friars*, because public instruction was the main end of their institution; but, in honour of him, they were afterwards called Dominicans.[b] [☞ Just before his death, Dominic sent Gilbert de Fresnoy with twelve of the brethren into England, where they founded their first monastery at Oxford, in 1221, and, soon after, another at London. In 1276, the mayor and aldermen of London gave them two whole streets near the river Thames, where they erected a very commodious convent, whence that place still bears the name of Black-Friars; for so the Dominicans were called in England.]

XXV. Francis, the founder of the celebrated order that bears his name, was the son of a merchant of Assisi, in the province of Umbria, and led, in his youth, a most debauched and dissolute life. Upon his recovery from a severe fit of sickness, which was the consequence and punishment of his licentious conduct, he changed his method of living, and, as extremes are natural to men of warm imaginations, fell into an extravagant kind of devotion, that looked less like religion than alienation of mind. Some time after this,[c] he happened to be in a church, where he heard that passage of the Scripture repeated, in which Christ addresses his apostles in the following manner: "Provide neither gold, nor silver, nor brass in your purses, nor scrip for your journey, neither two coats, neither shoes, nor yet staves; for the workman is worthy of his meat."[d] This produced a powerful effect upon his mind, made him consider a voluntary and absolute poverty as the essence of the Gospel and the soul of religion, and prescribe this poverty as a sacred rule both himself and to the few who followed him. Such was the commencement of the famous Franciscan order, whose chief was undoubtedly a pious and well-meaning man, though grossly ignorant, and manifestly weakened in his intellect by the disorder from which he had recently recovered. Nevertheless the new society, which appeared to Innocent III. extremely adapted to the present state of the church, and proper to restore its declining credit, was solemnly approved and confirmed by Honorius III., in 1223, and had already made a considerable progress when its devout founder, in 1226, was called from this life. Francis, through an excessive humility, would not suffer the monks of his order to be called *Fratres*, i. e. brethren or friars, but *Fraterculi*, i. e. little brethren or friars minors,[e] by which denomination they continue to be distinguished.[f] [☞ The Franciscans came into England in the reign of Henry III., and their first establishment was at Canterbury.]

XXVI. These two orders restored the church from that declining condition in which it had been languishing for many years, by the zeal and activity with which they set themselves to discover and extirpate heretics, to undertake various negotiations and embassies for the interest of the hierarchy, and to confirm the wavering multitude in an implicit obedience to the Roman pontiffs. These spiritual rulers, on the other hand, sensible of their obligations to the new monks, which, no doubt, were very great, not only engaged them in the most important affairs, and raised them to the most eminent stations in the church, but also accumulated upon them employments and privileges, which, if they enriched them on the one hand, could not fail to render them odious on the other,[g] and to excite the envy and complaints of other ecclesiastics. Such (among many other extraordinary prerogatives) was the permission they received from the pontiffs, of preaching to the multitude, hearing *confessions*, and pronouncing *absolution*, without any license from the bishops, and even without consulting them; to which we may add the treasure of ample and extensive *indulgences*, whose distribution was committed by the popes to the Franciscans, as a means of subsistence, and a rich indemnification for their voluntary poverty.[h] These acts of liberality and marks of protection, lavished upon the Dominican and Franciscan friars with such an ill-judged profusion, as they overturned the ancient discipline of the church, and were a manifest encroachment upon the rights of the first and second orders of the ecclesiastical rulers, produced the most unhappy and bitter dissensions between the Mendicant orders and the bishops. And these dissensions, extending their contagious influence beyond the limits of the church, excited in all the European provinces, and even in the city of Rome,[i] under the very eyes of the pontiffs, the most dreadful disturbances and tumults.

---

[a] See Jac. Echard and Quetif in Scriptoribus Ord. Dominic. tom. i. p. 84.—Acta Sanctor. April. tom. iii. p. 872.—Nicol. Jansenii Vita S. Dominici. Add to these the long list of writers mentioned by Fabricius, in his Bibliotheca Lat. med. Ævi, tom. ii. p. 137. and also Antonii Bremondi Bullarium Ordinis Dominicani.

[b] The Dominicans are called *Fratres Majores* in several of the ancient records: see Ant. Matthæi Analecta vet. Ævi, t. ii. p. 172. This appellation, however, by which the Dominicans were set in opposition to the Franciscans, who called themselves *Fratres Minores*, was rather a term of derision than a real name.—In France the Dominicans were called *Jacobins*, from the Rue de St. Jaques, where their first convent was erected at Paris.

[c] In 1208.

[d] Matthew x. 9, 10.

[e] They were called *Fratricelli* by the Italians, *Freres Mineurs* by the French, and *Fratres Minores* by the Latin writers.

[f] Bonaventura wrote a life of St. Francis, which has passed through several editions. But the most ample and circumstantial accounts of this extraordinary man are given by Luke Wadding, in the first volume of his Annal. Ord. Min. a work which contains a complete history of the Franciscan order, confirmed by a great number of authentic records, and the best edition of which is that published at Rome in 1731, and the following years, in eighteen volumes in folio, by Joseph Maria Fonseca ab Ebora. It is to the same Wadding that we are obliged for the Opuscula Sti. Francisci, and the Bibliotheca Ordinis Minorum, the former of which appeared at Antwerp in 1623, and the latter at Rome in 1650. The other writers, who have given accounts of the Franciscan order, are mentioned by Jo. Alb. Fabricius, in his Bibliotheca Lat. medii Ævi, tom. ii. p. 573.

[g] The popes were so infatuated with the Franciscans, that those whom they could not employ more honourably in their civil negotiations or domestic affairs, they made their publicans, beadles, &c. See, for a confirmation of this, the following passages in the Histor. Major of Matthew Paris: 'Fratres Minores et Prædicatores (says he) invitos, ut credimus, jam suos fecit dominus papa, non sine ordinis eorum læsione et scandalo, teloniarios et bedellos,' p. 634.—'Non cessavit papa pecuniam aggregare, faciens de Fratribus Prædicatoribus, et Minoribus, etiam invitis, non jam piscatoribus hominum, sed nummorum,' p. 639.—'Erant Minores et Prædicatores magnatum consiliatores et nuntii, etiam domini papæ secretarii; nimis in hoc gratiam sibi secularem comparantes;' ad an. 1236, p. 354.—'Facti sunt eo tempore Prædicatores et Minores regum consiliarii et nuntii speciales, ut sicut quondam mollibus induti in domibus regum erant, ita tunc qui vilibus vestiebantur in domibus, cameris, et palatiis essent principum;' ad an. 1239, p. 465.

[h] See Baluzii Miscellan. tom. iv. p. 490, tom. vii. p. 392.—It is well known, that no religious order had the distribution of so many and such ample indulgences as the Franciscans. Nor could these good friars live and multiply as they did, without some source of profit, since, by their institution, they were to be destitute of revenues and possessions of every kind. It was therefore in the place of fixed revenues, that such lucrative indulgences were put into their hands.

[i] Baluzii Miscellan. tom. vii. p. 441.

The measures taken by the popes to appease these tumults were various, but ineffectual, because their principal view was to support the cause of their faithful servants and creatures, the Mendicant friars, and to maintain them in the possession of their honours and advantages.[a]

XXVII. Among all the controversies which were maintained by the Mendicants, whether against the bishops, abbots, schools, or other religious orders, that was the most famous which arose in 1228, between the Dominicans and the university of Paris, and was prolonged, with various success, until the year 1259. The Dominicans claimed, as their unquestionable right, two theological classes in that celebrated university: one of these had been taken from them, and an academical law had passed, importing that no religious order should have what the Dominicans demanded. The latter, however, persisted obstinately in reclaiming the professorship they had lost; while the doctors of the university, perceiving the restless and contentious spirit that animated their efforts, excluded them from their society, and formed themselves into a separate body. This measure was considered as a declaration of war; and, accordingly, the most vehement commotions arose between the contending parties. The debate was brought before the tribunal of the Roman pontiff, in 1255; and the decision, as might have been expected, was in favour of the monks. Alexander IV. ordered the university of Paris not only to restore the Dominicans to their former place in that learned society, but moreover to make a grant to them of as many classes or professorships as they should think proper to demand. This unjust and despotic sentence was opposed by the university with the utmost vigour; and thus the contest was renewed with double fury. But the magistrates of Paris were, at length, so terrified and overwhelmed with the thundering edicts and formidable mandates of the exasperated pontiff, that, in 1259, they yielded to superior force, and satisfied the demands not only of the Dominican, but also of the Franciscan order, in obedience to the pope, and to the extent of his commands.[b] Hence arose that secret enmity and silent ill-will, which prevailed so long between the university and the Mendicant orders, especially the Dominicans.

XXVIII. In this famous debate none pleaded the cause of the university with greater spirit, or asserted its rights with greater zeal and activity, than Guillaume de St. Amour, doctor of the Sorbonne, a man of true genius, worthy to have lived in better times, and capable of adorning a more enlightened age. This vigorous and able champion attacked the whole Mendicant tribe in various treatises with the greatest vehemence, and more especially in a book "concerning the perils of the latter times." He boldly maintained, that their discipline was in direct opposition to the precepts of the Gospel; and that, in confirming and approving it, the popes had been guilty of temerity, and the church was become chargeable with error. What gave occasion to the remarkable title of this celebrated work, was the author's being entirely persuaded that the prophecy of St. Paul, relating to the "perilous times that were to come in the last days,"[c] was fulfilled in the establishment of the Mendicant friars. This notion St. Amour maintained in the warmest manner, and proved it, principally from the book called the Everlasting Gospel, which was publicly explained by the Dominicans and Franciscans, and of which we shall have occasion to speak more fully hereafter. The fury and resentment of the Mendicants were therefore kindled in a peculiar manner against this formidable adversary, whom they persecuted without interruption, until, in 1256, the pope ordered his book to be publicly burned, and banished its author out of France, lest he should excite the Sorbonne to renew their opposition to these spiritual beggars. St. Amour submitted to the papal edict, and retired into his native province of Franche-Comté; but, under the pontificate of Clement IV., he returned to Paris, where he illustrated the tenets of his famous book in a more extensive work, and died esteemed and regretted by all, except the Mendicants.[d]

XXIX. While the pontiffs accumulated upon the Mendicants the most honourable distinctions, and the most valuable privileges which they had to bestow, they exposed them still more and more to the envy and hatred of the rest of the clergy; and this hatred was considerably increased by the audacious arrogance that discovered itself every where in the conduct of these supercilious orders. They had the presumption to declare publicly, that they had a divine impulse and commission to illustrate and maintain the religion of Jesus; they treated with the utmost insolence and contempt all ranks and orders of the priesthood; they affirmed, without a blush, that the true method of obtaining salvation was revealed to them alone, proclaimed with ostentation the superior efficacy and virtue of their *indulgences*, and vaunted, beyond measure, their interests at the court of Heaven, and their familiar connexions with the Supreme Being, the Virgin Mary, and the saints in glory. By these impious wiles, they so deluded and captivated the miserable and blinded multitude, that they would not entrust any others but the Mendicants with the care of their souls, their spiritual and eternal concerns.[e] We may give, as a specimen of these notorious frauds, the ridiculous fable, which the Carmelites impose upon the credulous, relating to Simon Stockius, the general of their order, who died

[a] See Jo. Launoii Explicata Ecclesiæ Traditio circa Canonem, Omnis utriusque Sexus, tom. i. part i. op. p. 247.—Rich. Simon, Critique de la Bibliotheque des Auteurs Ecclesiastiques, par M. Du-Pin, tom. i. p. 326.—L'Enfant, Histoire du Concile de Pise, tom. i. p. 310, tom. ii. p. 8.—Echardi Scriptores Dominicani, tom. i. p. 404. The circumstances of these flaming contests are mentioned by all the writers, both of this and the following centuries.

[b] See Cæs. Egass. du Boulay, Histor. Acad. Paris. tom. iii. 138, 240, &c.—Jo. Cordesii, or (to mention him by the name he assumed) Jo. Alitophili Præf. Histor. et Apologetica ad Opera Gulielmi de S. Amore.—Antoine Touron, Vie de S. Thomas, p. 134.—Wadding, Annal. Minor. tom. iii. p. 247, 366. tom. iv. p. 14, 52, 106, 263.—Matth. Paris, Histor. Major, ad an. 1228.—Nangis Chronicon, apud d'Acherii Spicilegium, tom. iii. p. 38.

[c] 2 Timothy, iii. 1.

[d] The doctors of the university of Paris profess still a high respect for the memory of St. Amour, esteem his book, and deny obstinately that he was ever placed in the list of heretics. The Dominicans, on the contrary, consider him as a heretic of the first magnitude, if we may use that expression. Such of his works as could be found were published in 1632, at *Paris*, (though the title bears *Constantiæ*,) by Cordesius, who has introduced them by a long and learned preface, in which he defends the reputation and orthodoxy of St. Amour in a triumphant manner. This learned editor, to avoid the resentment and fury of the Mendicants, concealed his real name, and assumed that of Jo. Alitophilus. This did not, however, save his book from the vengeance of these friars, who obtained from Louis XIII. in 1633, an edict for its suppression, which Touron, a Dominican friar, has published in his *Vie de St. Thomas*.—For a farther account of the life of this famous doctor, see Wadding, Annal. Minor. tom. iii. p. 366.—Boulay, Hist. Acad. Paris. tom. iii. p. 266.—Nat. Alex. Hist. Eccles. sæc. XIII. cap. iii. art. vii. p. 95.—Rich. Simon, Critique de la Biblioth. Eccles. de M. Du-Pin, t. i. p. 345.

[e] See Matth. Paris, ad an. 1246, Histor. Maj.

about the beginning of this century. To this ecclesiastic, they tell us that the Virgin Mary appeared, and gave him a solemn promise, that the souls of such as left the world with the Carmelite cloak or scapulary upon their shoulders, should be infallibly preserved from eternal damnation.[a] And here let it be observed to the astonishment of all, in whom the power of superstition has not extinguished the plainest dictates of common sense, that this ridiculous and impious fiction found patrons and defenders even among the pontiffs.[b]

XXX. It is however certain, that the Mendicant orders, though they were considered as the main pillars of the hierarchy, and the principal supports of the papal authority, involved the pontiffs, after the death of Dominic and Francis, in many perplexities and troubles, which were no sooner dispelled, than they were unhappily renewed; and thus the church was often reduced to a state of imminent danger. These tumults and perplexities began with the contests between the Dominicans and Franciscans about pre-eminence, in which these *humble* monks mutually indulged themselves in the bitterest invectives and the severest accusations both in their writings and their discourses, and opposed each other's interests with all the fury of disappointed ambition. Many schemes were formed, and various measures were employed, for terminating these scandalous dissensions; but the root of the evil still remained, and the flame was rather covered than extinguished.[c] Beside this, the Franciscans were early divided among themselves, and split into several factions, which gathered strength and consistence from day to day, and not only disturbed the tranquillity of the church, but struck at the supreme jurisdiction and prerogatives of the Roman pontiffs. And whoever considers with attention the series of events that happened in the Latin church from this remarkable period, will be fully convinced that the Mendicant orders (whether through imprudence or design we shall not determine) gave some very severe blows to the authority of the church of Rome, and excited in the minds of the people those ardent desires of a reformation, which produced, in after-times, such substantial and such glorious effects.

XXXI. The occasion of these intestine divisions among the Franciscans, was a dispute about the precise meaning of their rule. Their founder and chief had made absolute poverty one of their indispensable obligations. The religious orders before his time were so constituted, that, though no single monk had any personal property, the whole community, considered as one collective body, had possessions and revenues, from which every member drew the means of his subsistence. But the austere chief of the Franciscans absolutely prohibited both separate and collective property to the monks of his order, not permitting either the individual or the community to possess funds, revenues, or any worldly goods.[d] This injunction appeared so severe to several of the friars-minors, that they took the liberty to dispense with it as soon as their founder was dead; and in this they were seconded by pope Gregory IX., who, in 1231, published an interpretation of this rule, which considerably mitigated its excessive rigour.[e] But this mitigation was far from being agreeable to all the Franciscans; it shocked the austere monks of that order, those particularly who were called the *Spirituals*,[f] whose melancholy temper rendered them fond of every thing harsh and gloomy, and whose fanatical spirit hurried them always into extremes. Hence arose a warm debate, which Innocent IV. decided, in 1245, in favour of those who were inclined to mitigate the severity of the rule in question. By his decree it was enacted, that the Franciscan friars should be permitted to possess certain places, habitations, chattels, books, &c. and to make use of them, but that the property of all these things should reside in St. Peter or the Roman church; so that without the pope's consent they might neither be sold, bartered, nor transferred, under any pretext whatever. This edict was considered by the gloomy part of the order as a most pernicious depravation of their holy rule, and was, consequently, opposed and rejected by them with indignation. Hence many of these *spiritual* malcontents retired into the woods and deserts, while others were apprehended by Crescentius, the general of the society, and sent into exile.[g]

XXXII. A change, however, arose in their favour, in 1247, when John of Parma was chosen general of the order. This famous ecclesiastic, who was zealously attached to the sentiments of the spiritual members, recalled them from their exile, and inculcated upon all his monks a strict and unlimited obedience to the very letter of the rule that had been drawn up by St. Francis.[h] By this reform, he brought back the order to its primitive state; and the only reward he obtained for his zealous labours, was to be accused as a rebellious heretic at the tribunal of pope Alexander IV., in consequence of which he was obliged to resign his post. He had also the mortification to see the monks who adhered to his sentiments thrown into prison, which unhappy lot he himself escaped with great difficulty.[i] His successor, the famous Bonaventura, who was one of the most eminent scholastic divines of this century, proposed steering a middle course between the contending factions, having nothing so much at heart as to prevent an open schism. Nevertheless, the measures he took to reconcile the jarring parties, and to maintain a spirit of union in the order, were not attended with the degree of success which he expected from them; nor were they sufficient to hinder the less austere part of the Franciscans from soliciting and obtaining, in 1257, from Alexander IV. a solemn renewal of the mild interpretation

[a] See Jo. Launoii Lib. de Viso Stockii, oper. tom. ii. part ii. p. 379.—Acta Sanctor. tom. iii. Mensis Maii ad diem xvi.—Theoph. Rainaudi Scapulare Marianum, tom. vii. op. p. 614.

[b] Benedict XIV., notwithstanding his pretended freedom from superstition and priestly fraud, deigned to appear among the supporters of this gross fiction, though he defended it with his usual air of prudence and timidity, in his book de Festis B. Mariæ Virg. lib. ii. cap. vi. p. 472, t. x. op. edit. Rom.

[c] See the Alcoran des Cordeliers, tom. i. p. 256, 266, &c. Luc. Wadding, Annales Minor. tom. iii. p. 380.

[d] The words of the rule itself relating to this point are as follow: 'Fratres sibi nihil approprient, nec domum, nec locum, nec aliquam rem sed, sicut peregrini et advenæ in hoc sæculo, in paupertate et humilitate famulantes Domino, vadant pro eleemosynâ confidenter .... (*i. e.* let them be sturdy beggars) ..... Hæc est illa celsitudo altissimæ paupertatis quæ vos carissimos meos fratres hæredes et reges regni cœlorum instituit."

[e] The bull was published by Emmanuel Roderic in his Collectio Privilegiorum regularium Mendicantium, et non Mendicantium, tom. i.

[f] Luc. Wadding, Annal. Minor. tom. iii. p. 99: they were also called Zelatores, and Cæsarians from their chief Cæsarius.

[g] Luc. Wadding, Annal. Minor. tom. iii. iv.

[h] Luc. Wadding, Annal. Minor. tom. iii.

[i] Wadding, tom. iv.

which Innocent IV. had given of the rule of their founder.[a] On the other hand, those who adhered to the sentiments of John of Parma maintained their cause with such success, that, in an assembly of the order holden in 1260, the explication of Innocent was abrogated and annulled, especially in those points wherein it differed from that which had been formerly given by Gregory IX.[b]

XXXIII. This dispute concerning the true sense of the rule of St. Francis was followed by another of equal moment, which produced new and unhappy divisions among the monks of that order. About the commencement of this century, there were handed about in Italy several pretended prophecies of the famous Joachim, abbot of Sora in Calabria,[c] whom the multitude revered as a person divinely inspired, and equal to the most illustrious prophets of ancient times. The greatest part of these predictions were contained in a work entitled the Everlasting Gospel, which was also usually called the Book of Joachim.[d] This Joachim, (whether a real or fictitious person we shall not pretend to determine,) among many other future events, foretold the destruction of the church of Rome, whose corruptions he censured with the greatest severity, and the promulgation of a new and more perfect Gospel in the age of the Holy Ghost, by a set of poor and austere ministers, whom God was to raise up and employ for that purpose. For he divided the world into three ages, with reference to the three dispensations of religion. The two imperfect ages,—namely, the age of the Old Testament, which was that of the *Father*, and the age of the New, which was under the administration of the *Son*,—had according to the predictions of this fanatic, already expired, and the third age, that of the *Holy Ghost*, had commenced. The *Spiritual*, i. e. the austere Franciscans, who were, for the most part, well-meaning but wrong-headed enthusiasts, not only swallowed down, with the most voracious and implicit credulity, the prophecies and doctrines which were attributed to Joachim, but applied those predictions to themselves, and to the rule of discipline established by their holy founder St. Francis;[e] for they maintained, that he delivered to mankind the *true Gospel*, and that he was the angel whom St. John saw flying in the midst of heaven.[f]

XXXIV. When the intestine divisions among the Franciscans were at the greatest height, one of the *Spiritual* friars, whose name was Gerard, undertook the explication of the Everlasting Gospel ascribed to Joachim, in a book which appeared, in 1250, under the title of Introduction to the Everlasting Gospel.[g] In this book, the fanatical monk, among other enormities, as insipid as impious,

[a] This edict of Alexander IV. is published by Wadding, Annal. Min. t. iv. among the Records.

[b] The interpretation of Gregory mitigated the rule of St. Francis; but that of Innocent went much farther, and seemed to destroy its fundamental principles. See Wadding, Annales Minor. tom. iv. The lamentable divisions that reigned among the monks of this famous order, are described, in an accurate and lively manner, by Bonaventura himself, in a letter, which is extant in the work now cited.

[c] The resemblance between the words *Sora* and *Flora*, has probably led Dr. Mosheim here into a slight mistake. *Sora* is not in Calabria, but in the province of Capua. It must therefore have been *Flora*, that our author intended to write, as Spanheim, Fleury, and other ecclesiastical historians, have done.

[d] The Merlin of the English, the Malichi of the Irish, and Nostradamus of the French, those pretended soothsayers, who, under the illusory or feigned persuasion of a divine impulse, sang in uncouth verse the future revolutions of church and state, are just what we may suppose the Joachim of the Italians to have been. Many predictions of this latter were formerly handed about, and are still to be seen: they have passed through various editions, and have been illustrated by the lucubrations of several commentators. It is not to be doubted that Joachim was the author of some predictions, and that he, in a particular manner, foretold the reformation of the church, of which he might easily see the absolute necessity. It is however certain that the greatest part of the predictions and writings, which were formerly attributed to him, were composed by others; and this we may affirm even of the Everlasting Gospel, the work undoubtedly of some obscure, silly, and visionary author, who thought proper to adorn his reveries with the celebrated name of Joachim, in order to gain them credit, and to render them more agreeable to the multitude. The title of this senseless production is taken from Revelations, xiv. 6, and it contained three books; the first was entitled, *Liber Concordiæ Veritatis*, i. e. the Book of the Harmony of Truth; the second, *Apocalypsis Nova*, or the New Revelation; and the third, *Psalterium decem Chordarum*, i. e. the Ten-stringed Harp. This account was taken from a manuscript of that work in the library of the Sorbonne, by Jac. Echard, who has published it in his Scriptores Dominican. tom. i.

[e] This is acknowledged even by Wadding, notwithstanding his partiality in favour of the spiritual or austere Franciscans. See his Annal. Minor. tom. iv. p. 3—6.

[f] Revel. xiv. 6. '*And I saw another angel fly in the midst of heaven, having the Everlasting Gospel to preach unto them that dwell on the earth.*' See on this subject Baluzii Miscellan. tom. i. p. 221, 235.—Echardi Scriptor. Dominic. tom. i. p. 202.—Codex Inquisit. Tolosanæ a Limborchio edit. p. 301.

[g] As the accounts given of this book, by ancient and modern writers, are not sufficiently accurate, it may not be improper to offer here some observations that may correct their mistakes. 1. They almost all confound the Everlasting Gospel, or the Gospel of the Holy Ghost, (for so it is also called, as we are told by Guil. de St. Amour, in his book de Periculis noviss. Temporum,) with the Introduction to the Everlasting Gospel. But these two productions must be carefully distinguished from each other. The Everlasting Gospel was attributed to the abbot Joachim, and it consisted of three books, as has been already observed. But the Introduction to this Gospel was the work of a Franciscan monk, who explained the obscure predictions of the pretended Gospel, and applied them to his order. The Everlasting Gospel was neither complained of by the university of Paris, nor condemned by the Roman pontiff, Alexander IV.; but the Introduction was complained of, condemned, and burned, as appears evidently from the letters of the above mentioned pontiff, which are to be seen in Boulay's Histor. Academ. Paris. tom. iii. p. 292. The former consisted, as productions of that nature generally do, of ambiguous predictions and intricate riddles, and was consequently despised or neglected; but the latter was dangerous in many respects. 2. It is farther to be observed, that the ancient writers are not agreed concerning the author of this Introduction. They are unanimous in attributing it to one of the mendicant friars; but the votaries of St. Francis maintain, that the author was a Dominican, while the Dominican party affirm as obstinately, that he was a Franciscan. The greatest part of the learned, however, are of opinion, that the author of the infamous work in question was John of Parma, general of the Franciscans, who is known to have been most warmly attached to the *spiritual* faction of that order, and to have maintained the sentiments of the abbot Joachim with an excessive zeal. See Wadding, (Annal. Minor. tom. iv.) who endeavours to defend him against this accusation, though without success. (See also the Acta Sanctorum, tom. iii. Martii, p. 157; for John of Parma, though he preferred the Gospel of St. Francis to that of Christ, has, nevertheless, obtained a place among the saints.) The learned Echard is of a different opinion, and has proved, (in his Scriptor. Dominican. tom. i. p. 202,) from the curious manuscripts yet preserved in the Sorbonne, relating to the Everlasting Gospel, that Gerard, a Franciscan friar, was the author of the infamous Introduction to that book. This Gerard, indeed, was the intimate friend and companion to John of Parma, and not only maintained, with the greatest obstinacy, the cause of the *spirituals*, but also embraced all the sentiments that were attributed to the abbot Joachim, with such an ardent zeal, that he chose to remain 18 years in prison, rather than to abandon them. See Wadding, tom. 4. Those Franciscans who were called *observantes*, i. e. vigilant, from their professing a more rigid observance of the rule of their founder than was practised by the rest of their order, place Gerard among the saints of the first rank, and impudently affirm, that he was not only endowed with the gift of prophecy, but also with the power of working miracles. See Wadding, tom. iii. p. 213. It is to be observed, 3dly, That whoever may have been the writer of this detestable book, the whole mendicant order, in the judgment of the greatest part of the historians of this age, shared the guilt of its composition and publication, more especially the Dominicans and Franciscans, who are supposed to have fallen upon this impious method of deluding the multitude into a high notion of their sanctity, in order to establish their dominion, and to extend their authority beyond all bounds. This opinion, however, is ill-founded, notwithstanding the numbers by which it has been adopted. The Franciscans alone are chargeable with the guilt of

inculcated the following detestable doctrine: "That St. Francis, who was the angel mentioned in the Revelations xiv. 6, had promulgated to the world the true and everlasting gospel of God; that the gospel of Christ was to be abrogated in the year 1260, and to give place to this new and everlasting gospel, which was to be substituted in its room; and that the ministers of this great reformation were to be humble and bare-footed friars, destitute of all worldly emoluments."[a] When this strange book was published at Paris in 1254, it excited in the doctors of the church, and indeed in all good men, the most lively feelings of horror and indignation against the mendicant friars, who had already, by other parts of their conduct, incurred the displeasure of the public. This general ferment engaged pope Alexander IV., though much against his will, to order the suppression of this absurd book in 1255; he, however, took care to have this order executed with the greatest possible mildness, lest it should hurt the reputation of the mendicants, and open the eyes of the superstitious multitude. But the doctors of the university of Paris, not being satisfied with these gentle and timorous proceedings, repeated without interruption their accusation and complaints, until the extravagant and obnoxious production was publicly committed to the flames.[b]

XXXV. The intestine flame of discord, which had raged among the Franciscans, and was smothered, though not extinguished, by the prudent management of Bonaventura, broke out anew with redoubled fury after the death of that pacific doctor. Those Franciscan monks who were fond of opulence and ease, renewed their complaints against the rule of their founder as unreasonable and unjust, demanding what it was absolutely beyond the power of man to perform. Their complaints, however, were without effect; and their schemes were disconcerted by pope Nicolas III., who leaned to the side of the austere Franciscans, and who, in 1279, published that famous *constitution* which confirmed the rule of St. Francis, and contained an accurate and elaborate explication of the maxims it recommended, and the duties it prescribed.[c] By this edict he renewed that part of the rule, which prohibited all kinds of property among the Franciscans, every thing that bore the least resemblance to a legal possession, or a fixed domain; but he granted to them, at the same time, the use of things necessary, such as houses, books, and other conveniences of that nature, the property of which, in conformity with the appointment of Innocent IV., was to reside in the church of Rome. Nor did the provident pontiff stop here; but prohibited, under the severest penalties, all private explications of this new law, lest they should excite disputes, and furnish new matter of contention; and reserved the power of interpreting it to himself and his successors alone.[d]

XXXVI. However disposed Nicolas was to satisfy the spiritual and austere part of the Franciscan order, which had now become numerous both in Italy and France, and particularly in the province of Narbonne, the constitution above mentioned was far from producing that effect. The monks of that gloomy faction, who resided in Italy, received the papal edict with a sullen and discontented silence. Their brethren in France, and more especially in the southern parts of that kingdom, where the inhabitants are of a warm and sanguine complexion, testified, in an open and tumultuous manner, the disapprobation of this new constitution; and having at their head a famous Franciscan, whose name was Pierre Jean d'Olive, they excited new dissensions and troubles in the order.[e] Pierre was a native of Serignan in Languedoc, who had acquired a shining reputation by his writings, and whose eminent sanctity and learning drew after him a great number of followers; nor is it to be denied, that there were many important truths and wise maxims in the instructions he delivered. One of the great objects of which he never lost sight in his writings, was the corruption of the church of Rome, which he censured with extraordinary freedom and severity, in a work entitled Postilla, or a Commentary on the Revelations, affirming boldly, that this church was represented by the 'whore of Babylon, the mother of harlots,' whom St. John beheld sitting upon a scarlet-coloured beast, full of names of blasphemy, having seven heads, and ten horns.[f] It is however to be observed, that this severe censor of a corrupt church, was himself a most superstitious fanatic in several respects, having imbibed the greatest part of those monstrous opinions, which the Spirituals pretended to have received from the abbot Joachim; to which he added an impious and extravagant veneration for St. Francis, whom he considered as entirely transformed into the person of Christ.[g] In the debate concerning the sense of the rule of this famous chief, he seemed to adhere to neither of the contending parties;

this horrid production, as appears most evidently from the fragments of the book itself, which yet remain; but we are obliged in justice to observe farther, that this guilt does not lie upon all the Franciscans, but only on the *spiritual* faction. Perhaps we might go still farther, and allege, that the charge ought not to be extended even to all the members of this faction, but to such alone as placed an idle and enthusiastic confidence in Joachim, and gave credit to all his pretended prophecies. These observations are necessary to the true understanding of what has been said concerning the Everlasting Gospel by the following learned men: Jo. Andr. Schmidius, Dissertat. Helmst. 1700.—Usserius, *de Successione Ecclesiar. Occident.* c. ix. sect. 20.—Boulay, Hist. Acad. Paris. tom. iii. p. 292.—Natal. Alexander, Histor. Eccles. sæc. XIII. artic. iv.—Wadding, Annal. Minor. tom. iv.—Upon the whole it may be affirmed, that the book under consideration is not, as the greatest part of the learned have imagined, a monument of the arrogance of the mendicant orders in general, but rather a proof of the impious fanaticism and extravagance of a small number of Franciscans.

[a] See Guil. de St. Amour de Periculis noviss. Tempor. who observes that the book under consideration was not indeed published before the year 1254, but that the opinions contained in it had an earlier origin, and were propagated even in the year 1200. Several of the ancient writers have given large extracts from this infamous book. See Herm. Corneri Chronicon, in Eccardi Corpore Histor. medii Ævi, tom. ii. p. 850.—Chronicon Egmondanum, in Ant. Matthæi Analectis veteris Ævi, tom. ii. p. 517.—Ricobaldus apud Eccardi Corp. tom. i. p. 1215.—But between these extracts there is a great difference, which seems to have arisen from this, that some drew their citations from the Everlasting Gospel of Joachim, while others drew theirs from the Introduction of Gerard, not sufficiently distinguishing one work from the other.

[b] See Boulay, Hist. Acad. Paris. tom. iii. p. 299.—Jordani Chronicon in Muratorii Antiq. Ital. tom. iv. p. 998.

[c] Some affirm, that this constitution was issued by Nicolas IV.; but their opinion is refuted by Wadding, in his Annal. Min. tom. v.

[d] This constitution is yet extant in the Jus. Canon. lib. vi. Decretal. Tit. xii. c. iii. p. 1028. edit. Bohm. and is vulgarly called the Constitution *Exiit*, from its beginning with that word.

[e] In some ancient records, this ring-leader is called Petrus Biterrensis, i. e. Peter of Beziers, because he resided for a long time in the convent of Beziers, where he performed the functions of a public teacher. By others, he is named Petrus de Serignano, from the place of his nativity This remark is so much the more necessary, as some authors have taken these three denominations for three distinct persons.

[f] Revelations, xvii. 3, 5.

[g] Totum Christo configuratum. See the Litera Magistrorum, de Postillâ Fratris P. Joh. Olivi, in Baluzii Miscellan. tom. i. p. 213.—Wadding, Annales Minor. tom. v. p 51.

for he allowed to his followers the bare use of the necessaries of life; and being called upon, at different times, by the authority of his superiors, to declare his sentiments upon this head, he professed his assent to the interpretation that had been given of the rule in question by Nicolas III. He leaned, nevertheless, to the side of those austere and spiritual Franciscans, who not only opposed the introduction of property among the individuals of the order, but also maintained, that the whole community, considered collectively, was likewise to be excluded from possessions of every kind. Great was his zeal for these gloomy Franciscans, and he defended their cause with warmth;[a] hence he is looked upon as the chief of that faction, which disputed so often, and so vehemently, with the Roman pontiffs, in favour of the renunciation of property, in consequence of the institution of St. Francis.[b]

XXXVII. The credit and authority of Pierre d'Olive, whom the multitude considered, not only as a man of unblemished sanctity, but also as a prophet sent from above, added new force and vigour to the Spirituals, and encouraged them to renew the combat with redoubled fury. But the prudence of the heads of the order prevented, for some time, the pernicious effects of these violent efforts, and so over-ruled the impetuous motions of this enthusiastic faction, that a sort of equality was preserved between the contending parties. But the promotion of Matthew of Aqua Sparta, who was elected general of the order in 1287, put an end to these prudential measures, and changed entirely the face of affairs. This new chief suffered the ancient discipline of the Franciscans to dwindle away to nothing, indulged his monks in abandoning even the very appearance of poverty, and thus drew upon himself not only the indignation and rage of the austere part of the spiritual Franciscans, but also the disapprobation of the more moderate members of that party. Hence arose various tumults and seditions, first in the marquisate of Ancona, and afterwards in France, which the new general endeavoured to suppress by imprisonment, exile, and corporal punishments; but, finding all these means ineffectual, he resigned his place in 1289.[c] His successor, Raymond Goffredi, employed his utmost efforts to appease these troubles. For this purpose he recalled the banished friars, set at liberty those who had been thrown into prison, and put out of the way several of the austere Franciscans, who had been the principal encouragers of these unhappy divisions, by sending them into Armenia in the character of missionaries. But the disorder was too far gone to be easily remedied. The more moderate Franciscans, who had a relish for the sweets of property and opulence, accused the new general of a partial attachment to the Spirituals, whom he treated with peculiar affection and respect, and therefore employed their whole credit to procure his dismission from office, which, with much difficulty, they at length effected, under the pontificate of Boniface VIII. On the other hand, the more rigid part of the spiritual faction renounced all fellowship, even with such of their own party as discovered a pacific and reconciling spirit; and, forming themselves into a separate body, protested publicly against the interpretation which Nicolas III. had given of the rule of St. Francis. Thus, from the year 1290, the affairs of the Franciscans carried a dismal aspect, and portended nothing but seditions and schisms in an order which had been so famous for its pretended disinterestedness and humility.[d]

XXXVIII. In the year 1294, a certain number of Italian Franciscans, of the spiritual party, addressed themselves to Celestin V. for permission to form a separate order, in which they might not only profess, but also observe, in the strictest manner, that austere rule of absolute poverty, which St. Francis had prescribed to his followers. The good pontiff, who, before his elevation to the supremacy of the church, had led a solitary and austere life,[e] and was fond of every thing that looked like mortification and self-denial, granted with the utmost facility the request of these friars, and placed, at the head of the new order, a monk, whose name was Liberatus, and who was one of the greatest self-tormentors of all the monastic tribe.[f] Soon after this, Celestin, finding himself unfit for the duties of his high and important office, resigned the pontificate, in which he was succeeded by Boniface VIII. who annulled all the acts of his predecessor, and suppressed, among other institutions, the new order, which had assumed the title of the *Celestin Hermits of St. Francis*.[g] This disgrace was, as it were, the signal which drew upon them the most furious attacks of their enemies. The worldly-minded Franciscans persecuted them with the most unrelenting bitterness, accused them of various crimes, and even cast upon them the odious reproach of Manicheism. Hence many of these unhappy fanatics retired into Achaia, whence they passed into a small island, where they imagined themselves secure from the rage of their adversaries, and at liberty to indulge themselves in all the austerities of that miserable life, which they looked upon as the perfection of holiness here below. But no retreat was sufficient to screen them from the vigilance and fury of their cruel persecutors, who left no means unemployed to perpetuate their miseries. In the mean time, the branch of the spiritual Franciscans that remained in Italy, continued to observe the rigorous laws of their primitive institution in spite of

[a] The real sentiments of Pierre d'Olive will be best discovered in the last discourse he pronounced, which is yet extant in Boulay's Histor. Acad. Paris. tom. iii. p. 535, and in Wadding's Annal. Min. t. v. p. 378.

[b] For an account of this famous friar, see not only the common monastic historians, such as Raynaldus, Alexander, and Oudinus, but also the following: Baluzii Miscel. tom. i. p. 213. and his Vit. Pontif. Avenion. tom. ii. p. 752. Car. Plessis d'Argentre, Collectio Judiciorum de novis Ecclesiæ Erroribus, tom. i. p. 226.—Wadding, Annal. Minor. tom. v. p. 52, 108, 121, 140, 236, and more especially, p. 378, where he makes an unsuccessful attempt to justify this enthusiast.—Boulay, Hist. Acad. Paris. tom. iii. p. 535.—Schelhornii Amœnitates Literariæ, tom. ix. p. 678. Histoire Generale de Languedoc, par les Moines Benedictins, tom. iv. p. 91, 179, 182. The bones of Pierre d'Olive were taken up by the order of pope John XXII. and burned publicly with his writings, in the year 1325.

[c] Wadding, Annales Min. tom. v. p. 210, 235.

[d] Idem opus, t. v. p. 108, 121, 140, and more especially p. 235, 236

[e] This pope, whose name was Peter Mueron, had retired very young to a solitary mountain, in order to devote himself entirely to prayer and mortification. The fame of his piety brought many to see him from a principle of curiosity, several of whom renounced the world, and became the companions of his solitude. With these he formed a kind of community, in 1254, which was approved by Urban IV. in 1264, and erected into a distinct order, called the Hermits of St. Damien. On his assumption of the pontifical name of Celestin V., his order, which must not be confounded with the new Franciscan Celestin Hermits, took the title of Celestins.

[f] Wadding, Annales, tom. v. p. 324, 338.

[g] Wadding, Annales, tom. vi.—Bullarium Magnum, Contin. III. IV. p. 108.

Boniface VIII., who used his utmost efforts to conquer their obstinacy. They erected societies of their order, first in the kingdom of Naples, afterwards in the Milanese, and in the marquisate of Ancona; and, at length spreading themselves through the greatest part of Europe, they continued in the most violent state of war with the church of Rome, until the Reformation changed the face of things. In these conflicts they underwent trials and sufferings of every kind, and multitudes of them perished in the flames, as miserable victims to the infernal fury of the Inquisition.[a]

XXXIX. Toward the conclusion of this century arose in Italy the enthusiastic sect of the Fratricelli and Bizochi, which, in Germany and France, received the denomination of Beghards. They were condemned by Boniface VIII,[b] and by several of his successors; and the inquisitors were ordered by these despotic pontiffs to persecute them until they were extirpated, which commission they executed with their usual barbarity. The *Fratricelli*, or *Little Brethren*, were Franciscan monks, who separated themselves from the grand community of St. Francis, with an intention of obeying the laws of their parent and founder in a more strict and rigorous manner than they were observed by the other Franciscans, and who, accordingly, renounced every kind of possession and property both common and personal, and begged from door to door their daily subsistence.[c] They alleged that neither Christ nor his apostles had any possessions, either personal or in common; and that *they* were the models, whom St. Francis commanded his followers to imitate. After the example also of their austere founder, they went about clothed with sordid garments, or rather with loathsome rags, declaimed against the corruption of the church of Rome, and the vices of the pontiffs and bishops, foretold the reformation of the church and the restoration of the true Gospel, by the genuine followers of St. Francis, and declared their assent to almost all the doctrines, which were published under the name of the abbot Joachim. They esteemed and respected Celestin V., because, as has been already observed, he was, in some measure, the founder of their society, by permitting them to erect themselves into a separate order. But they refused to acknowledge, as true and lawful heads of the church, his successor Boniface and the subsequent pontiffs, who opposed the Fratricelli, and persecuted their order.[d]

XL. As the Franciscan order acknowledged, for its

[a] The writers that serve generally as guides in this part of the history of the church, and whom I have been obliged to consult upon the divisions of the Franciscans, (whose history, as will soon appear, is peculiarly interesting and important,) are far from meriting the encomiums which are due to perspicuity and exactness. This part of the ecclesiastical history of what is called the Middle Age, has not hitherto been accurately illustrated by any writer, though it be, every way, worthy of the labours of the learned, and of the attention of Christians. Its principal merit consists herein, that it exhibits striking examples of piety and learning struggling against the power of superstition and ignorance, and against that spiritual tyranny of which they were the principal supports. And it may be observed, that these rebellious Franciscans, though fanatical and superstitious in several respects, deserve an eminent rank among those who prepared the way for the reformation in Europe, and who excited, in the minds of the people, a just aversion to the church of Rome. Raynaldus, Bzovius, Spondanus, in their Annals, Eymericus, in his Directorium Inquisitorum, and Natalis Alexander, in his Ecclesiastical History, relate the revolutions that happened in the Franciscan order, and in the church in general, during this period; but their accounts are neither so accurate, nor so ample, as the importance of the events deserved. And as it is from these authors that the protestant historians have drawn their materials, we need not be surprised at the defects with which the latter abound. Wadding, who merits high encomiums as a laborious and learned writer, is yet an uncertain guide, when he treats of the matters now under consideration. His attachment to one party, and his fear of the others, subject him to restraints, that prevent his declaring the truth with a noble freedom. He shades his picture with dexterity. He conceals, dissembles, excuses, acknowledges, and denies, with such a timorous prudence and caution, that the truth could not but suffer considerably under his pen. He appears to have been attached to the rigid Franciscans, and yet had not the courage to declare openly, that they had been injured by the pontiffs. He saw, on the other hand, the tumults and perplexities in which these rigid Franciscans had involved the church of Rome, and the strokes which they had aimed, with no small success, at the majesty of the pontiffs: but he has taken all imaginable pains to throw such a shade upon this part of their conduct, as conceals its violence from the view of his readers. Such then being the characters of the writers who have handed down to us the history of the church in this important period, I could not follow any one of them as a sure or constant guide in all the events they relate, the judgments they form, or the characters they describe. I have not, however, been destitute of a clue to conduct me through the various windings of this intricate labyrinth. The testimonies of ancient authors, with several manuscripts that have never yet been published, such as the Diplomas of the pontiffs and emperors, the Acts of the Inquisition, and other records of that kind, are the authentic sources from which I have drawn my accounts of many things that have been very imperfectly represented by other historians.

[b] See Trithemius, An. Hirsaug. t. ii. p. 74, though this author is defective in several respects, and more especially in his accounts of the origin and sentiments of the Fratricelli. It is also to be observed, that he confounds, through the whole of his history, the sects and orders of this century one with another, in the most ignorant and unskilful manner. See rather Du Boulay, His. Acad. Paris. t. iii. p. 541, where the edict published in 1297, by Boniface VIII. against the Bizochi or Beghards, is inserted; as also Jordani Chronicon, in Muratorii Antiq. Italiæ, tom. iv. p. 1020.

[c] The Fratricelli resembled the Spirituals in many of their maxims and observances: they, however, were a distinct body, and differed from them in various respects. The Spirituals, for instance, continued to hold communion with the rest of the Franciscans, from whom they differed in points of considerable moment, nor did they ever pretend to erect themselves into a particular and distinct order; the Fratricelli, on the contrary, renounced all communion with the Franciscans, and, withdrawing their obedience from the superiors of that society, chose for themselves a new chief, under whom they formed a new and separate order. The Spirituals did not absolutely oppose their order's possessing certain goods jointly and in common, provided they renounced all property in these goods, and confined their pretensions to the mere use of them; whereas the Fratricelli rejected every kind of possession, whether personal or in common, and embraced that absolute poverty and want which St. Francis had prescribed in his Rule and in his last Testament. We omit the mention of less important differences.

[d] The accounts of the Fratricelli, that are given by ancient and modern writers, even by those who pretend to the greatest exactness, are extremely confused and uncertain. Trithemius, in his Annal. Hirsaug. tom. ii. p. 74, affirms, that they derived their origin from Tanchelinus, and thus ignorantly confounds them with the Catharists and other sects that arose in those times. The Franciscans leave no means unemployed to clear themselves from all relation to this society, and to demonstrate that such a pestilential and impious sect, as that of the Fratricelli, did not derive their origin from the order of St. Francis. In consequence of this, they deny that the Fratricelli professed the Franciscan rule; and maintain, on the contrary, that the society which was distinguished by this title was a heap of rabble, composed of persons of all kinds and all religions, whom Herman Pongilup, toward the conclusion of this century, assembled at Ferrara, and erected into a distinct order. See Wadding's Annal. Minor. tom. vi. p. 279. This author employs all his eloquence to defend his order from the infamous reproach of having given rise to that of the Fratricelli; but his efforts are vain; for he acknowledges, and even proves by unquestionable authorities, that this hated sect professed and observed, in the most rigorous manner, the rule of St. Francis; and nevertheless, he denies that they were Franciscans; by which he means, and indeed can only mean, that they were not such Franciscans as those who lived in subjection to the general of the order, and adopted the interpretation which the popes had given of the rule of their founder. All Wadding's boasted demonstration, therefore, comes to no more than this, that the Fratricelli were Franciscans who separated themselves from the grand order of St. Francis, and rejected the authority of the general of that order, and the laws and interpretations, together with the jurisdiction of the pontiffs; and this no mortal ever took into his head to deny. Hermannus, or (as he is called by many) Armannus Pongilup, whom Wadding and others consider as the parent of the Fratricelli, lived in this century at Ferrara, in the highest reputation for his extraordinary piety; and when he died, in 1269, he was interred with the greatest pomp and magnificence in the principal church of that city. His memory was, for a long time, honoured with a degree of veneration equal to that which is paid to the most illustrious saints, and it was supposed that the Supreme Being bore testimony to his emi-

companions and associates, a set of men, who observed the third rule that was prescribed by St. Francis, and were therefore commonly called Tertiaries;[a] so likewise the order of the Fratricelli, who were desirous of being considered as the only genuine followers of St. Francis, had a great number of Tertiaries attached to their cause. These half-monks were called, in Italy, *Bizochi* and *Bocasoti;* in France, *Beguins;* and in Germany *Begwards*, or *Beghards*, which last was the denomination by which they were commonly known in almost all places.[b] They differed from the Fratricelli, not in their opinions and doctrines, but only in their manner of living.

nent sanctity by various miracles. But, as Pongilup had been suspected of heresy by the Inquisitors of Heretical Depravity, on account of the peculiar austerity of his life, which resembled that of the Catharists, they made, even after his death, such an exact and scrupulous inquiry into his maxims and morals, that, many years after he was laid low in the grave, his impiety was detected and published to the world. Hence it was, that, in 1300, his tomb was destroyed; his bones were dug up, and burned by the order of Boniface VIII., and the multitude effectually cured of the enthusiastic veneration they had for his memory. The judicial acts of this remarkable event are recorded by Muratori, in his Antiquit. Italic. medii Ævi, tom. v. p. 93—147, and it appears evidently from them, that those learned men, who consider Pongilup as the founder of the order of the Fratricelli, have fallen into a gross error. So far was he from being the founder of this sect, that he was dead before it was in existence. The truth is, that this famous enthusiast was a Catharist, infected with Paulician or Manichean principles, and a member of the sect entitled *bagnolists*, from a town of that name in Provence, where they resided. Some modern writers, indeed, have seen so far into the truth, as to perceive that the Fratricelli were a separate branch of the rigid and austere Franciscans; but they err in this, that they consider them as the same sect with the Beghards or Beguins, under a different denomination. Such is the opinion adopted by Limborch, (in his Hist. Inquisit. lib. i. cap. xix.) who seems to have been very little acquainted with the matters now under consideration; by Baluze, in his Miscellan. tom. i. p. 195, and Vit. Pontif. Avenionens. tom. i. p. 509; by Beausobre, in his Dissertation concerning the Adamites, subjoined to the History of the Wars of the Hussites, p. 389; and by Wadding, in his Annal. Minor. tom. v. p. 376. But, notwithstanding the authorities of these learned men, it is certain, as we shall show in its place, that there was a real difference between the Fratricelli and the Beghards, not indeed with respect to their opinions, but in their rule of discipline and their manner of life.

The principal cause of the errors that have obscured the history of the Fratricelli, is the ambiguity in the denomination of their order. *Fratricellus* or *Fraterculus* (Little Brother) was an Italian nick-name, or term of derision, that was applied in this century to all those who, without belonging to any of the religious orders, effected a monkish air in their clothing, their carriage, and their manner of living, and assumed a sanctimonious aspect of piety and devotion. See Villani, Istorie Florentine, lib. viii. c. 84.—Imola in Dantem, p. 1121, in Muratori's Antiq. Ital. tom. i. And as there were many vagabonds of this kind during this century, it happened that the general term of *Fratricelli* was applied to them all, though they differed considerably from one another in their opinions and in their methods of living. Thus the Catharists, the Waldenses, the Apostles, and many other sects who had invented new opinions in religion, were marked with this denomination by the multitude; while the writers of foreign nations, unacquainted with this ludicrous application of the word, were puzzled in their inquiries after the sect of the Fratricelli, (who had given so much trouble to the Roman pontiffs,) were even led into the grossest mistakes, and imagined, at one time, that this order was that of the Catharists; at another, that it was the sect of the Waldenses, &c. But, in order to have distinct ideas of this matter, it must be considered that the word *Fraterculus*, or Little Brother, bore a quite different sense from the ludicrous one now mentioned, when it was applied to the austere part of the Franciscans, who maintained the necessity of observing, in the strictest manner, the rule of their founder. Instead of being a nick-name, or a term of derision when applied to them, it was an honourable denomination in which they delighted, and which they preferred infinitely to all other titles. The import of *Fratricelli* corresponds with Friars-Minors; and every one knows, that the latter appellation was adopted by the Franciscans, as an expression of their extraordinary humility and modesty. In assuming this title, therefore, these monks did not, properly speaking, assume a new name, but only translated the ancient name of their order into the Italian language; for those whom the Latins called *Fratres Minores*, the Italians called *Fratricelli*. Of the many proofs we might draw from the best authors in favour of this account of the matter, we shall only allege one, from the Life of Thom. Aquinas, by Gulielmus de Thoco in Actis Sanctor. Martii, tom. i. cap. ii. sect. xxi. "Destruxit (says that biographer) er tertium pestiferum pravitatis errorem S. Thomas - - - cujus sectatores simul et inventores *se nominant fratercules de vitâ paupere*, ut etiam sub hoc humilitatis sophistico nomine simplicium corda seducant - - - contra quem errorem pestiferum Johannes papa XXII. mirandam edidit decretalem."

Now this very Decretal of John XXII. against the Fratricelli, which Thoco calls admirable, is, to mention no other testimonies, a sufficient and satisfactory proof of what I have affirmed in relation to that sect. In this act (which is to be seen in the Extravagantia Joh. XXII. Corp. Juris Canon. tom. ii. p. 1112, edit. Bohmer) the pontiff expresses himself thus: "Nonnulli profanæ multitudinis viri, qui vulgariter Fraticelli seu Fratres de paupere vitâ, Bizochi, sive Beguini, nuncupantur in partibus Italiæ, in insulâ Siciliæ - - - - publicè mendicare solent." He afterwards divides the Fratricelli into monks and tertiaries, or (which amounts to the same thing, as we shall show in its place) into Fratricelli and Beguins. With respect to the Fratricelli, properly so called, he expresses himself thus: "Plurimi regulam seu ordinem Fratrum Minorum - - - - se profiteri ad literam conservare confingunt, prætendentes se a sanctæ memoriæ Cœlestino Papâ Quinto, prædecessore nostro, hujus status seu vitæ privilegium habuisse. Quod tamen etsi ostenderent, non valeret, cum Bonifacius papa octavus ex certis causis rationabilibus omnia ab ipso Cœlestino concessa - - - - viribus penitus evacuaverit." Here he describes clearly those Fratricelli, who, separating themselves from the Franciscans with a view to observe more strictly the rule of St. Francis, were erected into a distinct order by Celestin V. And in the following passage he characterises, with the same perspicuity, the Bizochi and Beguins, who entitled themselves of the third order of the penitents of St. Francis: "Nonnulli ex ipsis asserentes se esse de tertio ordine beati Francisci pœnitentium vocato, prædictum statum et ritum eorum sub velamine talis nominis satagunt palliare."

[a] Beside two very austere rules drawn up by St. Francis, the one for the Friars-Minors, and the other for the Poor Sisters, called *Clarisses*, from St. Clara their founder, this famous chief drew up a third, whose demands were less rigorous, for such as, without abandoning their worldly affairs or resigning their possessions, were disposed to enter with certain restrictions into the Franciscan order, and desirous of enjoying the privileges annexed to it. This rule prescribed fasting, continence, hours of devotion and prayer, mean and dirty apparel, gravity of manners, and things of that nature; but neither prohibited contracting marriage, accumulating wealth, filling civil employments, nor attending to worldly affairs. All the Franciscan historians have given accounts of this third rule, more especially Wadding, Annal. Min. tom. ii.—Helyot Hist. des Ordres, tom. vii. They who professed this third rule, were called *Friars of the Penance of Christ*, and sometimes also, on account of the meanness of their garments, *Brethren of the Sack;* but they were more generally known by the denomination of *Tertiaries*. The greatest part of the religious orders of the church of Rome imitated this institution of St. Francis, as soon as they perceived the various advantages that were deducible from it. And hence, at this day, these orders continue to have their Tertiaries.

[b] The Tertiaries that were connected with the order of the Fratricelli, arose about the year 1296, in the marquisate of Ancona and the neighbouring countries, and were called Bizochi, as we learn from the edict issued against them, in 1297, by Boniface VIII., and published by Du Boulay, in his Historia, Acad. Paris, tom. iii. p. 541. They are mentioned under the same title by John XXII. in the bull already cited. Add to all these authorities, that of the learned Du-Fresne, who, in his Glossar. Latinit. mediæ, observes, that this denomination is derived from *Bizochus*, which signifies in French *une Besace*, i. e. *a sack* or *wallet*, such as beggars in general, and these holy beggars in particular, were accustomed to carry about with them. The term *Bocasotus*, (or *Vocasotus*, as Du-Boulay writes it,) has without doubt the same origin, and bears the same signification. It is used by Jordan, in his Chronicle, from which we shall cite a remarkable passage in the following note. The denominations of *Beghards* and *Beguins*, given to the Tertiaries in France and Italy, are very frequently met with in the ecclesiastical history of the middle ages. The accounts, however, which both ancient and modern writers generally give of these famous names, are so uncertain, and so different from each other, that we need not be surprised to find the history of the Beghards and Beguins involved in greater perplexity and darkness, than any other part of the ecclesiastical annals of the period now mentioned. It is therefore my present object to remove this perplexity, and dispel this darkness as far as that can be done in the short space to which I am confined, and to disclose the true origin of these denominations.

The words *Beghard* or *Beggehard*, *Begutta*, *Beghinus*, and *Beghina*, which only differ in their terminations, have all one and the same sense. The German and Belgic nations wrote *Beghard* and *Begutte*, which terminations are extremely common in the language of the ancient Germans. But the French substituted the Latin termination for the German, and changed *Beghard* into *Beghinus* and *Beghina;* so that those who in Holland and Germany were called *Beghard* and *Begutte*, were denominated, in France, *Beghini* and *Beghinæ*. Even in Germany and Holland, the Latin termination was gradually introduced instead of the German, particularly in the feminine term *Begutta*, of which change

The Fratricelli were real monks, subjected to the rule of St. Francis; while the Bizochi or Beguins, if we except their sordid habit, and certain observances and maxims, which they followed in consequence of the injunctions of the famous saint above mentioned, lived after the manner of other men, and were therefore considered in no other light, than as seculars and laymen.[a] It is, however, to be observed, that the Bizochi were divided into two classes, which derived their respective denominations of *perfect* and *imperfect*, from the different degrees of austerity that they discovered in their manner of living. The perfect lived upon alms, abstained from wedlock, and had no fixed habitations. The imperfect, on the contrary had their houses, wives, and possessions, and were engaged, like the rest of their fellow-citizens, in the various affairs of life.[b]

XLI. We must not confound these Beguins and Beguines, who derived their origin from an austere branch of the Franciscan order, with the German and Belgic Beguines, who crept out of their obscurity in this century, and multiplied prodigiously in a very short time.[c] Their origin was of earlier date than this century;

we might allege several probable reasons, if this were the proper place for disquisitions of that nature. There are many different opinions concerning the origin and signification of these terms, which it would be too tedious to mention, and still more so to refute. Besides, I have done this in a large work concerning the Beghards, wherein I have traced out, with the utmost pains and labour, (from records, the greatest part of which had never before seen the light,) the history of all the sects to whom these names have been given, and have, at the same time, detected the errors into which many learned men have fallen, in treating this part of the history of the church. At present, therefore, setting aside many opinions and conjectures, I shall confine myself to a brief inquiry into the true origin and signification of these words. They are undoubtedly derived from the old German word *beggen* or *beggeren*, which signifies to seek any thing with importunity, zeal, and earnestness. In joining to this word the syllable *hard*, which is the termination of many German words, we have the term *Beggehard*, which is applicable to a person who asks any thing with ardour and importunity; and, therefore, common mendicants, in the ancient German language, were called *Beghard*, from which the English word *beggar* is manifestly derived. *Begutta* signifies a female beggar.—When Christianity was introduced into Germany, the word *beggen*, or *beggeren*, was used in a religious sense, and expressed the act of devout and fervent prayer to the Supreme Being. Accordingly, we find, in the Gothic translation of the Four Gospels attributed to Ulphilas, the word *beggen* employed to express the duty of the earnest and fervent prayer. Hence, when any person distinguished himself from others by the frequency and fervour of his devotional service, he was called a *Beghard*, i. e. *a devout man*; and the denomination of *Begutta* was given in the same sense, to women of uncommon piety. And as they who distinguished themselves from others by the frequency of their prayers, thus assumed a more striking air of external devotion than the rest of their fellow-Christians, all those who were ambitious of appearing more religious and devout than their neighbours, were called *Beghardi* or *Beguttæ*.

The observations we have hitherto made with respect to the origin and signification of the words in question, will serve as a clue to rescue the attentive reader from that labyrinth of difficulties in which the subject has been involved. They will also enable him to account for the prodigious multitudes of Beghards and Beguins that sprang up in Europe in the thirteenth century, and will show him how it happened, that these denominations were given to above 30 sects or orders, which differed widely from each other in their opinions, discipline, and manner of living. The original signification of the word *Beghard*, (or *Beggert*, as it was pronounced by the common people,) was *importunate beggar*. Therefore, when the people saw certain persons, not only embracing with resignation, but also with the most voluntary choice, and under a pretext of devotion, the horrors of absolute poverty, begging their daily bread from door to door, and renouncing all their worldly possessions and occupations, they called all such persons *Beghards*, or, if they were women, *Beguttes*, without considering the variety of opinions and maxims by which they were distinguished. The sect called *Apostles*, the rigid Franciscans, the *brethren of the free spirit* (of whom we shall speak hereafter,) all embraced this sordid state of beggary; and though among these orders there was not only a wide difference, but even the greatest opposition, the Germans called them indiscriminately *Beghards*, from the miserable state which they had all embraced. Nor is this to be wondered at; the character which they possessed in common was striking, while the sentiments and maxims that divided them escaped the observation of the multitude.

But the word *Beghard* acquired a second, and a new signification, in this century, being employed, as we have already observed, to signify a person who prayed with uncommon frequency, and who distinguished himself from those about him by an extraordinary appearance of piety. The force of this term, in its new signification, is the same with that of the word *Methodist*, which is at present the denomination of a certain sect of fanatics in Great-Britain. Such, therefore, as departed from the manner of living that was usual among their fellow-citizens, and distinguished themselves by the gravity of their aspect and the austerity of their manners, were comprehended under the general denomination of *Beghards* and *Beguttes* in *Germany*, and of *Beguins* and *Beguines* in *France*. These terms, as we could show by many examples, comprehended at first even the monks and nuns; but, in process of time, they were confined to those who formed a sort of intermediate order between the monks and citizens, and who resembled the former in the manner of living, without assuming their name or contracting their obligations. The Tertiaries, therefore, or half-monks of the Dominican, Franciscan, and, in general, of all the religious orders, were called *Beghards*; for though, as lay-citizens, they belonged to the body politic, yet they distinguished themselves by their monkish dispositions, and their profession of extraordinary piety and sanctity of manners. The fraternity of weavers, the Brethren of St. Alexius, the followers of Gerard the Great, in a word, all who pretended to an uncommon degree of sanctity and devotion, were called *Beghards*, although they procured the necessaries of life by honest industry, without having recourse to the sordid trade of begging.

The denominations, therefore, of Beghards, Beguttes, Beguins, and Beguines, are rather honourable than otherwise, when we consider their origin; and they are mentioned as such, in several records and deeds of this century, whose authority is most respectable, particularly in the Testament of St. Louis, king of France. But, in the sequel, these terms lost gradually, as the case often happens, their primitive signification, and became marks of infamy and derision. For, among these religious beggars and these sanctimonious pretenders to extraordinary piety, there were many, whose piety was nothing more than the most senseless superstition; many, also, whose austere devotion was accompanied with opinions of a corrupt nature, entirely opposite to the doctrine of the church; and (what was still more horrible) many artful hypocrites, who, under the mask of religion, concealed the most abominable principles, and committed the most enormous crimes. These were the fools and knaves who brought the denomination of Beghard into disrepute, and rendered it both ridiculous and infamous; so that it was only employed to signify idiots, heretics, or hypocrites. The denomination of Lollards, of which sect we shall soon have occasion to speak, met with the same fate, and was rendered contemptible by the persons who masked their iniquity under that specious title.

[a] See the Acta Inquis. Tolos. published by Limborch, p. 298, 302, &c. Among the various passages of ancient writers, which tend to illustrate the history of the Fratricelli and Beguins, I shall quote only one, which is to be found in Jordan's Chronicon, published by Muratori, in his Antiq. Ital. medii Ævi, tom. iv. p. 1020, and confirms almost every thing we have said upon that head; anno 1294. "Petrus de Macerata et Petrus de Forosempronio apostatæ fuerunt ordinis Minorum et hæretici. His petentibus eremitice vivere, ut regulam B. Francisci ad literam servare possent; quibus plures Apostatæ adhæserunt, qui statum communitatis damnabant et declarationes regulæ, et vocabant se Fratres S. Francisci (he ought to have said *Fratricellos*) Sæculares, (i. e. the Tertiaries, who were the friends and associates of the Fratricelli, without quitting, however, their secular state, or entering into the monastic order;) Sæculares autem vocârunt Bizocios aut Fratricellos vel Bocasotos." Jordan, however, errs in affirming, that the Sæculares were called Fratricelli; for the latter name belonged only to the true monks of St. Francis, and not to the Tertiaries. The other circumstances of this account are exact, and show that the more austere professors of the Franciscan rule were divided into two classes, namely, friars and seculars, and that the latter were called *Bizochi*. "Ii dogmatizabant, quod nullus summus pontifex regulam B. Francisci declarare potuit. Item, quod angelus abstulit a Nicolao tertio papatûs auctoritatem . . . Et quod ipsi soli sunt in viâ Dei et vera ecclesia," &c.

[b] This division is mentioned, or supposed by several authors, and more especially in the Acta Inquisit. Tolosanæ, p. 303, &c.

[c] In the seventeenth century, there was a great debate carried on in the Netherlands on this subject. In the course of this controversy it was proved, by the most authentic and unexceptionable records and diplomas, that, so early as the eleventh and twelfth centuries, there had been several societies of Beguines established in Holland and Flanders. It is true, that no more than three of these authentic acts were produced; the first was drawn up in 1065, the second in 1129, the third in 1151; and they were all three drawn up at Vilvorden by the Beguines. See Aub. Miræus, Opera Diplomatico-historica, tom. ii. c. xxvi. p. 948, and tom. iii. p. 623.—Erycius Puteanus, de Beghinarum apud Belgas Instituto. This treatise of Puteanus is to be found with another of the same au-

but it was only now that they acquired a name, and made a noise in the world. Their primitive establishment was, undoubtedly, the effect of virtuous dispositions and upright intentions. A certain number of pious women, both virgins and widows, in order to maintain their integrity, and preserve their principles from the contagion of a vicious and corrupt age, formed themselves into societies, each of which had a fixed place of residence, and lived under the inspection and government of a female head. Here they divided their time between exercises of devotion, and works of honest industry, reserving to themselves the liberty of entering into the state of matrimony, as also of quitting the convent, whenever they thought proper. And as all those among the female sex, who made extraordinary professions of piety and devotion, were distinguished by the title of *Beguines*, (i. e. persons who were uncommonly assiduous in prayer,) that title was given to the women of whom we are now speaking.[a] The first regular society of this kind that we read of, was formed at Nivelle in Brabant, in 1226;[b] and it was followed by so many institutions of a like nature in France, Germany, Holland, and Flanders, that, toward the middle of the thirteenth century, there was scarcely a city of any note, that had not its *beguinage*, or *vineyard*, as it was sometimes called in conformity to the style of the Song of Songs.[c] All these female societies were not governed by the same laws; but, in the greatest part of them, the hours that were not devoted to prayer, meditation, or other religious exercises, were employed in weaving, embroidering, and other manual labours. The poor, sick, and disabled Beguines, were supported by the pious liberality of such opulent persons as were friends to the order.

XLII. This female institution was soon imitated in Flanders by the other sex; and considerable numbers of unmarried men, both bachelors and widowers, formed themselves into communities of the same kind with those of the Beguines, under the inspection and government of a certain chief, and with the same religious views and purposes; reserving to themselves, however, the liberty of returning to their former mode of life.[d] These pious persons were, in the style of this age, called *Beghards*, and (by a corruption of that term usual among the Flemish and Dutch) *Bogards;* from others they received the denomination of *Lollards:* in France they were distinguished at first by that of *Bons Valets*, or *Bons Garçons*, and afterwards by that of *Beguins:* they were also styled the *Fraternity of Weavers*, from the trade which the greatest part of them exercised. The first Beghard society seems to have been that which was established at Antwerp in 1228; and this establishment was followed by many similar associations in Germany, France, Holland, and Flanders, though, after all their success, their congregations were less numerous than those of the Beguines.[e] It is worthy of observation, that the Roman pontiffs never honoured the societies of the Beghards and Beguines with their solemn or explicit approbation, or confirmed their establishments by the seal of their authority. They, however, granted them a full toleration, and even defended them often against the stratagems and violence of their enemies, who were many in number. This appears by the edicts in favour of the Beghards, which the pontiffs granted in compliance with the solicitations of many illustrious personages, who wished well to that society. It did not, however, continue always to flourish. The greatest part of the convents, both of the Beghards and Beguines, are now either demolished, or converted to other uses. In Flanders, indeed, a considerable number of the latter still subsist, but few of the former are to be found in any country.

XLIII. After the accounts hitherto given of the rulers of the church, and of the religious orders that were instituted or became famous during this century, it will not be improper to conclude this chapter, by mentioning briefly the Greek and Latin writers, who, during the same period, acquired fame by their learned productions. The most eminent among the Greeks were,

Nicetas Acominatus, who composed a work, entitled the History and Treasure of the Orthodox Faith;

Germanus, the Grecian patriarch, of whom we have yet extant, among other productions of less note, a Book against the Latins, and an Exposition of the Greek Liturgy;

Theodorus Lascaris, who left behind him several treatises upon various subjects of a religious nature, and who also entered the lists against the Latins, which was the reigning passion among such of the Greeks as were endowed with tolerable parts, and were desirous of showing their zeal for the honour of their nation;

Nicephorus Blemmida, who employed his talents in the salutary work of healing the divisions between the Greeks and Latins;

Arsenius, whose Synopsis of the Canon Law of the Greeks is far from being contemptible;

thor, and upon the same subject, in a work entitled Josephi Geldolphi à Ryckel Vita S. Beggæ, cum Adnotationibus, p. 65—227. Duaci, 1631. Now, though we grant that those writers have not fallen into an error who place the rise of the Beguines in the twelfth or thirteenth century, yet the small number of authentic records, which they have to produce in favour of their antiquity, is an incontestable proof of the obscurity in which they lay concealed before the time in which these authors placed their origin, and may render it almost probable, that the only convent of Beguines, that existed before the thirteenth century, was that of Vilvorden.

[a] All the Beghards and Beguines that yet remain in the Netherlands, where their convents have almost entirely changed their ancient and primitive form, affirm unanimously, that both their name and institution derive their origin from St. Begghe, duchess of Brabant, and daughter of Pepin, mayor of the palace of the king of Austrasia, who lived in the seventh century. This lady, therefore, they consider as their patroness, and honour her as a kind of tutelar divinity with the deepest sentiments of veneration and respect. See Jos. Geld. à Ryckel, Vit. S. Beggæ, a work of great bulk and little merit, and full of the most silly and insipid fables.—Those who are not well-wishers to the cause of the Beguines, adopt a quite different account of their origin, which they deduce from Lambert le Begue, a priest and native of Liege, who lived in the twelfth century, and was much esteemed for his eminent piety. The learned Peter Coens, canon of Antwerp, has defended this opinion with more erudition than any other writer, in his Disquisitio Historica de Origine Beghinarum et Beghinagiorum in Belgio, Leod. 1672.

☞ [b] Other historians say, in 1207.

[c] See Matth. Paris, Histor. Major, ad An. 1243 and 1250, p. 540, 696. —Thomas Cantipratensis in Bono Universali de Apibus, lib. ii. cap. li. —Pet. de Herenthal, in his Annals, from which we have a very remarkable passage cited by Jos. Geld. à Ryckel, in his *Observationes ad Vitam S. Beggæ*, sect. cxcvi. The origin and charters of the convents of Beguines, that were founded during this and the following century in Holland and Flanders, are treated in an ample manner by Aub. Miræus, in his Opera Historico-diplomatica, John Bapt. Grammaye, in his Antiquitates Belgicæ, Anton. Sanders, in his Brabantia et Flandria illustrata, and by other writers of the Belgic history.

[d] Matth. Paris, Hist. Major, ad An. 1253.

[e] See Ryckelii Vita S. Beggæ, p. 635.—Ant. Sanderi Flandria Illustrata, lib. iii. c. xvi. Jo. Bapt. Grammaye's Antiquit. Fland. p. 22.—Aub. Miræi Opera Diplom. Hist. tom. iii. c. clxviii.—Helyot, Hist. des Ordres, tom. vii. p. 248, who is nevertheless chargeable with many errors. —Gerardus Antoninus, Pater Minister (so the head of the order is called in our times) Beghardorum Antwerpiensium, in Epistola ad Ryckium de Beghardorum origine et fatis, in Ryckelii Vita S. Beggæ, p. 489. This author, indeed, from a spirit of partiality to his order, conceals the truth designedly in various places.

Georgius Acropolita, who acquired a high degree of renown, not only by his historical writings, but also by the transactions and negotiations in which he was employed by the emperor Michael;

Johannas Beccus or Veccus, who involved himself in much trouble, and excited the odium of many, by defending the cause of the Latins against his own nation with too much zeal;

George Metochita, and Constantine Meliteniota, who employed, without success, their most earnest efforts to bring about a reconciliation between the Greeks and Latins;

George Pachymeres, who acquired reputation by his commentary upon Dionysius, the pretended chief of the mystics, and by a history which he composed of his own time; and,

George the Cyprian, whose hatred of the Latins, and warm opposition to Veccus above-mentioned, rendered him more famous than all his other productions.[a]

XLIV. The prodigious number of Latin writers that appeared in this century, renders it impossible for us to mention them all; we shall therefore confine our account to those among them, who were the most eminent, and whose theological writings demand most frequently our notice in the course of this history. Such were,

Joachim, abbot of Flora in Calabria, who was a man of mean parts and of a weak judgment, full of enthusiastic and visionary notions, but was esteemed for his piety and supposed knowledge, and was even considered, during his life and after his death, by the miserable and blinded multitude, as a prophet sent from above. The pretended prophecies of this silly fanatic are abundantly known, and have been frequently published;[b]

Stephen Langton, archbishop of Canterbury, who wrote commentaries upon the greatest part of the books of Scripture;[c]

Francis, the founder of the famous society of Friars-minors, or Franciscans, whose writings were designed to touch the heart, and excite pious and devout sentiments, but discover little genius, and less judgment.

Alan de l'Isle, a logician, who made no mean figure among the disputatious tribe; who applied himself also to the study of chemistry, and published several moral discourses, in which are many wise and useful exhortations and precepts;[d]

Jacobus de Vitriaco, who acquired a name by his Oriental History; and Jacobus de Voragine, whose History of the Lombards[e] was received with applause.

The writers of this century, who obtained the greatest renown on account of their laborious researches in what was called philosophical or dialectical theology, were Albertus Magnus, Thomas Aquinas, and Bonaventura, who respectively possessed an inquisitive turn of mind, and a sublime and penetrating genius, accompanied with an uncommon talent of exploring the most hidden truths, and treating with facility the most abstruse subjects, though they are all chargeable with errors and reveries that do little honour to their memories.[f] The other writers, who trod the same intricate paths of metaphysical divinity, were many in number, and several of them were justly admired, though much inferior in renown to the celebrated triumvirate now mentioned; such were Alexander Hales, the interpreter of Aristotle, William of Paris,[g] Robert Capito,[h] Thomas Cantipratensis, John of Peckham, William Durand, Roger Bacon,[i] Richard Middleton, Giles de Columna, Armand de Bello-Visu, and several others.

Hugo de St. Caro gained much applause by his Concordance of the Holy Bible.[k]

Guillaume de St. Amour carried on with great spirit and resolution, but with little success, a literary and theological war against those friars who looked upon begging as a mark of sanctity.

Humbert de Romanis drew up a system of rules and precepts, with a view of subjecting to a better regulation the lives and manners of the monastic orders.

William Perald arose in this century to a high degree of literary renown, in consequence of a system of morals he published under the title of Summa Virtutum et Vitiorum.[l]

Raymond Martin yet survives the oblivion that has covered many of his contemporaries; and his *Pugio Fidei*, or Sword of Faith, which he drew against the Jews and Saracens, has escaped the ruins of time.

John of Paris deserves an eminent rank among the glorious defenders of truth, liberty, and justice, since he maintained the authority of the civil powers, and the majesty of kings and princes, against the ambitious stratagems and usurpations of the Roman pontiffs, and declared openly his opposition to the opinion that was commonly adopted with respect to the sacrament of the Lord's supper, and the presence of Christ in that holy ordinance.[m]

CHAPTER III.

Concerning the Doctrine of the Christian Church, during this Century.

I. HOWEVER numerous and deplorable were the corruptions and superstitious abuses which had hitherto reigned in the church, and deformed the beautiful simpli-

[a] For a more ample account of all these writers, the reader may consult the Bibliotheca Græca of Fabricius.

[b] The life of Joachim was written in Italian by Gregory di Lauro, and published at Naples in 1660. The first edition of his prophecies appeared at Venice, in 1517; and it was followed by several new editions, to satisfy the curiosity of the populace, great and small.

☞ [c] Langton was a learned and polite author for the age in which he lived. To him we are indebted for the division of the Bible into chapters. He wrote commentaries upon all the books of the Old Testament, and upon St. Paul's Epistles.

[d] Several of the name of Alan lived in this century, who have been strangely confounded, both by ancient and modern writers. See Jaq. le Bœuf, Memoires sur l'Hist. d'Auxerre, tom. i. and Dissert. sur l'Hist. Civil. et Eccles. de Paris, tom. ii.

[e] Jac. Echardi Scriptor. Domin. t. i.—Bollandi Præf. ad Acta Sanctor.

[f] For an account of Albert, see Echard. Script. Dom. tom. i.—For an account of Thomas Aquinas, who was called the *Angel of the Scholastics* among other splendid titles, see the Acta Sanctorum, tom. i. and Ant. Touron, *Vie de St. Thomas*, Paris, 1737.—We have also a circumstantial relation of whatever concerns the life, writings, and exploits of Bonaventura, the tutelar saint of the Lyonnois, in France, in the two following books, viz. Colonia's Histoire Literaire de la Ville de Lyon, tom. ii. and the Histoire de la Vie et du Culte de S. Bonaventure, par un Religieux Cordelier.

[g] See the Gallia Christiana, published by the Benedictines, tom. vii.

[h] Anthony Wood has given an ample account of Robert Capito, in his Antiquitat. Oxoniens. tom. i.

☞ [i] We are surprised to find Roger Bacon thrust here into a crowd of vulgar literati, since that great man, whose astonishing genius and universal learning have already been noticed, was in every respect superior to Albert and Bonaventura, two of the heroes of Dr. Mosheim's triumvirate.

☞ [k] Hugo de St. Caro, or St. Cher, composed also a very learned collection of the various readings of the Hebrew, Greek, and Latin manuscripts of the Bible. This work, which he entitled Correctorium Bibliæ, is preserved in manuscript in the Sorbonne Library. We must not forget to observe also, that his Concordance is the first that ever was compiled.

[l] See Colonia, Histoire Literaire de la Ville de Lyon, tom. ii. p. 322.

[m] We may learn his opinion concerning the eucharist from his trea-

city of the Gospel, they were nevertheless increased in this century, instead of being reformed; and the religion of Christ continued to suffer under the growing tyranny of fanaticism and superstition. The progress of reason and of truth was retarded among the Greeks and Orientals, by their immoderate aversion to the Latins, their blind admiration of whatever bore the stamp of antiquity, the indolence of their bishops, the stupidity of their clergy, and the calamities of the times. Among the Latins, many concurring causes united to augment the darkness of that cloud which had already been cast over the divine lustre of genuine Christianity. On the one hand, the Roman pontiffs could not bear the thought of any thing that might have even the remotest tendency to diminish their authority, or to encroach upon their prerogatives; and therefore they laboured assiduously to keep the multitude in the dark, and to blast every attempt that was made toward a reformation in the doctrine or discipline of the church. On the other hand, the school divines, among whom the Dominican and Franciscan monks made the greatest figure on account of their unintelligible jargon and subtlety, shed perplexity and darkness over the plain truths of religion by their intricate distinctions and endless divisions, and by that cavilling, quibbling, disputatious spirit, which is the mortal enemy both of truth and virtue. It is true that these scholastic doctors were not all equally chargeable with corrupting the truth; the most enormous and criminal corruptors of Christianity were those who led the multitude into the two following abominable errors: that it was in the power of man to perform, if he wished, a more perfect obedience than God required; and that the whole of religion consisted in an external air of gravity, and in certain composed bodily gestures.

II. It will be easy to confirm this general account of the state of religion by particular facts. In the fourth Lateran council, convoked by Innocent III., in 1215, and at which an extraordinary number of ecclesiastics were assembled,[a] that imperious pontiff, without deigning to consult any body, published no less than seventy laws or decrees, by which not only the authority of the popes and the power of the clergy were confirmed and extended, but also new doctrines, or *articles of faith*, were imposed upon Christians. Hitherto the opinions of the Christian doctors, concerning the *manner* in which the body and blood of Christ were *present* in the eucharist, were extremely different; nor had the church determined, by any clear and positive decree, the sentiment that was to be embraced in relation to that important matter. It was reserved for Innocent to put an end to the liberty, which every Christian had hitherto enjoyed, of interpreting this presence in the manner he thought most agreeable to the declarations of Scripture, and to decide in favour of the most absurd and monstrous doctrine that the phrensy of superstition was capable of inventing. This audacious pontiff pronounced the opinion, which is embraced at this day in the church of Rome with regard to that point, to be the only true and orthodox account of the matter; and he *had the honour* of introducing and establishing the use of the term *Transubstantiation*, which was hitherto absolutely unknown.[b] The same pontiff placed, by his own authority, among the duties prescribed by the divine laws, that of *auricular confession* to a priest; a confession that implied not only a general acknowledgment, but also a particular enumeration of the sins and follies of the penitent. Before this period several doctors, indeed, looked upon this kind of confession as a duty inculcated by divine authority; but this opinion was not publicly received as the doctrine of the church; for, though the confession of sin was justly deemed an essential duty, yet it was left to every Christian's choice, to make the confession mentally to the Supreme Being, or to express it in words to a spiritual confidant and director.[c] These two laws, which, by the authority of Innocent, were received as laws of God, and consequently adopted as laws of the church, occasioned a multitude of new injunctions and rites, of which not even the smallest traces are to be found in the sacred writings, or in the apostolic and primitive ages; and which were much more adapted to establish and extend the reign of superstition, than to open the eyes of the blinded multitude upon the enormous abuses of which it had been the source

III. There is nothing that will contribute more to convince us of the miserable state of religion in this century, and of the phrensy that prevailed in the devotion of these unhappy times, than the rise of the sect called *Flagellantes*, or *Whippers*, which sprang up in Italy, in 1260, and thence diffused itself through almost all the countries of Europe. The societies that embraced this new discipline, presented the most hideous and shocking spectacle that can well be conceived; multitudes, composed of persons of both sexes, and of all ranks and ages, ran through the public places of the most populous cities, and also through the fields and deserts, with whips in their hands, lashing their naked bodies with astonishing severity, filling the air with their wild shrieks, and beholding the firmament with an air of distraction, ferocity, and horror; and all this with a view to obtain the divine mercy for themselves and others, by their voluntary mortification and penance.[d] This method of appeasing the Deity was perfectly conformable to the notions of religion that generally prevailed in this century; nor did these fanatical Flagellators do any thing more, in this extravagant discipline, than practise the lessons which they had received from the monks, especially from the mendicant fanatics. Hence they attracted the esteem and veneration, not only of the populace, but also of their rulers, and were honoured and revered by all ranks and orders, on account of their extraordinary sanctity and virtue. Their sect, however, did not always continue in the same high degree of credit and reputation; for, though the primitive whippers were exemplary in point of morals, yet their societies were augmented, as might naturally be expected, by a turbulent and furious rabble, many of whom were infected with the most ridiculous and even impious opinions. Hence both the emperors and pontiffs thought proper to put an end to this religious phrensy, by declaring all devout flagellation contrary to the divine law, and prejudicial to the soul's eternal interests.

tise entitled Determinatio de S. Cœnâ, published at London, by the learned Dr. Allix, in 1686.—See also Echardi Scriptor. Dominican. tom. i. p. 501.—Baluzii Vitæ Pontif. Avenionens. tom. i.

[a] At this council there were present 412 bishops, 800 abbots and priors, beside the ambassadors of almost all the European princes.

[b] See Edm. Albertinus, de Eucharistia, lib. iii. p. 972.

[c] See the book of the learned Daille, concerning Auricular Confession.

[d] Christ. Schotgenii Historia Flagellantium.—Jaques Boileau, Histoire des Flagellans, chap. ix. We have also a lively picture of this fanatical discipline of the Whippers, exhibited in Martenne's Voyage Literaire de deux Benedictins, tom ii. with which the reader may compare Muratori's Antiq. Ital. medii Ævi, tom. vi.

IV. The Christian interpreters and commentators of this century differ very little from those of the preceding times. The greatest part of them pretended to draw from the depths of truth, (or rather of their imaginations,) what they called the *internal juice and marrow* of the Scriptures, i. e. their hidden and mysterious sense; and this they did with so little dexterity, so little plausibility and invention, that the greater part of their explications must appear insipid and nauseous to such as are not entirely destitute of judgment and taste. If our readers be desirous of a proof of the justice of this censure, or curious to try the extent of their patience, they have only to peruse the explications that have been given by Archbishop Langton, Hugh de St. Cher, and Antony of Padua, of the various books of the Old and New Testament. The mystic doctors carried this visionary method of interpreting Scripture to the greatest height, and displayed the most laborious industry, or rather the most egregious folly, in searching for mysteries, where reason and common sense could find nothing but plain and evident truths. They were too *penetrating* and *quick-sighted* not to perceive clearly in the holy scriptures all those doctrines that were agreeable to their idle and fantastic system. Nor were their adversaries, the schoolmen, entirely averse to this arbitrary and fanciful manner of interpretation, though their principal industry was employed rather in collecting the explications given by the ancient doctors, than in inventing new ones, as appears from the writings of Alexander Hales, William Alvernus, and Thomas Aquinas himself. We must not, however, omit observing, that the scholastic doctors in general, and more especially these now mentioned, had recourse often to the subtleties of logic and metaphysics, to assist them in their explications of the sacred writings. To facilitate the study and interpretation of these divine books, Hugh de St. Cher composed his Concordance,[a] and the Dominicans, under the eye of their supreme chief, the learned Jordan, gave a new edition of the Latin translation of the Bible, carefully revised and corrected from the ancient copies.[b] The Greeks contributed nothing that deserves attention toward the illustration of the Scriptures; the greatest part of which were expounded with great learning by Gregory Abulpharaj, that celebrated Syrian, whose erudition was famous throughout the east, and whom we have already had occasion to mention.[c]

V. Systems of theology and ethics were multiplied exceedingly in this century; and of those writers, who treated of the divine perfections and worship and of the practical rules of virtue and obedience, the number is too great to permit specification. All such as were endowed with any considerable degree of genius and eloquence, employed their labours upon these noble branches of sacred science, more especially the academical and public teachers, among whom the Dominicans and Franciscans held the most eminent rank. It is, indeed, unnecessary to mention the names, or enumerate the productions of these doctors, since whoever is acquainted with the characters and writings of Albert the Great, and Thomas Aquinas, will know every thing that is worthy of note in the rest, who were no more than their echoes. The latter of these truly great men, commonly called the Angel of the Schools, or the Angelic Doctor, sat unrivalled at the head of the divines of this century, and deservedly obtained the principal place among those who digested the doctrines of Christianity into a regular system, and illustrated and explained them in a scientific manner. For no sooner had his system, or *sum* of theology and morals, seen the light, than it was received almost universally with the highest applause, placed in the same rank with Lombard's famous Book of Sentences, and admitted as the standard of truth, and the great rule according to which the public teachers formed their plans of instruction, and the youth their methods of study. Some writers, indeed, have denied that Thomas was the author of the celebrated system that bears his name;[d] but the reasons which they allege in support of this notion are destitute of evidence and solidity.[e]

VI. The greatest part of these doctors followed Aristotle as their model, and made use of the logical and metaphysical principles of that subtle philosopher, in illustrating the doctrines of Christianity, and removing the difficulties with which some of them were attended. In their philosophical explications of the more sublime truths of that divine religion, they followed the hypothesis of the *Realists*,[f] which sect, in this century, was much more numerous and flourishing than that of the *Nominalists*, on account of the lustre and credit it derived from the authority of Thomas Aquinas and Albert, its learned and venerable patrons. Yet, notwithstanding all the subtlety and penetration of these irrefragable, seraphic, and angelic doctors, as they were usually styled, they often appeared wiser in their own conceit, than they were in reality, and frequently did little more than involve in greater obscurity the doctrines which they pretended to place in the clearest light. For, not to mention the ridiculous oddity of many of their expressions, the hideous barbarity of their style, and their extravagant and presumptuous desire of prying into matters that infinitely surpass the comprehension of short-sighted mortals, they were chargeable with defects in their manner of reasoning, which every true philosopher will, of all others, be most careful to avoid. For they neither defined their terms accurately, (and hence arose innumerable disputes merely about words,) nor did they divide their subjects with perspicuity and precision; and hence they generally treated it in a confused and unsatisfactory manner. The great Angelic Doctor himself, notwithstanding his boasted method, was defective in these respects; his definitions are often vague, or obscure, and his plans or divisions, though full of art, are frequently destitute of clearness and proportion.

VII. The method of investigating divine truth by reason and philosophy remarkably prevailed, and was followed with such ardour, that the number of those who, in conformity with the example of the ancient doctors, drew their systems of theology from the holy scriptures and the writings of the fathers, and who acquired on that account the name of *Biblicists*,[g] diminished from day to day. It is true, indeed, that several persons of eminent

[a] Echardi Scriptor. Ord. Prædicator. tom. i. p. 194.
[b] Rich. Simon, Crit. de la Bib. des Aut. Ecc. par M. Du-Pin, t. i. p. 341. Jos. Sim. Assemani Biblioth. Orient. Vatican, tom. ii. p. 177.
[c] See Jo. Launoii Traditio Ecclesæ circa Simoniam, p. 290.
[d] See Natalis Alexander, Histor. Eccles. Sæc. xiii. p. 391.—Echard and Quetif, Scriptor. Ordin. Prædicator. Sæc. xiii. tom. i. p. 293.—Ant. Touron, Vie de St. Thomas, p. 604.
[e] In the original we find Positivi in the margin, which is manifestly a fault; since the Positivi were quite opposite, in their method of teaching, to the schoolmen, and were the same with the Biblici mentioned in the following section. See above, Cent. xii. Part ii. Ch. iii. sect. viii.
[f] In the margin of the original, instead of *Biblicists*, which we find in the text, Dr. Mosheim has written *Sententiarii*, which is undoubtedly an oversight. The Sententiarii, or followers of Peter Lom-

piety,[a] and even some of the Roman pontiffs,[b] exhorted with great seriousness and warmth the scholastic divines, and more especially those of the university of Paris, to change their method of teaching theology, and (relinquishing their philosophical abstraction and subtlety) to deduce the sublime science of salvation from the holy scriptures with that purity and simplicity with which it was delivered by the inspired writers. But these admonitions and exhortations were without effect; the evil was too inveterate to admit a speedy remedy, and the passion for logic and metaphysics had become so general and so violent, that neither remonstrances nor arguments could check its presumption or allay its ardour. In justice however to the scholastic doctors, it is necessary to observe, that they did not neglect the dictates of the Gospel or the authority of tradition, though it is sufficiently proved, by what they drew from these two sources, that they had studied neither with much attention or application of mind.[c] And it is moreover certain, that, in process of time, they committed to others the care of consulting the sources now mentioned, and reserved to themselves the much-respected province of philosophy, and the intricate mazes of dialectical chicane. And, indeed, independent of their philosophical vanity, we may assign another reason for this method of proceeding, drawn from the nature of their profession, and the circumstances in which they were placed. For the greatest part of these subtle doctors were Dominican or Franciscan friars; and, as the monks of these orders had no possessions, not even libraries, and led, besides, wandering and itinerant lives, such of them as were ambitious of literary fame, and of the honours of authorship, were, for the most part, obliged to draw their materials from their own genius and memory, being destitute of all other succours.

VIII. The opinions which these philosophical divines instilled into the minds of the youth, appeared to the votaries of the ancient fathers highly dangerous and even pernicious; and hence they used their utmost efforts to stop the progress of these opinions, and to diminish the credit and influence of their authors. Nor was their opposition at all ill-grounded; for the subtle doctors of the school not only explained the mysteries of religion in a manner conformable to the principles of their presumptuous logic, and modified them according to the dictates of their imperfect reason, but also promoted the most impious sentiments and tenets concerning the Supreme Being, the material world, the origin of the universe, and the nature of the soul. And when it was objected to these sentiments and tenets, that they were in direct contradiction to the genius of Christianity, and to the express doctrines of Scripture, these scholastic quibblers had recourse, for a reply, or rather for a method of escape, to that perfidious distinction which has been frequently employed by modern deists,—that these tenets were philosophically true, and conformable to right reason, but that they were, indeed, theologically false, and contrary to the orthodox faith. This produced an open war between the Biblicists and the scholastic doctors; which was carried on with great warmth throughout the whole course of this century, particularly in the universities of Oxford and Paris, where we find the former loading the latter with the heaviest reproaches in their public acts and in their polemic writings, and accusing them of corrupting the doctrines of the Gospel, both in their public lessons, and in their private discourse.[d] Even St. Thomas himself was accused of holding opinions contrary to the truth; his orthodoxy, at least, was looked upon as extremely dubious by many of the Parisian doctors.[e] He accordingly saw a formidable scene of opposition arising against him, but had the good fortune to ward off the storm, and to escape untouched. Others, whose authority was less extensive, and whose names were less respectable, were treated with greater severity. The living were obliged to confess publicly their errors; and the memories of the dead, who had persevered in them to the last, were branded with infamy.

IX. But the most formidable adversaries the scholastic doctors had to encounter were the Mystics, who, rejecting every thing that bore the least resemblance to argumentation or dispute about matters of doctrine and opinion, confined their endeavours to the advancement of inward piety, and the propagation of devout and tender feelings, and thus acquired the highest degree of popularity. The people, who are much more affected with what touches their passions, than with what is only addressed to their reason, were attached to the Mystics in the warmest manner; and this gave such weight to the reproaches and invectives which they threw out against the schoolmen, that the latter thought it more prudent to disarm these favourites of the multitude by mild and submissive measures, than to return their reproaches with indignation and bitterness. They accordingly set themselves to flatter the Mystics, and not only extolled their sentimental system, but employed their pens in illustrating and defending it; they even associated it with the scholastic philosophy, though they were as different from each other as any two things could be. It is well known that Bonaventura, Albert the Great, Robert Capito, and Thomas Aquinas, contributed to this reconciliation between mysticism and dialectics by their learned labours, and even went so far as to write commentaries upon Dionysius, the chief of the Mystics, whom these subtle doctors probably looked upon with a secret contempt.

X Both the schoolmen and Mystics of this century treated, in their writings, of the obligations of morality, the duties of the Christian life, and of the means that were most adapted to preserve or deliver the soul from the servitude and contagion of vice; but their methods of

bard, who is considered as the father of the scholastic philosophy, are to be placed in the same class with the philosophical divines, mentioned in the preceding section, and were very different from the *Biblici*, both in their manner of thinking and teaching.

[a] See Du Boulay, Hist. Acad. Paris. tom. iii. p. 9, 129, 180.—Ant. Wood, Antiq. Oxoniens. tom. i. p. 91.

[b] See the famous epistle of Gregory IX. to the professors in the university of Paris, published in Du Boulay's Histor. Acad. Paris. tom. iii. The pontiff concludes that remarkable epistle with the following words: "Mandamus et strictè præcipimus, quatenus sine fermento mundanæ scientiæ doceatis theologicam puritatem, non adulterantes verbum Dei philosophorum figmentis . . . sed, contenti terminis a patribus institutis, mentes auditorum vestrorum fructu cœlestis eloquii saginetis, ut hauriant de fontibus Salvatoris."

[c] Faydit, Alteration du Dogme Theologique par la Philosophie d'Aristote, p. 289.—Richard Simon, Critique de la Bibliotheque des Auteurs Eccles. par M. Du-Pin. tom. i. p. 170.

[d] See Matth. Paris, Histor. Major, p. 541.—Boulay, Hist. Acad. Paris. tom. iii. p. 397, 430, &c.

[e] See J. Launoy, Histor. Gymnas. Navarreni, part iii. lib. iii. chap. cxvi. tom. iv. op. part i. p. 485.—Boulay, Histor. Acad. Paris. tom. iv. p. 204.—Petri Zorni Opuscula Sacra, tom. i. p. 445.—R. Simon, Lettres Choisies, tom. ii. p. 266.—Echardi Scriptor. Ordin. Prædicator. tom. i. p. 435.

handling these important subjects were, as may be easily conceived, entirely different. We may form an idea of mystical morality from the observations of George Pachymeres, upon the Writings of Dionysius, and from the Spiritual Institutes, or Abridgment of Mystic Theology, composed by Humbert de Romanis, of which productions the former was written in Greek, and the second in Latin. As to the scholastic moralists, they were principally employed in defining the nature of virtue and vice in general, and the characters of the various virtues and vices in particular; and hence a prodigious number of *sums*, or systematic collections *of virtues and vices*, appeared in this century. The schoolmen divided the virtues into two classes. The first comprehended the moral virtues, which differ, in no respect, from those which Aristotle recommended to his disciples. The second contained the theological virtues, which, in consequence of what St. Paul says, (1 Corinth. xiii. 13,) they made to consist in faith, hope, and charity. In explaining and illustrating the nature of the virtues comprehended in these two classes, they seemed rather to have in view the pleasures of disputing, than the design of instructing; and they exhausted all their subtlety in resolving difficulties which were of their own creation. Thomas Aquinas shone forth as a star of the first magnitude, though, like the others, he was often covered with impenetrable fogs. The second part of his famous *sum* was wholly employed in laying down the principles of morality, and in deducing and illustrating the various duties that result from them; and this part of his learned labour has had the honour and misfortune of passing through the hands of a truly prodigious number of commentators.

XI. It is absolutely necessary to observe here, that the moral writers of this and the following centuries must be read with the utmost caution, and with a perpetual attention to this circumstance, that, though they employ the same terms that we find in the sacred writings, yet they use them in a quite different sense from that which they really bear in these divine books. They speak of justice, charity, faith, and holiness; but, from the manner in which these virtues are illustrated by those quibbling sophists, they differ much from the amiable and sublime duties, which Christ and his disciples inculcated under the same denominations. A single example will be sufficient to render this evident beyond contradiction. A *pious* and *holy* man, according to the sense annexed by our Saviour to these terms, is one who consecrates his affections and actions to the service of the Supreme Being, and accounts it his highest honour and felicity, as well as his indispensable duty, to obey his laws. But, in the style of the moral writers of this age, that person was *pious* and *holy*, who deprived himself of his possessions to enrich the priesthood, to build churches, and found monasteries, and whose faith and obedience were so implicitly enslaved to the imperious dictates of the Roman pontiffs, that he believed and acted without examination, as these lordly directors thought proper to prescribe. Nor were the ideas which these writers entertained concerning *justice*, at all conformable to the nature of that virtue, as it is described in the holy scriptures, since in their opinion it was lawful to injure, revile, torment, persecute, and even put to death, a *heretic*, i. e. any person who refused to obey blindly the decrees of the pontiffs, or to believe all the absurdities which they imposed upon the credulity of the multitude.

XII. The writers of controversy in this century were more numerous than respectable. Nicetas Acominatus, who made a considerable figure among the Greeks, attacked all the different sects in his work entitled The Treasure of the Orthodox Faith; but he combated after the Grecian manner, and defended the cause which he had espoused, rather by the decrees of councils and the decisions of the fathers, than by the dictates of reason and the authority of Scripture. Raymond of Pennafort was one of the first among the Latins, who abandoned the unchristian method of converting infidels by the force of arms and the terrors of capital punishments, and who undertook to vanquish the Jews and Saracens by reason and argument.[a] This engaged in the same controversy a considerable number of able disputants, who were acquainted with the Hebrew and Arabic languages; among whom Raymond Martini, the celebrated author of the Sword of Faith,[b] is unquestionably entitled to the first rank. Thomas Aquinas also appeared with dignity among the Christian champions; and his book against the Gentiles[c] is far from being contemptible: nor ought we to omit mentioning a learned book of Alan de l'Isle, which was designed to refute the objections both of Jews and Pagans.[d] The writers, who handled other (more particular) branches of theological controversy, were far inferior to those now mentioned in genius and abilities; and their works seemed less calculated to promote the truth, than to render their adversaries odious.

XIII. The grand controversy between the Greek and Latin church, was still carried on; and all the efforts that were made, during this century, to bring it to a conclusion, proved ineffectual. Gregory IX. employed the ministry of the Franciscan monks to bring about an accommodation with the Greeks, and pursued with zeal this laudable purpose from the year 1232, to the end of his pontificate, but without the least appearance of success.[e] Innocent IV. embarked in the same undertaking, in 1247, and with that view sent John of Parma, with other Franciscan friars, to Nice; while the Grecian pontiff came in person to Rome, and was declared legate of the apostolic see.[f] But these previous acts of mutual civility and respect, which excited the hopes of such as longed for the conclusion of these violent discords, did not terminate in the reconciliation that was expected. New incidents arose to blast the influence of these salutary measures, and the flame of dissension gained new vigour. Under the pontificate of Urban IV., however, the aspect of things changed for the better, and the negotiations for peace were renewed with such success, as pro-

[a] Echard and Quetif apud Scriptores Ordinis Prædicator. tom. i. sect. xiii.

[b] Bayle's Dictionary, at the article Martini.—Pauli Colomesii Hispania Orient. p. 209.

[c] Jo. Alb. Fabricius, Delect. Argumentorum et Scriptor. pro veritate Relig. Christian. p. 270.

[d] Liber contra Judæos et Paganos.

[e] See Wadding, Annal. Minor. tom. ii. p. 279, 296; and Echard, Scriptor. Ordin. Prædicator. tom. i. p. 103, 911.—Add to these Matth Paris, Histor. Major, p. 386.

[f] See Baluzii Miscellan. tom. vii. p. 370, 388, 393, 497.—Wadding Annal. Minor. tom. iii. and iv.

mised a speedy conclusion of these unhappy divisions; for Michael Palæologus had no sooner driven the Latins out of Constantinople, than he sent ambassadors to Rome to declare his pacific intentions, that thus he might establish his disputed dominion, and gain over the Roman pontiff to his side.[a] But during the course of these negotiations, Urban's death left matters unfinished, and suspended once more the hopes and expectations of the public. Under the pontificate of Gregory X., proposals of peace were again made by the same emperor, who, after much opposition from his own clergy, sent ambassadors to the council of Lyons in the year 1274;[b] and these deputies, with the solemn consent of John Veccus, patriarch of Constantinople, and several Greek bishops, publicly agreed to the terms of accommodation proposed by the pontiff.[c] This re-union, however, was not durable; for the situation of affairs in Greece and Italy being changed some years after this convention, in such a manner as to deliver the former from all apprehensions of a Latin invasion, Andronicus, the son of Michael, assembled a council at Constantinople, in the palace of Blachernæ, A. D. 1284, in which, by a solemn decree, this ignominious treaty was annulled, and the famous Veccus, by whose persuasion and authority it had been concluded, was sent into exile.[d] This resolute measure, as may well be imagined, rendered the divisions more violent than they had been before the treaty was signed; and it was also followed by an open schism, and by the most unhappy discords among the Grecian clergy.

XIV. We pass over several controversies of a more private kind, and of inferior moment, which have nothing in their nature or circumstances to claim the attention of the curious; but we must not forget to observe that the grand dispute concerning the eucharist was still continued in this century, not only in France, but also in some other countries; for, though Innocent III. had, in the Lateran council of the year 1215, presumptuously placed *transubstantiation* among the avowed and regular doctrines of the Latin church, yet the authority of this decree was called in question by many, and several divines maintained the probability of the opinions that were opposed to that monstrous doctrine. Those indeed who, adopting the sentiments of Berenger, considered the bread and wine in no other light than as signs or symbols of the body and blood of Christ, did not venture either to defend or profess this opinion in a public manner; while many thought it sufficient to acknowledge what was termed a *real presence*, though they explained the *manner* of this presence quite otherwise than the doctrine of Innocent had defined it.[e] Among these, John, surnamed Pungens Asinus, a subtle doctor of the university of Paris, acquired an eminent and distinguished name, and without incurring the censure of his superiors, substituted *consubstantiation* for *transubstantiation* toward the conclusion of this century.

CHAPTER IV

Concerning the Rites and Ceremonies used in the Christian Church during this Century.

I. It would be endless to enumerate the additions that were made in this century to the external part of divine worship, in order to increase its pomp and render it more striking. These additions were produced in part by the public edicts of the Roman pontiffs, and partly by the private injunctions of the sacerdotal and monastic orders, who shared the veneration which was excited in the multitude by the splendour and magnificence of this religious spectacle. Instead of mentioning these additions, we shall only observe in general, that religion had now become a sort of a raree-show in the hands of the rulers of the church, who, to render its impressions more deep and lasting, thought proper to exhibit it in a striking manner to the external senses. For this purpose, at stated times, and especially upon the principal festivals, the miraculous dispensations of the divine wisdom in favour of the church, and the more remarkable events in the Christian history, were represented under allegorical figures and images, or rather in a kind of mimic show.[g] But these scenic representations, in which there was a motley mixture of mirth and gravity, these tragi-comical spectacles, though they amused and affected in a certain manner the gazing populace, were highly detrimental, instead of being useful to the cause of religion; they degraded its dignity, and furnished abundant matter of laughter to its enemies.

II. It will not appear surprising that the bread, consecrated in the sacrament of the Lord's supper, became the object of religious worship; for this was the natural consequence of the monstrous doctrine of *transubstantiation*. But the effects of that impious and ridiculous doctrine did not end here; it produced a series of ceremonies and institutions, still used in the church of Rome, in honour of that *deified* bread, as they blasphemously call it. Hence arose those rich and splendid receptacles which were formed for the residence of God under this new shape,[h] and the lamps and other precious ornaments that were designed to beautify this habitation of

[a] Wadding, tom. iv. p. 181, 201, 223, 269, 303.

[b] See Wadding, Annal. Minor. tom. iv. p. 343, 371. tom. v. p. 9, 29, 62.—Colonia, Hist. Liter. de la Ville de Lyon, tom. ii. p. 284.

[c] Joseph (not Veccus) was patriarch of Constantinople, when this treaty was concluded. The former had bound himself by a solemn oath never to consent to a reconciliation between the Greek and Latin churches; for which reason the emperor, when he sent his ambassadors to Lyons, proposed to Joseph the following alternative: that, if they succeeded in bringing about an accommodation, he should renounce his patriarchal dignity; but if they failed in their attempt, he was to remain patriarch, being advised, at the same time, to retire to a convent, until the matter was decided. The ambassadors were successful: Joseph was deposed, and Veccus elected in his place; when, and not before, the latter ratified the treaty in question by his solemn consent to the ignominious article of supremacy and pre-eminence, which it confirmed to the Roman pontiff.

[d] Leo Allatius, de perpetuâ Consensione Eccles. Orient. et Occident. lib. i. c. xv. xvi. p. 727.—Fred. Spanheim de Perpet. Dissensione Græcor. et Latin. tom. ii. op. p. 188, &c.

[e] Pet. Allix. Præf. ad F. Johannis Determinat. de Sacramento Altaris, published at London in 1686.

[f] The book of this celebrated doctor was published by the learned Allix above mentioned. See Baluzii Vitæ Pontif. Avenion. tom. i. p. 576.—D'Acherii Spicileg. Veter. Scriptor. tom. iii. p. 58.—Echardi Scriptores Dominic. tom. i. p. 561.

[g] It is probable that this licentious custom of exhibiting mimic representations of religious objects derived its origin from the Mendicant friars.

☞ [h] This blasphemous language, which Dr. Mosheim is obliged to use in representing the absurdities of the doctrine of *transubstantiation*, is nothing in comparison with the impious figures that were used by the abettors of that monstrous tenet, to accommodate it, in some measure, to the capacities of the multitude. We need not wonder, that the Pagans metamorphosed their Jupiter into a bull, a swan, and other such figures, when we see the rulers of the Christian church transforming the Son of God into a piece of bread; a transformation so vile, and (even were it not vile) so useless, that it is inconceivable how it could enter into the head of any mortal, and equally so, how the bishops of Rome could con-

the Deity; and hence the custom that still prevails of carrying about this *divine bread* in solemn pomp through the public streets, when it is to be administered to sick or dying persons, with many other ceremonies of a like nature, which are dishonourable to religion, and opprobrious to humanity. But that which gave the finishing touch to this heap of absurdities, and displayed superstition in its highest extravagance, was the institution of the celebrated annual Festival of the Holy Sacrament, or, as it is sometimes called, of the Body of Christ; the origin of which was as follows: a certain devout woman, whose name was Juliana, and who lived at Liege, declared that she had received a revelation from heaven, intimating to her, that it was the will of God, that a peculiar festival should be annually observed in honour of the holy sacrament, or rather of the *real presence* of Christ's body in that sacred institution. Few gave attention or credit to this pretended vision, the circumstances of which were extremely equivocal and absurd,[a] and which would have come to nothing, had it not been supported by Robert, bishop of Liege, who, in 1246, published an order for the celebration of this festival throughout the province, notwithstanding the opposition which he knew would be made to a proposal founded only on an idle dream. After the death of Juliana, one of her friends and companions, whose name was Eve, adopted her cause with uncommon zeal, and had sufficient credit with Urban IV. to engage him to publish, in 1264, a solemn edict, by which the festival in question was imposed upon all the Christian churches. This edict, however, did not produce its full effect, on account of the death of the pontiff, which happened soon after its publication; so that the festival in question was not universally celebrated in the Latin churches before the pontificate of Clement V.,[b] who, in the council which he held at Vienne in Dauphiné, in 1311, confirmed the edict of Urban, and thus, in spite of all opposition, established a festival, which contributed more to render the doctrine of transubstantiation agreeable to the people, than the decree of the Lateran council under Innocent III., or than all the exhortations of his lordly successors.

III. About the conclusion of this century, Boniface VIII. added, to the public rites and ceremonies of the church, the famous jubilee, which is still celebrated at Rome, at a stated period, with the utmost profusion of pomp and magnificence. In 1299, a rumour was propagated among the inhabitants of that city, importing that all such as should visit, within the limits of the following year, the church of St. Peter, should obtain the remission of all their sins, and that this privilege was to be annexed to the performance of the same service once in every period of one hundred years. Boniface no sooner heard of this, than he ordered strict inquiry to be made concerning the author and the foundation of this report; and the result of the inquiry was answerable to his views; for he was assured, by many testimonies worthy of credit,[c] (say the Roman-catholic historians) that, from the remotest antiquity, this important privilege of remission and indulgence was to be obtained by the service above mentioned. No sooner had the pontiff received this information, than he addressed to all Christians an epistolary mandate, in which he enacted it as a solemn law of the church, that those who, in every hundredth or jubilee year, should confess their sins, and visit, with sentiments of contrition and repentance, the churches of St. Peter and St. Paul at Rome, should obtain thereby the entire remission of their various offences.[d] The successors of Boniface were not satisfied with adding a multitude of new rites and inventions, by way of ornaments, to this superstitious institution; but, finding by experience that it added to the lustre, and augmented the revenues of the Roman church, they rendered its return more frequent, and fixed its celebration to every five-and-twentieth year.[e]

CHAPTER V.

Concerning the Divisions and Heresies that troubled the Church during this Century.

I. WE have no account of any new sects that arose among the Greeks during this century. Those of the Nestorians and Jacobites, established in the remoter regions of the east, who equalled the Greeks in their aversion to

ide so far in the credulity of the people as to risk their authority by propagating such a doctrine.

☞ [a] This fanatical woman declared, that as often as she addressed herself to God, or to the saints in prayer, she saw the full moon with a small defect or breach in it; and that, having long studied to find out the signification of this strange appearance, she was *inwardly* informed by the Spirit, that the *moon* signified the *church*, and that the defect or breach was the want of an annual festival in honour of the holy sacrament.

[b] See Barthol. Fisen, Origo prima Festi Corporis Christi ex Viso Sanctæ Virgini Julianæ oblato, published at Liege in 1619.—Dallæus, de Cultus religiosi objecto, p. 287.—Acta Sanctor. April. tom. i. p. 437, 903.—And above all Benedict XIV. Pont. Max. de Festis Christi et Mariæ, lib. i. c. xiii. p. 360. tom. x. op.

☞ [c] These *testimonies worthy of credit* have never been produced by the Romish writers, unless we rank, in that class, that of an old man, who had completed his 107th year, and who, being brought before Boniface, declared (if we may believe the abbé Fleury) that his father, who was a common labourer, had assisted at the celebration of a jubilee, a hundred years before that time. See Fleury's Hist. Eccles. toward the end of the twelfth century. It is, however, a very unaccountable thing, if the institution of the jubilee year was not the invention of Boniface, that there should be neither in the acts of councils, nor in the records of history or writings of the learned, any trace or the least mention of its celebration before the year 1300. This, and other reasons of an irresistible evidence, have persuaded some Roman catholic writers to consider the institution of the jubilee year, as the invention of this pontiff, who, to render it more respectable, pretended that it was of a much earlier date. See Ghilen. et Victorell. apud Philippi Bonanni Numism. Pontif. Rom. tom. i. p. 22, 23.

[d] So the matter is related by James Caietan, cardinal of St. George, and nephew to Boniface, in his Relatio de Centesimo seu Jubilæo anno, which is published in his Magna Bibliotheca Vet. Patrum, tom. vi. p. 426, and in the Bibliotheca Maxima Patrum, tom. xxv. p. 267. Nor is there any reason to believe that this account is erroneous and false, or that Boniface acted the part of an impostor from a principle of avarice upon this occasion.

☞ *N. B.* It is not without astonishment, that we hear Dr. Mosheim deciding in this manner with respect to the *good faith* of Boniface, and the *relation* of his nephew. The character of that wicked and ambitious pontiff is well known, and the relation of the cardinal of St. George has been proved to be the most ridiculous, fabulous, motley piece of stuff, that ever usurped the title of an historical record. See the excellent Lettres de M. Chais sur les Jubilés, tom. i. p. 53.

[e] The various writers who have treated of the institution of the Roman Jubilee, are enumerated by Jo. Albert Fabricius in his Bibliogr. Antiquar. p. 316. Among the authors that may be added to this list, there is one whom we think it necessary to mention particularly, viz. the Reverend Charles Chais, whose Lettres Historiques et Dogmatiques sur les Jubilés et les Indulgences, were published in 1751.

☞ These letters of Mr. Chais (Minister of the French church at the Hague, and well known in the republic of letters) contain the most full and accurate account that has been ever given of the institution of the Jubilee, and of the rise, progress, abuses, and enormities, of the infamous traffic of indulgences. This account is judiciously collected from the best authors of antiquity, and from several curious records that have escaped the researches of other writers; it is also interspersed with curious, and sometimes ludicrous anecdotes, that render the work equally productive of entertainment and instruction. In the first volume of these letters, the learned author lays open the nature and origin

the rites and jurisdiction of the Latin church, were frequently solicited, by the Franciscan and Dominican papal missionaries, to receive the Roman yoke. In 1246, Innocent IV. used his utmost efforts to bring both these sects under his dominion; and, in 1278, terms of accommodation were proposed by Nicolas IV. to the Nestorians, and particularly to that branch of the sect which resided in the northern parts of Asia.[a] The leading men, both among the Nestorians and Jacobites, seemed to give ear to the proposals that were made to them, and to wish for a reconciliation with the church of Rome; but the prospect of peace soon vanished, and a variety of causes concurred to prolong the rupture.

II. During the whole course of this century, the Roman pontiffs carried on the most barbarous and inhuman persecution against those whom they branded with the denomination of *heretics;* i. e. against all those who called their pretended authority and jurisdiction in question, or taught doctrines different from those which were adopted and propagated by the church of Rome. For the sects of the Cathari, Waldenses, Petrobrussians, &c. gathered strength from day to day, spread imperceptibly throughout all Europe, assembled numerous congregations in Italy, France, Spain, and Germany, and formed by degrees such a powerful party as rendered them formidable to the pontiffs, and menaced the papal jurisdiction with a fatal revolution. To the ancient sects new factions were added, which, though they differed from each other in various respects, unanimously agreed in this point: "That the public and established religion was a motley system of errors and superstition, and that the dominion which the popes had usurped over Christians, as also the authority they exercised in religious matters, were unlawful and tyrannical." Such were the notions propagated by the sectaries, who refuted the superstitions and impostures of the times by arguments drawn from the holy scriptures, and whose declamations against the power, the opulence, and the vices of the pontiffs and clergy, were extremely agreeable to many princes and civil magistrates, who groaned under the usurpations of the sacred order. The pontiffs, therefore, considered themselves as obliged to have recourse to new and extraordinary methods of defeating and subduing enemies, who, both by their number and their rank, were every way proper to fill them with terror.

III. Of these dissenters from the church of Rome, the number was no where greater than in Narbonne Gaul,[b] and the countries adjacent, where they were received and protected, in a singular manner, by Raymond VI. earl of Toulouse, and other persons of the highest distinction; and where the bishops, either through humanity or indolence, were so negligent and remiss in the prosecution of heretics, that the latter, laying aside all their fears, formed settlements, and multiplied greatly from day to day. Innocent III. was soon informed of all these proceedings; and, about the commencement of this century, he sent legates extraordinary into the southern provinces of France to do what the bishops had left undone, and to extirpate heresy, in all its various forms and modifications, without being at all scrupulous in the adoption of such methods as might seem necessary to effect this salutary purpose. The persons charged with this commission were Rainier,[c] a Cistertian monk, and Pierre de Castelnau,[d] archdeacon of Maguelone, who became also afterwards a Cistertian friar. These eminent missionaries were followed by several others, among whom was the famous Spaniard, Dominic, founder of the order of preachers, who, returning from Rome in 1206, met with these delegates, embarked in their cause, and laboured both by his exhortations and actions in the extirpation of heresy. These spirited champions, who engaged in this expedition upon the sole authority of the pope, without either asking the advice or demanding the succours of the bishops, and who inflicted capital punishment upon such of the heretics as they could not convert by reason and argument, were distinguished in common discourse by the title of *Inquisitors;* and from them the formidable and odious tribunal, called the *Inquisition*, derived its origin.

IV. When this new set of heresy-hunters[e] had executed their commission, and purged the provinces to which they were sent of the greatest part of the enemies of the Roman faith, the pontiffs were so sensible of their excellent services, that they established missionaries of a like nature, or, in other words, placed *Inquisitors* in almost every city, whose inhabitants had the misfortune to be suspected of heresy, notwithstanding the reluctance which the people showed to this new institution, and the violence with which they frequently expelled, and sometimes massacred, these bloody officers of the popish hierarchy. The council convoked at Toulouse, in 1229, by Romanus,

of the institution of the jubilee; he proves it to have been a human invention, which owed its rise to the avarice and ambition of the popes, and its credit to the ignorance and superstition of the people, and whose celebration was absolutely unknown before the thirteenth century, which is the true date of its origin. He takes notice of the various changes it underwent with respect to the time of its celebration, the various colours with which the ambitious pontiffs covered it in order to render it respectable and alluring in the eyes of the multitude; and exposes these delusions by many convincing arguments, whose gravity is seasoned with an agreeable and temperate mixture of decent raillery. He proves, with the utmost evidence, that the papal jubilee is an imitation of the Secular Games, which were celebrated with such pomp in pagan Rome. He points out the gross contradictions that reign in the bulls of the different popes, with respect to the nature of this institution, and the time of its celebration. Nor does he pass over in silence the infamous traffic of indulgences, the worldly pomp and splendour, the crimes, debaucheries, and disorders of every kind, that were observable at the return of each jubilee year. He lays also before the reader an historical view of all the jubilees that were celebrated from the pontificate of Boniface VIII. in the year 1300, to that of Benedict XIV. in 1750, with an entertaining account of the most remarkable adventures that happened among the pilgrims who repaired to Rome on these occasions. The second and third volumes of these interesting letters treat of the indulgences that are administered in the church of Rome. The reader will find here their nature and origin explained, the doctrine of the Roman catholic divines relating to them stated and refuted, the history of this impious traffick accurately laid down, and its enormities and pernicious effects circumstantially exposed, with learning, perspicuity, and candour.

[a] Odor. Raynaldus, Annal. Eccles. tom. xiii. *ad Annum* 1247, sect. xxxii. et tom. xv. ad A. 1303, sect. xxii. et ad A. 1304, sect. xxiii.—Matth. Paris, Hist. Major, p. 372.

[b] That part of France, which, in ancient times, was termed Narbonne Gaul, comprehended the provinces of Savoy, Dauphiné, Provence, and Languedoc.

☞ [c] Instead of Rainier, other historians mention one Raoul, or Ralph, as the associate of Pierre de Castelnau. See Fleury's Histoire Eccles. liv. lxxvi. sect. xii.

[d] The greatest part of the Roman writers consider Pierre de Castelnau as the first inquisitor. It will appear hereafter in what sense this assertion may be admitted. For an account of this legate, see the Acta Sanctor. tom. i. Martii, p. 411.

☞ [e] The term of heresy-hunters, for which the translator is responsible, will not seem absurd, when it is known, that the missionaries who were sent into the provinces of France to extirpate heresy, and the inquisitors who succeeded them, were bound by an oath, not only to seek for the heretics in towns, houses, cellars, and other lurking-places, but also in woods, caves, fields, &c.

cardinal of St. Angelo, and pope's legate, went still farther, and erected in every city a set or society *of inquisitors, consisting of one priest and three laymen.*[a] This institution was, however, superseded in 1233 by Gregory IX., who intrusted the Dominicans, or preaching friars, with the important commission of discovering and bringing to judgment the heretics who were lurking in France, and in a formal epistle discharged the bishops from the burthen of that painful office.[b] Immediately after this, the bishop of Tournay, who was the pope's legate in France, began to execute this new resolution, by appointing Pierre Cellan, and Guillaume Arnaud, inquisitors of heretical pravity at Toulouse, and afterwards proceeded in every city, where the Dominicans had a monastery, to constitute officers of the same nature, selected from the monks of that celebrated order.[c] From this period we are to date the commencement of the dreadful tribunal of the *inquisition*, which in this and the following ages subdued such a prodigious multitude of heretics, part of whom were converted to the church by terror, and the rest committed to the flames without mercy. For the Dominicans erected, first at Toulouse and afterwards at Carcasone and other places, a tremendous court, before which were summoned not only heretics, and persons suspected of heresy, but likewise all who were accused of magic, sorcery, Judaism, witchcraft, and other crimes of a spiritual kind. This tribunal, in process of time, was erected in other countries of Europe, though not every where with the same success.[d]

V. The method of proceeding in this court of inquisition was at first simple, and almost in every respect similar to that which was observed in the ordinary courts of justice.[e] But this simplicity was gradually changed by the Dominicans, to whom experience suggested several new methods of augmenting the pomp and majesty of their spiritual tribunal, and who made such alterations in the process, that the manner of taking cognisance of heretical causes became totally different from that which was usual in civil affairs. These friars were, to say the truth, entirely ignorant of judicial matters; nor were they acquainted with the proceedings of any other tribunal, than that which was called, in the Roman church, the *Tribunal of penance.* It was therefore from this, that they modelled the new court of *Inquisition*, as far as a resemblance was possible; and hence arose that strange system of inquisitorial law, which, in many respects, is so contrary to the common feelings of humanity, and the plainest dictates of equity and justice. This is the important circumstance by which we are enabled to account for the absurd and iniquitous proceedings of the inquisitors, against persons who are accused of holding, what they call, heretical opinions.

VI. That nothing might be wanting to render this spiritual court formidable and tremendous, the Roman pontiffs persuaded the European princes, and more especially the emperor Frederic II., and Louis IX. king of France, not only to enact the most barbarous laws against heretics, and to commit to the flames, on pretence of public justice, those who were pronounced such by the inquisitors, but also to maintain the latter in their office, and grant them their protection in the most open and solemn manner. The edicts to this purpose issued by Frederic II. are well known; edicts fit only to excite horror, and which rendered the most illustrious piety and virtue incapable of saving from the most cruel death such as had the misfortune to be disagreeable to the inquisitors.[f] These execrable laws were not, however, sufficient to restrain the just indignation of the people against these inhuman judges, whose barbarity was accompanied with superstition and arrogance, with a spirit of suspicion and perfidy, and even with temerity and imprudence. Accordingly they were insulted by the multitude in many places, were driven in

[a] See Harduini Concilia, tom. vii. p. 175.

[b] Bern. Guido in Chronico Pontif. apud Jac. Echardum, Scriptor. Prædicator. tom. i. p. 88.—Percini Historia Inquisit. Tolosanæ, subjoined to his Historia Conventus Frat. Prædicat. Tolosæ, 1693.—Histoire Generale de Languedoc, tom. iii. p. 394.

[c] Echard and Percinus, loc. citat.

[d] The accounts which we have here given of the rise of the Inquisition, though founded upon the most unexceptionable testimonies and the most authentic records, are yet very different from those that are to be found in most authors. Some learned men tell us, that the Tribunal of the Inquisition was the invention of St. Dominic, and was first erected by him in the city of Toulouse; that he, of consequence, was the first inquisitor; that the year of its institution is indeed uncertain; but that it was undoubtedly confirmed in a solemn manner by Innocent III. in the Lateran council of 1215. See Jo. Alb. Fabricius, in his Lux Evangelii toti Orbi exoriens, p. 569.—Phil. Limborchi Historia Inquisit. lib. i. c. x. and the other writers mentioned by Fabricius. I will not affirm, that the writers, who give this account of the matter, have advanced all this without authority; but this I will venture to say, that the authors, whom they have taken for their guides, are not of the first rate in point of merit and credibility. Limborch, whose History of the Inquisition is looked upon as a most important and capital work, is generally followed by modern writers in their accounts of that odious tribunal. But, however laudable that historian may have been in point of fidelity and diligence, it is certain that he was little acquainted with the ecclesiastical history of the middle ages; that he drew his materials, not from the true and original sources, but from writers of a second class, and thus has fallen, in the course of his history, into various mistakes. His account of the origin of the inquisition is undoubtedly false; nor does that which is given by many other writers approach nearer to the truth. The circumstances of this account, which I have mentioned in the beginning of this note, are more especially destitute of all foundation. Many of the Dominicans, who, in our times, have presided in the court of inquisition, and have extolled the sanctity of that *pious* institution, deny, at the same time, that Dominic was its founder, as also that he was the first inquisitor, or that he was an inquisitor at all. They go still farther, and affirm, that the court of inquisition was not erected during the life of St. Dominic. Nor is all this advanced inconsiderately, as every impartial inquirer into the proofs they allege will easily perceive. Nevertheless, the question, whether or not St. Dominic was an inquisitor, seems to be merely a dispute about words, and depends entirely upon the different significations of which the term *inquisitor* is susceptible. That word, according to its original meaning, signified a person invested with the commission and authority of the pope to extirpate heresy and oppose its abettors, but not clothed with any judicial power. But it soon acquired a different meaning, and signified a person appointed by the pontiff to proceed *judicially* against heretics and such as were suspected of heresy, to pronounce sentence according to their respective cases, and to deliver over to the secular arm such as persisted obstinately in their errors. In the latter sense Dominic was not an inquisitor, since it is well known that there were no papal judges of this nature before the pontificate of Gregory IX.; but he was undoubtedly an inquisitor in the sense originally attached to that term.

[e] The records, published by the Benedictines in their Histoire Gener. de Languedoc, tom. iii. p. 371, show the simplicity that reigned in the proceedings of the inquisition at its first institution.

[f] The laws of the emperor Frederic, in relation to the inquisitors, may be seen in Limborch's History of the Inquisition, as also in the Epistles of Pierre de Vignes, and in Bzovius, Raynaldus, &c. The edict of St. Louis, in favour of these spiritual judges, is generally known under the title of *Cupientes;* for so it is called by the French lawyers, on account of its beginning with that word. It was issued in 1229, as the Benedictine monks have proved sufficiently in their Hist. Generale de Languedoc, tom. iii. It is also published by Catelius, in his Histor. Comit. Tolosanor. and by many other authors. This edict is as severe and inhuman, to the full, as the laws of Frederic II.; for a great part of the sanctity of good king Louis consisted in his furious and implacable aversion to heretics, against whom he judged it more expedient to employ the influence of racks and gibbets, than the power of reason and argument. See Du Freine, Vita Ludovici a Joinville scripta.

an ignominious manner out of some cities, and were put to death in others; and Conrad of Marpurg, the first German inquisitor, who derived his commission from Gregory IX., was one of the many victims that were sacrificed upon this occasion to the vengeance of the public,[a] which his incredible barbarities had raised to a dreadful degree of vehemence and fury.[b]

VII. When Innocent III., perceived that the labours of the inquisitors were not immediately attended with such abundant fruits as he had fondly expected, he addressed himself, in 1207, to Philip Augustus, king of France, and to the leading men of that nation, urging them, by the alluring promise of the most ample indulgences, to extirpate all, whom he thought proper to call heretics, by fire and sword.[c] This exhortation was repeated, with new accessions of fervour and earnestness, in the following year, when Pierre de Castelnau, the legate of this pontiff, and his inquisitor in France, was put to death by the patrons of the heretics.[d] Not long after this, the Cistertian monks, in the name of this pope, proclaimed a crusade against the heretics throughout France; and a storm seemed to be gathering against them on all sides. Raymond VI., earl of Toulouse, in whose territories Castelnau had been massacred, was solemnly excommunicated, and, to deliver himself from this ecclesiastical malediction, changed sides, and embarked in the crusade now mentioned. In 1209, a formidable army of cross-bearers commenced against the heretics (who were comprehended under the general denomination of *Albigenses*[e]) an open war, which they carried on with the utmost exertions of cruelty, though with various success, for several years. The chief director of this war was Arnald, abbot of the Cistertians, and legate of the Roman pontiff; and the commander in chief of the troops employed in this *noble* expedition was Simon, earl of Montfort. Raymond, who, consulting his safety rather than his conscience, had engaged in the crusade against the heretics, was now obliged to attack their persecutors. For Simon, who had embarked in this war, not so much from a principle of zeal for religion, or of aversion to the heretics, as from a desire of augmenting his fortune, cast a greedy eye upon the territories of Raymond, and his selfish views were seconded and accomplished by the court of Rome. After many battles, sieges, and a multitude of other exploits, conducted with the most intrepid courage and the most abominable barbarity, he received from the hands of Innocent, at the Lateran council, A. D. 1215, the county of Toulouse, and the other lands belonging to the obnoxious earl, as a reward for his zeal in supporting the *cause of God* and of *the church*. About three years after this, he lost his life at the siege of Toulouse. Raymond, his valiant adversary, died in 1222.

VIII. Thus were the two chiefs of this deplorable war taken off the scene; but this removal was far from extinguishing the infernal flame of persecution on the side of the pontiffs, or calming the restless spirit of faction on that of the pretended heretics. Raymond VII., earl of Toulouse, and Amalric, earl of Montfort, succeeded their fathers at the head of the contending parties, and carried on the war with the utmost vehemence, and with such various success as rendered the issue for some time doubtful. The former seemed at first more powerful than his adversary; and pope Honorius III., alarmed at the vigorous opposition he made to the orthodox legions, engaged Louis VIII., king of France, by the most pompous promises, to march in person with a formidable army against the enemies of the church. The obsequious monarch listened to the solicitations of the lordly pontiff, and embarked with a considerable military force in the cause of the church, but did not live to reap the fruits of his zeal. His engagements, however, with the court of Rome, and his furious designs against the heretics, were executed with the greatest alacrity and vigour by his son and successor Louis the Saint; so that Raymond, pressed on all sides, was obliged, in 1229, to make peace upon the most disadvantageous terms, even by making a cession of the greatest part of his territories to the French monarch, after having sacrificed a considerable portion of them, as a peace-offering to the church of Rome.[f] This treaty gave a mortal blow to the cause of heresy, and dispersed the champions that had appeared in its defence: the inquisition was established at Toulouse, and the heretics were not only exposed to the *pious* cruelties of Louis, but, what was still more shocking, Raymond himself, who had formerly been their patron, became their persecutor, and treated them upon all occasions with the most inhuman severity. It is true, this prince broke the engagements into which he had entered by the treaty above-mentioned, and renewed the war against Louis and the inquisitors, who abused, in the most odious manner, their victory and the power they had acquired. But this new effort, in favour of the heretics, was attended with

[a] The life of this furious and celebrated inquisitor was composed from the most authentic records, and also from several valuable manuscripts, by the learned John Herman Schminckius. See also Wadding, An. Minor. t. ii. p. 151, 355, and Echard, Scrip. Dominican. t. i. p. 487.

☞ [b] The abbé Fleury acknowledges the brutal barbarity of this unrelenting inquisitor, who, under the pretext of heresy, not only committed to the flames a prodigious number of nobles, clerks, monks, hermits, and lay-persons of all ranks, but moreover caused them to be put to death on the very day when they were accused, without appeal. See Fleury's Hist. Eccles. liv. lxxx.

[c] Innocentii Tertii Epistolæ, lib. x. epist. 49.

[d] Innoc. Epist. lib. xi. p. 26.—Acta Sanctor. Mart. tom. i. p. 411.

[e] This term is used in two senses, of which one is general, and the other more confined. In its more general and extensive sense it comprehends all the various kinds of heretics who resided at that time in Narbonne Gaul, i. e. in the southern parts of France. This appears from the following passage of Petrus Sarnensis, who, in the dedication of his History of the Albigenses to Innocent III. expresses himself thus: "Tolosani et aliarum civitatum et castrorum hæretici, et defensores eorum, generaliter Albigenses vocantur." The same author divides afterwards the Albigenses into various sects, (cap. ii. p. 3, and 8.) of which he considers that of the Waldenses as the least pernicious. 'Mali erant Waldenses, sed comparatione aliorum hæreticorum longe minus perversi.' It was not, however, from the city of Albigia, or Albi, that the French heretics were comprehended under the general title of Albigenses, but from another circumstance, namely, that the greatest part of Narbonne Gaul was, in this century, called Albigesium, as the Benedictine monks have clearly demonstrated in their Histoire Generale de Languedoc, tom. iii. The term *Albigenses*, in its more confined sense, was used to denote those heretics who inclined toward the Manichæan system, and who were otherwise known by the denominations of Catharists, Publicans or Paulicians, and Bulgarians. This appears evidently from many incontestable authorities, and more especially from the Codex Inquisitionis Tolosanæ, (published by Limborch, in his History of the Inquisition,) in which the Albigenses are carefully distinguished from the other sects that made a noise in this century.

☞ [f] It was in consequence of this treaty (of which the articles were drawn up at Maux, and afterwards confirmed at Paris, in presence of Louis) that the university of Toulouse was founded, Raymond having bound himself thereby to pay the sum of 4000 silver marcs, toward the support of two professors of divinity, two of canon law, two of grammar, and six of the liberal arts, during the space of ten years. We must also observe, that what Dr. Mosheim says of the cession that Raymond made of his lands is not sufficiently clear and accurate. These lands were not to be transferred till after his death, and they were to be transferred to the brother of Louis IX. who, according to the treaty, was to espouse the daughter of Raymond. See Fleury's Hist. Eccles. liv. lxxix. sect. 50.

little or no effect, and the unfortunate earl of Toulouse, the last representative of that noble and powerful family, dejected and exhausted by the losses he had sustained, and the perplexities in which he was involved, died, in 1249, without male issue. And thus ended a civil war, of which religion had been partly the cause, and partly the pretext, and which, in its consequences, was highly profitable both to the kings of France and to the Roman pontiffs.[a]

IX. The severity which the court of Rome employed in the extirpation of heresy, and the formidable arguments of fire and sword, racks and gibbets, with which the popes and their creatures reasoned against the enemies of the church, were not sufficient to prevent the rise of new and pernicious sects in different countries. Many of these sects were inconsiderable in themselves, and transitory in their duration, while some of them made a noise in the world, and were suppressed with difficulty. Among the latter we may reckon that of the Brethren and Sisters of the free spirit, which about this time gained ground secretly and almost imperceptibly in Italy, France, and Germany, and seduced into its bosom multitudes of persons of both sexes, by the striking appearance of piety that was observed in the conduct of the members who composed it. How far the councils of this century proceeded against the new sect, we cannot say with certainty, because we have upon record only a few of the decrees that were issued upon that occasion. Perhaps the obscurity of the rising faction screened it, in a great measure, from public view. But this was not the case in the following age; the *Brethren* and *Sisters* above-mentioned issued from their retreats in proportion as their numbers increased: they drew upon them the eyes of the world, and particularly those of the inquisitors, who committed to the flames such of these unhappy enthusiasts as fell into their hands; while the councils, holden in Germany and other countries, loaded them with excommunications and damnatory edicts.

This sect took its denomination from the words of St. Paul,[b] and maintained that the true children of God were invested with the privilege of a full and perfect *freedom* from the jurisdiction of the *law*.[c] They were called, by the Germans and Flemish, *Beghards* and *Beguttes*, names which, as we have seen already, were usually given to those who made an extraordinary profession of piety and devotion. They received from others the reproachful denomination of *Bicorni*, i. e. Idiots. In France, they were known by the appellation of Beguins and Beguines, while the multitude distinguished them by that of *Turlupins*, the origin and reason of which title I have not been able to learn.[d] Nothing carried a more shocking air of lunacy and distraction than their external aspect and manners. They ran from place to place clothed in the most singular and fantastic apparel, and begged their bread with wild shouts and clamours, rejecting with horror every kind of industry and labour, as an obstacle to divine contemplation, and to the ascent of the soul toward the Father of spirits. In all their excursions they were followed by women, called *Sisters*, with whom they lived in the most intimate familiarity.[e] They distributed, among the people, books which contained the substance of their doctrines; held nocturnal assemblies in places remote from public view; and seduced many from frequenting the ordinary institutions of divine worship.

X. These brethren, who gloried in the freedom which they pretended to have obtained, *through the spirit*, from the dominion and obligation of the *law*, adopted a certain rigid and fantastic system of mystic theology, built upon pretended philosophical principles, which bore a striking resemblance to the impious doctrines of the Pantheists. They held, "That all things flowed by emanation from God, and were finally to return to their divine source; that rational souls were so many portions of the Supreme Deity, and that the universe, considered as one great whole, was God: that every man, by the power of contemplation, and by calling off his mind from sensible and terrestrial objects, might be united to the Deity in an inexplicable manner, and become one with the Source and Parent of all things; and that they, who, by long and assiduous meditation, had plunged themselves, as it were, into the abyss of the Divinity, acquired a most glorious and sublime liberty, and were not only delivered from the violence of sinful lusts, but even from the common instincts of nature." From these and the like doctrines, the brethren drew this impious and horrid conclusion, "That the person who had ascended to God in this manner, and was absorbed by contemplation in

[a] Many writers, both ancient and modern, have related the circumstances of this religious war, carried on against the earls of Toulouse and their confederates, and also against the heretics, whose cause they maintained. But the historians, whom I have consulted on this subject, have not treated it with that impartiality which is so essential to the merit of historic writing. The protestant writers, among whom Basnage deserves an eminent rank, are too favourable to Raymond and the Albigenses; the Roman catholic historians lean with still more partiality to the other side. Of the latter, the most recent are Benedict, a Dominican monk, author of the Histoire des Albigeois, des Vaudois, et des Barbets, published at Paris in 1691, and J. Bapt. L'Anglois, a Jesuit, who composed the Histoire des Croisades contre les Albigeois, published at Rouen in 1703, to which we must add Jo. Jac. Percini Monumenta Conventus Tolosani Ordinis Fratrum Prædicator. in quibus Historia hujus Conventus distribuitur, et refertur totius Albigensium facti narratio, Tolosæ, 1693. These writers are chargeable with the greatest partiality and injustice for the reproaches and calumnies they throw out so liberally against the Raymonds and the Albigenses, while they disguise, with a perfidious dexterity, the barbarity of Simon of Montfort, and the ambitious views of extending their dominions that engaged the kings of France to enter into this war. The most ample and accurate account of this expedition against the heretics is that which is given by the learned Benedictines Claude le Vic and Joseph Vaissette, in their Histoire Generale de Languedoc, tom. iii. in which, however, there are several omissions, which render that valuable work defective.

[b] Romans, viii. 2, 14.

[c] The accounts here given of these wretched fanatics are, for the most part, taken from authentic records, which have not been yet published, from the decrees of synods and councils holden in France and Germany, from the diplomas of the Roman pontiffs, the sentences pronounced by the inquisitors, and other sources of information to which I have had access. I have also a collection of extracts from certain books of these enthusiasts, and more especially from that which treated of the *Nine Spiritual Rocks*, and which was in the highest esteem among the free brethren, who considered it as a treasure of divine wisdom and doctrine. As I cannot here expose these records to the examination of the curious reader, I beg leave to refer him to a long and ample edict issued out against these brethren by Henry I. archbishop of Cologne, and published in the Statuta Coloniensia, anno 1554. This edict is, in every respect, conformable to those published on the same occasion at Mentz, Aschaffenburg, Paderborn, Beziers, Treves, and other places.

[d] Many have written of the Turlupins, but none with accuracy and precision. See Beausobre's Dissertation sur les Adamites, part ii. p. 384, where that learned author has fallen into several errors, as usually happens to him when he treats subjects of this kind. I know not the origin of the word Turlupin; but I am able to demonstrate, by the most authentic records, that the persons so called, who were burned at Paris and in other parts of France, were no other than the Brethren of the free spirit, who were condemned by the Roman pontiffs, and also by various councils.

[e] Hence they were styled, in Germany, *Schwestriones*, as appears by the decrees of several councils.

the abyss of Deity, became thus a part of the Godhead, commenced God, was the *Son of God* in the same sense and manner in which Christ was, and was thereby raised to a glorious independence, and freed from the obligation of all laws human and divine." It was in consequence of all this, that they treated with contempt the ordinances of the Gospel, and every external act of religious worship, looking upon prayer, fasting, baptism, and the sacrament of the Lord's supper, as the first elements of piety adapted to the state and capacity of children, and as of no sort of use to the *perfect man*, whom long meditation had raised above all external things, and carried into the bosom and essence of the Deity.[a]

XI. Among these fanatics there were several persons of eminent probity, who had entered into this sect with the most upright intentions, and who extended that liberty of the spirit, which they looked upon as the privilege of true believers, no farther than to an exemption from the duties of external worship, and an immunity from the positive laws of the church. The whole of religion was placed by this class of men in internal devotion, and they treated with the utmost contempt the rules of monastic discipline, and all other external rites and institutions, as infinitely beneath the attention of the *perfect*. Nor were their exhortations and examples without effect; for, about the middle of this century, they persuaded a considerable number of monks and devout persons, in Suabia, "to live without any rule, and to serve God in the liberty of the spirit, which was the most acceptable service that could be presented to the Deity."[b] The inquisitors, however, stopped these poor enthusiasts in the midst of their career, and committed several of them to the flames, in which they expired, not only with the most unclouded serenity, but even with the most triumphant feelings of cheerfulness and joy.

But we find among these Brethren of the free spirit another class of fanatics very different from these now mentioned, and much more extravagant, whose system of religion was as dangerous as it was ridiculous and absurd, since it opened a door to the most licentious manners. These wretched enthusiasts maintained, that, by continual contemplation, it was possible to eradicate all the instincts of nature out of the *heaven-born* mind, and to introduce into the soul a certain divine stupor, and holy apathy, which they looked upon as the great characteristics of Christian perfection. The persons who adopted these sentiments took strange liberties in consequence of their pretended sanctity, and showed, indeed, by their conduct, that they had little regard to external appearances; for they held their secret assemblies in a state of nudity, and lay in the same beds with their spiritual sisters, or, indiscriminately, with other women, without the smallest scruple or hesitation. This shocking violation of decency was a consequence of their pernicious system. They looked upon decency and modesty as marks of inward corruption, as the characters of a soul that was still under the dominion of the sensual, animal, and lascivious spirit, and that was not, as yet, re-united to the divine nature, its centre and source. And they considered, as at a fatal distance from the Diety, all such as either felt the carnal suggestions of nature, or were penetrated with warm emotions at the view or approach of persons of a different sex, or were incapable of vanquishing and suppressing the rising fervour of lust and intemperance.[c]

There were, moreover, in this fanatical troop, certain enthusiasts, who far surpassed in impiety the two classes we have been now mentioning, who abused the system and doctrines of the sect, so as to draw from them an apology for all kinds of wickedness, and who audaciously maintained, that the divine man, or the believer, who was intimately united to God, could not sin, let his conduct be ever so horrible and atrocious. This execrable doctrine was not, indeed, explained in the same manner by all the Brethren of the free spirit who were so outrageous to adopt it. Some held that the motions and actions of the body had no relation at all to the soul, which, by its union with God, was blended with the divine nature: others fell into a notion infinitely injurious to the Supreme Being, and maintained that the propensities and passions that arose in the soul of the divine man

[a] It may not be improper to introduce a certain number of sentences, translated faithfully from several of the more secret books of these heretics. The following will be sufficient to give the curious reader a full idea of their impiety.

"Every pious and good man is the only begotten Son of God, whom God engendered from all eternity: (for these heretics maintained, that what the Scriptures taught concerning the distinction of three persons in the divine nature, is by no means to be understood literally, and therefore explained it according to the principles of their mystical and fantastic system.)

"All created things are non-entities, or nothing: I do not say that they are small or minute, but that they are absolutely nothing.

"There is in the soul of man something that is neither created nor susceptible of creation, and that is, rationality, or the power of reasoning.

"God is neither good, nor better, nor best: whosoever therefore calls the Deity good, speaks as foolishly as he who calls an object black which he knows to be white.

"God still engenders his only begotten son, and begets still the same son, whom he had begotten from eternity: for every operation of the Deity is uniform and one; and therefore he engenders his son without any division.

"What the Scriptures say concerning Christ is true of every good, of every divine man: and every quality of the divine nature belongs equally to every person whose piety is genuine and sincere."

To these horrid passages we may add the following sentences, in which John bishop of Strasbourg (in an edict he published against the Brethren of the free spirit, in 1317) discovers farther the blasphemous doctrine of this impious sect. 'Deus (say these heretics) est formaliter omne quod est. Quilibet homo perfectus est Christus per naturam. Homo perfectus est liber in totum, nec tenetur ad servandum præcepta ecclesiæ data a Deo. Multa sunt poetica in Evangelio, quæ non sunt vera; et homines credere magis debent conceptibus ex animâ suâ Deo junctâ profectis, quam Evangelio,' &c.

[b] See Mart. Crusius, Annal. Suevicorum, part iii. lib. ii. cap. xiv. ad annum 1261.—This author has taken his materials from Felix Faber, an impartial writer.

[c] Certain writers, whose principal zeal is employed in the defence of these heretics, and who have accustomed themselves to entertain a high idea of the sanctity of all those who, in the middle ages, separated themselves from the communion of the church of Rome, suspect the inquisitors of having attributed falsely these impious doctrines to the Brethren of the free spirit, with a view to blacken these pious men, and to render them odious. But this suspicion is entirely groundless; and the account of this matter, which we have given in the text, is conformable to the strictest truth. The inquisitors have been less fabulous in their accusations of these heretics, than many are apt to imagine. They acknowledge that the Beghards, though destitute of shame, were not in general chargeable with a breach of the duties of chastity and abstinence. They were indeed of opinion, that the firmness of mind, and insensibility of heart, which rendered them proof against female charms, and deaf to the voice of nature, were privileges granted to them by the devil; for they adopted the opinion of honest Nieder, (Formicar. lib. iii. cap. v.) and affirmed that it was in the power of that evil spirit to render men cold, and to extinguish the warm and lascivious solicitations of nature; and that Satan wrought this miracle upon his friends and adherents, in order to procure them a high reputation for sanctity, and make them appear superior in virtue to the rest of mankind. "Credo (saith Nieder, who was both a Dominican and an inquisitor) quosdam ex eis dæmonis operâ affectos fuisse, ne moverentur ad naturales actus incontinentiæ. . . . . Facillimum enim est dæmonibus infrigidare."

after his union with the Deity, were the propensities and affections of God himself, and were therefore, notwithstanding their apparent deformity and opposition to the law, holy and good, since the Supreme Being is infinitely exalted above all law and all obligation.[a] It is necessary to observe, before we leave this subject, that flagitious and impious impostors mingled themselves sometimes with this sect, and took the name of Beghards, that by a feigned piety they might impose upon the multitude, and deceive the simple into their snares.[b]

XII. The famous Amalric, professor of logic and theology at Paris, whose bones were dug up and publicly burned in 1209, (although he had abjured his errors before his death,) and a considerable number of whose disciples and followers were committed to the flames on account of their absurd and pernicious doctrine, was undoubtedly of the same way of thinking with the sect whose opinions we have been now considering;[c] for, though the writers of this barbarous age have given very different and confused accounts of his opinions, and even attributed some doctrines to him which he never maintained, it is nevertheless certain, that he taught, that all things were the parts of one substance, or, in other words, that the universe was God, and that not only the *forms* of all things, but also their *matter* or substance, proceed from the Deity, and must return to the source from which they were derived.[d] From these absurd and blasphemous principles he deduced that chimerical system of fanatical devotion, which we have already exposed to the view of the reader, pretended to demonstrate the possibility of incorporating or translating the human nature into the divine, and rejected all kinds of external worship, as insignificant and useless. The disciples of this enthusiast were men of exemplary piety, were distinguished by the gravity and austerity of their lives and manners, and suffered death in the most dreadful forms with the utmost resolution and constancy. David of Dinant, a Parisian doctor, was one of the most eminent among these; and he usually expressed the fundamental principle of his master in the following proposition; "God is the primary matter or substance of all things." He composed a work entitled *Quaternarii*, with several other productions, which were chiefly designed to affect and gain the multitude; but he was at length obliged to save himself by flight.[e] The bishops, assembled in council at Paris, in 1209, considered the philosophy of Aristotle as the source of these impious doctrines, and, on that account, prohibited all persons from reading or explaining, either in public or private, the metaphysical and other productions of the Grecian sage.[f]

XIII. If we may depend upon the accounts given by certain writers, Amalric and his followers received with the utmost docility and faith the predictions, attributed to Joachim, abbot of Flora, concerning the reformation that

[a] This account will be confirmed by the following passage, which is faithfully translated from the famous book of the *Nine Rocks*, written originally in German: "Moreover the divine man operates and engenders whatever the Deity operates and engenders: for in God he produced and formed the heavens and the earth. He is also the father of the eternal word. Neither could God produce any thing without this divine man, who is therefore obliged to render his will conformable to the will of God, that whatever may be agreeable to the Deity, may be agreeable to him also. If therefore it be the will of God that I should commit sin, my will must be the same, and I must not even desire to abstain from sin. This is true contrition. And although a man, who is well and truly united to God, may have committed a thousand mortal sins, he ought not to wish that he had not committed them: he should even be ready to die a thousand deaths rather than omit one of these mortal sins." Hence arose the accusation brought by the inquisitors against this impious sect, whom they reproach with maintaining that the "sin of a man united to God, is not sin, since God works in him and with him whatever he does." Henry Suso, a Dominican monk, and one of the most celebrated Mystic writers, composed, in the following century, another book concerning the Nine Rocks, which is to be found in the edition of his works published by Laurence Surius. But this book is entirely different from that which was in such high esteem among the Beghards, though it bears the same title. The latter is of much older date, and was in vogue in Germany, among the Brethren of the free spirit, long before Suso was born. There fell some time ago into my hands an ancient manuscript, composed in Alsace during the fifteenth century, containing an account of various revelations and visions of that age. In this manuscript I found a piece entitled, Declaratio Religiosi cujusdam super Revelatione Carthusiano cuidam de Ecclesiæ per gladium reformatione, *Leodii in anno* 1453 *facta*; and, almost in the beginning of this declaration, I met with the following passage relating to the book of the Nine Rocks: "Homo quidam devotissimus, licet laicus, librum de novem Rupibus conscripsit à Deo compulsus, ubi multa ad præsens pertinentia continentur de Ecclesiæ renovatione et prævia gravi persecutione." These Nine Rocks signified, according to the fanatical doctrine of this wrong-headed sect, the different steps by which the divine man ascended to the Deity.

[b] The founder of this famous sect, the place of its origin, and the time of its first appearance, are not known with certainty. I have in my possession eighty-nine Sentences of the Beghards, vulgarly called Schwestriones, but who style themselves Brethren of the sect of the free spirit and of voluntary poverty, with a refutation of the said sentences, written at Worms toward the conclusion of this century by one of the inquisitors. The 79th sentence runs thus: "To say that the truth is in Rhetia, is to fall into the heresy of Donatus, who said that God was in Africa, and not elsewhere." From these words it appears evident, that Rhetia was the country where the church of the Brethren of the free spirit was fixed and established, and that from this province they passed into Germany. I am not, however, of opinion, that this sect had its origin in that province; but am rather inclined to think, that Italy was its country, and that, being driven thence, it took refuge in Rhetia. Nor is it at all improbable, that Italy, which saw so many religious factions arise in its bosom, was also the nursing mother of this blasphemous sect. We shall be almost fully confirmed in this opinion, when we consider that, in a long letter from Clement V. to Rainier bishop of Cremona, (published by Odor. Raynaldus, Annal. tom. xv. an. 1311,) the zealous pontiff exhorts that prelate to suppress and extirpate, with all his power, the sect of the Brethren of the free spirit, who were settled in several parts of Italy, and particularly in the province of Spoleto and the countries adjacent. Such are the terms of the pontiff's letter: "In nonnullis Italiæ partibus, tam Spoletanæ provinciæ, quam circumjacentium regionum."

[c] This did not escape the notice of the enemies of the Beghards or Brethren of the free spirit in Germany, much less that of the inquisitors, who, in their Refutation of the 89 sentences of the Beghards, mentioned in the preceding note, express themselves thus: (sent. 68.) "Dicere quod omnis creatura est Deus, hæresis Alexandri* est, qui dixit, materiam primam et Deum et hominem, hoc est mentes, esse in substantiâ, quod postea *quidam David de Dinanto* sequutus est, qui temporibus nostris de hac hæresi de Franciâ fugatus est, et punitus fuisset, si deprehensus fuisset."

[d] The account given by Fleury, in his Ecclesiastical History, of the opinions of Amalric, is very different from that which is here given by Dr. Mosheim. The former observes, that Amalric, or Amauri, taught that 'every Christian was obliged to believe himself a member of Jesus Christ, and that without this belief none could be saved;' and he observes also, that his disciples introduced errors still more pernicious, such as the following: "That the power of the Father had continued only during the Mosaic dispensation, that of the Son 1200 years after his entrance upon earth, and that, in the thirteenth century, the age of the Holy Spirit commenced, in which the sacraments and all external worship were to be abolished; that there would be no resurrection; that heaven and hell were mere fictions;" and many more sentiments of that nature, which, as the learned Spanheim imagines, were falsely imputed to Amalric, in order to render his memory odious, because he had opposed the worship of saints and images. See Fleury, Hist. Eccles. livre lxxvi. sect. lix.—Dr. Mosheim considered Amalric as a Pantheist; and many men of eminent learning are of this opinion. See, among others, Joh. Gerson apud Jac. Thomasium, and also Brucker's Hist. Philosoph. tom. iii. p. 688.

* See Martenne's Thesaur. Anecd. tom. iv. p. 163, where there is an account of the heresies for which several priests were burned at Paris in 1209.—Natal. Alexander, Hist. Eccl. Sæc. xiii. cap. iii. art. ii. p. 76.—Du Bois, Hist. Eccl. Paris. t. ii. p. 244.—Boulay, Hist. Acad. Paris. t. iii. p. 24, 48, 53.—Jac. Thomasius, de Exustione Mundi Stoicâ, p. 199.

[e] Launoy, de varia Aristot. fortuna in Acad. Paris. p. 127.

* The person here mentioned is Alexander, the Epicurean, of whom Plutarch speaks in his Symposium.

was soon to be brought about in the church by the power of the sword,—the approaching *Age of the Holy Ghost*, that was to succeed those of the Father and the Son,—and other things of that nature, which raised the hopes and occupied the thoughts of the Spiritual Franciscans. Whether these accounts may be depended upon or not, we shall not determine. To us they appear extremely doubtful. It is, however, true, that certain persons were so far deluded by these pretended prophecies, as to form new sects with a view to their accomplishment, and to declare war against the established church, its system of doctrine, and its forms of worship. Among other fanatical sectaries, there arose one of a most extraordinary kind, a Bohemian woman, named Wilhelmina, who resided in the territory of Milan. This delirious and wrong-headed woman, having studied with attention the predictions concerning the age of the Holy Ghost, was so extravagant as to persuade herself, and (what is still more amazing) had sufficient influence to persuade others, that the Holy Ghost had become incarnate in her person, for the salvation of a great part of mankind. According to her doctrine, "None could be saved by the blood of Jesus, but true and pious Christians; while the Jews, Saracens, and unworthy Christians, were to obtain salvation through the Holy Spirit which dwelt in her; and, in consequence thereof, all that had happened to Christ, during his appearance upon earth in the human nature, was to be exactly renewed in her person, or rather in that of the Holy Ghost which was united to her." This mad woman died at Milan, in 1281, in the most fragrant odour of sanctity; and her memory was not only holden in the highest veneration by her numerous followers and the ignorant multitude, but was also honoured with religious worship both in public and in private. Her sect was at length discovered by the curious eye of persecution, in 1300, and fell under the cognisance of the inquisitors, who destroyed the magnificent monument that had been erected to her honour, ordered her bones to be committed to the flames, and in the same fire consumed the leaders of this wretched faction, among whom were persons of both sexes.[a]

XIV. It was upon predictions similar to those mentioned in the preceding section, that the sect of the *Apostles* founded its discipline. The members of this sect made little or no alteration in the doctrinal part of the public religion; what they principally aimed at, was, to introduce among Christians the simplicity of the primitive times, and more especially the manner of life that was observed by the apostles. Gerard Sagarelli, the founder of this sect, obliged his followers to go from place to place as the apostles did, to wander about clothed in white, with long beards, dishevelled hair, and bare heads, accompanied with women whom they called their Sisters. They were also obliged to renounce all kinds of property and possessions, and to preach in public the necessity of repentance, while in their more private assemblies they declared the approaching destruction of the corrupt church of Rome, and the establishment of a purer service, and a more glorious church, which, according to the prophecies of the abbot Joachim, would certainly arise from its ruins. No sooner was the ill-fated leader of this faction committed to the flames,[b] than he was succeeded in that character by a bold and enterprising fanatic, named Dulcinus, a native of Novara, who published his predictions with more courage, and maintained them with more zeal, than his predecessor had done, and who did not hesitate to declare that, in a short time, pope Boniface VIII., the corrupt priests, and the licentious monks, were to perish by the hand of the emperor Frederic III., son of Peter, king of Arragon, and that a new and most holy pontiff was to be raised to the head of the church. These visionary predictions were, no doubt, drawn from the dreams of Joachim, who is said to have declared, among other things, that an emperor called Frederic III., was to bring to perfection what Frederic II. had left unfinished. Be that as it may, Dulcinus appeared with intrepid assurance at the head of the *apostles*; and acting, not only in the character of a prophet, but also in that of a general, he assembled an army to maintain his cause, and perhaps to accomplish, at least in part, his predictions. He was opposed by Raynerius, bishop of Vercelli, who defended the interests of the Roman pontiff, and carried on, above two years, a most sanguinary and dreadful war against this chief of the apostles. The issue of this contest was fatal to the latter, who, after several battles fought with obstinate courage, was at length taken prisoner, and put to death at Vercelli in a most barbarous manner, in 1307, together with Margaret, whom he had chosen for his spiritual sister, according to the custom of his sect. The terrible end of Dulcinus was not immediately followed by the extinction of his sect, which still subsisted in France, Germany, and other countries, and stood firm against the most vehement efforts of its enemies, until the beginning of the 15th century, when, under the pontificate of Boniface IX., it was totally extirpated.[c]

XV. This famous Joachim, abbot of Flora, whose fanatical predictions turned the heads of so many well-meaning people, and excited them to attempt reforming the church by the sword, and to declare open war against the Roman pontiffs, did not fall under the suspicion of heresy on account of these predictions, but in consequence of a new explication he had given of the doctrine of a Trinity of persons in the Godhead. He had in an elaborate work attacked very warmly Peter Lombard, the master of the sentences, on account of the distinction which this writer had made between the divine essence and the three persons in the Godhead; for Joachim

[a] The Milanese historians, such as Bernardinus Corius, and others, have related the adventures of this odd woman; but their accounts are very different from those given by the learned Muratori, in his Antiq. Italicæ medii Ævi, tom. v., and which he has drawn from the judicial proceedings of the court, where the extraordinary case of this female fanatic was examined. We are informed by the same excellent author, that a learned writer, name Puricelli, composed a history of Wilhelmina, and of her sect.

[b] This unhappy man was burned alive at Parma, in 1300.

[c] I composed in the German language an accurate history of this famous sect, which is very little known in our times; and I have in my hands materials, that will furnish an interesting addition to that history. That this sect subsisted in Germany, and in some other countries, until the pontificate of Boniface IX., is evident from the Chronicle of Herman Cornerus, published by Jo. George Echard, in his Corpus Historicum medii Ævi, tom. ii., and may be sufficiently demonstrated by other authentic testimonies. In 1402, a certain member of this apostolic sect, whose name was William, or Wilhelmus, was burned alive at Lubec. The Germans, who were accustomed to distinguish by the name of Beghards all those who pretended to extraordinary piety, and sought, by poverty and begging, an eminent reputation for sanctity and virtue, gave this title also to the sect of the *Apostles*.

looked upon this doctrine as introducing a fourth object, even an essence, into the Trinity. But the good man was too little versed in metaphysical matters, to carry on a controversy of such a subtle nature; and he was betrayed by his ignorance so far as to advance inconsiderately the most rash and most exceptionable tenets. For he denied that there was any thing, or any essence, that belonged in common to the three persons in the Trinity, or was jointly possessed by them; by which doctrine the *substantial* union, among the three persons, was taken away, and the union of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, was reduced from a *natural*, *simple*, and *numerical* unity, to a *moral* one only; that is, to such an unity as reigns in the counsels and opinions of different persons, who embrace the same notions, and think and act with one accord. This explication of the Trinity was looked upon by many as very little different from the Arian system; and therefore pope Innocent III. pronounced, in 1215, in the Lateran council, a damnatory sentence against the doctrine of Joachim; not extending, however, to the person or fame of the abbot himself. Notwithstanding this papal sentence, Joachim has at this day a considerable number of adherents and defenders, more especially among those Franciscans who are called *Observants*. Some of these maintain that the book of this abbot was corrupted and interpolated by his enemies, while the rest are of opinion that his doctrine was not thoroughly understood by those who opposed it.[a]

[a] See Dan. Papebrochius, Disquis. Histor. de Florensi Ordine, Prophetiis, Doctrinâ, B. Joachimi, in Actis Sanctorum, Maii, tom. vi. p. 486, which contains the life of Joachim, written by Syllanæus, and several other pieces of consequence. See also Natal. Alexander, Hist. Eccles. sæc. xiii. dis. ii. p. 331.—Luc. Wadding, Annal. Minor. tom. iv.

THE FOURTEENTH CENTURY.

PART I.

THE EXTERNAL HISTORY OF THE CHURCH.

CHAPTER I.

Concerning the prosperous Events that happened to the Church during this Century.

I. Several attempts were made by the princes of the west, at the instigation of the Roman pontiffs, to renew the war in Palestine against the Turks and Saracens, and to deliver the whole province of Syria from the oppressive yoke of those despotic infidels. The succession of pontiffs that resided in Avignon, evinced the greatest zeal for the renovation of this religious war, and left no artifice, no methods of persuasion unemployed, that could have the least tendency to engage the kings of England and France in an expedition to the Holy Land. But their success was not answerable to their zeal; and, notwithstanding the powerful influence of their exhortations and remonstrances, something still happened to prevent their producing the desired effect. Clement V. urged the renewal of this holy war with the greatest ardour in the years 1307 and 1308, and set apart a very large sum of money for prosecuting it with alacrity and vigour.[a] John XXII. ordered ten ships to be fitted out in 1319, to transport an army of pious adventurers into Palestine,[b] and had recourse to the power of superstition, that is, to the influence of indulgences, for raising the funds necessary to the support of this great enterprise. These indulgences he offered to such as contributed generously to the war, and appointed legates to administer them in all the European countries that were subject to his spiritual jurisdiction. But, under this fair show of piety and zeal, John is supposed to have covered the most selfish and grovelling views; and we find Louis of Bavaria, who was at that time emperor, and several other princes, complaining loudly that this pontiff made use of the holy war as a pretext to disguise his avarice and ambition;[c] and indeed the character of this pope was of such a stamp as tended to accredit such complaints. Under the pontificate of Benedict XII., a formidable army was raised, in 1330, by Philip de Valois, king of France, with a view, as was said, to attempt the deliverance of the Christians in Palestine;[d] but, when he was ready to embark his troops, the apprehension of an invasion from England obliged him to lay aside this weighty enterprise. In 1345, Clement VI., at the request of the Venetians, engaged, by the persuasive power of indulgences, a prodigious number of adventurers to embark for Smyrna, where they composed a numerous army under the command of Guido, or Guy, dauphin of Vienne; but the want of provisions soon obliged this army to return with the general into Europe.[e] This disappointment did not, however, damp the spirits of the restless pontiffs; for another formidable army was assembled in 1363, in consequence of the zealous exhortations of Urban V., and was to be employed in a new expedition against the infidels, with John, king of France, at its head; but the unexpected death of that prince blasted the hopes that many had entertained from this grand project, and occasioned the dispersion of that numerous body which had repaired to his standard.[f]

II. The missionaries who had been sent by the Roman pontiffs into China, Tartary, and the adjacent countries, in the preceding century, found their labours crowned with the desired success, and established a great number of Christian churches among those unenlightened nations. In 1307, Clement V. erected Cambalu (which at that time was the celebrated metropolis of Cathay, and is, undoubtedly, the same with Pekin, the capital city at present of the Chinese empire,) into an archbishopric, which he conferred upon John de Monte Corvino, an Italian friar who had been employed in propagating the Gospel in that country for many years. The same pontiff sent soon after, to assist this prelate in his pious labours, seven other prelates of the Franciscan order.[g] John XXII. exerted in this good cause the same zeal which had distinguished the pontificate of his predecessors. On the death of John de Monte Corvino, in 1333, he sent Nicolas of Bentra to fill the vacant archbishopric of Cambalu, and charged him with letters to the emperor of the Tartars, who, at that time, was in possession of the Chinese dominions. In 1338, Benedict XII. sent new legates and missionaries into Tartary and China, in consequence of a solemn embassy[h] with which he was honoured at Avignon from the khan of the Tartars. During the time that the princes of the latter nation maintained themselves in the empire of China, the Christian religion flourished in those vast regions; and both Latins and Nestorians not only made a public profession of their faith, but also propagated it, without any apprehension of danger, through the northern provinces of Asia.

III. There remained in this century scarcely any European prince unconverted to Christianity, if we except Jagellon, duke of Lithuania, who continued in the darkness of paganism, and worshipped the gods of his idolatrous ancestors, until 1386, when he embraced the Christian faith, received in baptism the name of Ladislaus, and

[a] Baluzii Vitæ Pontif. Avenion. tom. i. p. 15, 594; tom. ii. p. 55, 374, &c. Ant. Matthæi Analecta veteris Ævi, tom. ii. p. 577.
[b] Baluzii Vitæ Pontif. Avenion. tom. i. p. 125; tom. ii. p. 515.
[c] Baluzius, tom. i. p. 175, 786. Matthæi Analecta vet. Ævi, tom. ii p. 595.
[d] Baluzius, tom. i. p. 200.
[e] Fragmenta Histor. Romanæ. in Murator. Antiq. Ital. medii Ævi, tom. iii. p. 368.
[f] Baluzii Vitæ Pontif. Avenion. tom. i. p. 366, 368, 371, 401.
[g] Wadding, Annal. Ordin. Minor. tom. vi. ad an. 1305, sect. xii. p. 69. ad an. 1307, p. 91, 368; tom. vii. p. 53, 221; tom. viii. p. 235.—J. S. Asseman. Biblioth. Orient. Vatican. tom. iii. sect. ii. p. 521.—J. Echard, Scriptor. Prædicator. tom. i. p. 537.—Acta Sanctor. tom. i Januarii, p. 984.—Mosheim, Historia Eccles. Tartar.
[h] Baluzii Vitæ Pontificum Avenionensium, tom. i. p. 242.

persuaded his subjects to open their eyes upon the divine light of the Gospel. We shall not pretend to justify the purity of the motives that first engaged this prince to renounce the religion of his fathers, as they were accompanied, at least, with views of policy, interest, and ambition. On the death of Louis, king of Poland, which happened in 1382, Jagellon was named among the competitors who aspired to the vacant throne; and, as he was rich and powerful prince, the Poles beheld his pretensions nd efforts with a favourable eye. His religion was the only obstacle to the accomplishment of his views. Hedwige, the youngest daughter of the deceased monarch, who, by a decree of the senate, was declared heiress of the kingdom, was as little disposed to espouse, as the Poles were to obey, a Pagan; and hence Jagellon was obliged to make superstition yield to royalty.[a] On the other hand, the Teutonic knights and crusaders extirpated by fire and sword all the remains of paganism that were to be found in Prussia and Livonia, and effected, by force, what persuasion alone ought to have produced.

We find also in the annals of this century many instances of Jews converted to the Christian faith. The cruel persecutions they suffered in several parts of Europe, particularly in France and Germany, vanquished their obstinacy, and bent their intractable spirits under the yoke of the Gospel. The reports[b] (whether false or true, we shall not determine) that had been industriously spread abroad, of their poisoning the public fountains, of their killing infants and drinking their blood, of their profaning, in the most impious and blasphemous manner, the consecrated wafers that were used in the celebration of the eucharist, with other accusations equally enormous, excited every where the resentment of the magistrates and the fury of the people, and brought the most terrible sufferings, that unrelenting vengeance could invent, upon that wretched and devoted nation.

IV. The Saracens still maintained a considerable footing in Spain. The kingdoms of Granada and Murcia, with the province of Andalusia, were subject to their dominion; and they carried on a perpetual war with the kings of Castile, Arragon, and Navarre, in which, however, they were not always victorious. The African princes, and particularly the emperors of Morocco, became their auxiliaries against the Christians. On the other hand, the Roman pontiffs left no means unemployed to excite the Christians to unite their forces against the Moslems, and to drive them out of the Spanish territories; presents, exhortations, promises,—in short, all allurements that religion, superstition, or avarice, could render powerful,—were made subservient to the execution of this arduous project. The Christians, accordingly, united their counsels and efforts for this end; and though for some time the difficulty of the enterprise rendered their progress inconsiderable, yet even in this century their affairs wore a promising aspect, and gave them reason to hope that they might one day triumph over their enemies, and become sole possessors of the Spanish dominions.[c]

CHAPTER II.

Concerning the calamitous Events that happened to the Church during this Century.

I. THE Turks and Tartars, who extended their dominions in Asia with an amazing rapidity, and directed their arms against the Greeks, as well as against the Saracens, destroyed wherever they went the fruits that had sprung up in such a rich abundance from the labours of the Christian missionaries, extirpated the religion of Jesus in several provinces and cities where it had flourished, and substituted the impostures of Mohammed in its place. Many of the Tartars had formerly professed the Gospel, and still more had tolerated the exercise of that divine religion; but, from the beginning of this century, things put on a new face; and that fierce nation renounced every other religious doctrine, except that of the Koran. Even Timur-Bec, commonly called Tamerlane, their mighty emperor, embraced the doctrine of Mohammed, though under a form different from that which was adopted by the Tartars in general.[d] This formidable warrior, after having subdued the greatest part of Asia, having triumphed over Bajazet (or Bayezid) emperor of the Turks, and even filled Europe with terror at the approach of his victorious arms, made use of his authority to force multitudes of Christians to apostatise from their holy faith. To the dictates of authority he added the compulsive power of violence and persecution, and treated the disciples of Christ with the utmost barbarity. Persuaded, as we learn from the most credible writers of his life and actions, that it was incumbent upon the true followers of Mohammed to persecute the Christians, and that the most ample and glorious rewards were reserved for such as were most instrumental in converting them to the religion of that supposed prophet,[e] he employed the most inhuman acts of severity to vanquish the magnanimous constancy of such as persevered in their attachment to the Christian religion, of whom some suffered death in the most barbarous forms, while others were condemned to perpetual slavery.[f]

II. In those parts of Asia, which are inhabited by the Chinese, Tartars, Moguls, and other nations still less

[a] Odor. Raynaldus, Annal. Eccles. ad an. 1386, sect. iv. Wadding, Annal. Minor. tom. ix. p. 71.—Solignac, Histoire de Pologne, tom. iii. p. 241.

[b] It seems more than probable that these reports were insidiously forged out of animosity against the Jews, who had long been the peculiar objects of general odium. This will appear still more evidently to have been the case, when we consider that the popes Gregory IX. and Innocent IV., published, in the thirteenth century, declarations calculated to destroy the effect of several calumnies which had been invented and dispersed to the disadvantage of the Jews; and in the fourteenth century, we find Benedict XII. and Clement VI. giving similar proofs of their equity toward an injured people. We find, in history, circular letters of the dukes of Milan and Venice, and imperial edicts of Frederic III. and Charles V., to the same purpose; and all these circumstances materially detract from the credibility of the reports mentioned by Dr. Mosheim.

[c] See J de Ferreras, Histoire d'Espagne, tom. iv. v. vi.—Fragmenta Histor. Romanæ, in Muratorii Antiq. Ital. medii Ævi, tom. iii. p. 319, in which, however, there is a considerable mixture of falsehood with truth.—Baluzii Miscellan. tom. ii. p. 267.

[d] This great Tamerlane, whose name seemed to strike terror even when he was no more, adhered to the sect of the Sonnites, and professed the greatest enmity against their adversaries, the Shiites. See Petit Croix, Histoire de Timur-Bec, tom. ii. p. 151; tom. iii. p. 228. It is, however, extremely doubtful, what was, in reality, the religion of Tamerlane, though he professed the Mohammedan faith. See Mosheim, Hist. Eccles. Tartaror. p. 124.

[e] Petit de la Croix, Histoire de Timur-Bec, tom. ii. p. 329; tom. iii. p. 137, 243, &c.

[f] Many instances of this we find in the History of Timur-Bec, written by a Persian named Sherefeddin; published at Delft, in 1723.—See also Herbelot, Biblioth. Oriental. at the article Timur, p. 877.—[The work of Sherefeddin is the same with that of M. de la Croix who only professed himself, in this instance, a translator. EDIT.]

known, the Christian religion not only lost ground, but seemed to be totally extirpated. It is, at least, certain, that we have no account of any members of the Latin church residing in those countries, later than the year 1370; nor could we ever learn the fate of the Franciscan missionaries sent thither from Rome. We have, indeed, some records, from which it would appear that there were Nestorians residing in China so far down as the sixteenth century;[a] but these records are not so clear as to remove all doubt. However that may be, the abolition of Christianity in those remote parts of the world may, without hesitation, be imputed to the wars that were carried on by the Tartars against the Chinese and other Asiatic nations; for, in 1369, the last emperor of the race of Genghiz-Khan was driven out of China, and his throne filled by the Mim family, who, by a solemn law, refused to all foreigners the privilege of entering that country.

[a] Nicol. Trigautius, de Christ. Exped. apud Sinas, lib. i. c. xi.—Jos. Sim. Assemani Bib. Orien. Vatic. t. iii.—Du Halde, Descrip. de la Chine, t. i.

PART II.

THE INTERNAL HISTORY OF THE CHURCH.

CHAPTER I.

Concerning the State of Letters and Philosophy during this Century.

I. The Greeks, though dejected by the foreign and intestine calamities in which they were involved, were far from withdrawing their attention and zeal from the cause of literature, as is evident from the great number of learned men who flourished among them during this period. In this honourable class we may reckon Nicephorus Gregoras, Manuel Chrysoloras, Maximus Planudes, and many others, who, by their indefatigable application to the study of history, antiquities, and the *belles lettres*, acquired considerable reputation. Omitting the mention of writers of inferior note, we may observe, that Theodorus Metochita, John Cantacuzenus, and Nicephorus Gregoras, applied themselves to the composition of history, though with different success. Nor ought we to pass over in silence Nicephorus Callistus, who compiled an ecclesiastical history, which, notwithstanding its being debased with idle stories and evident marks of superstition, is highly useful on account of its illustration of many important facts.

II. As no sage of this century had the presumption to set up for a leader in philosophy, such of the Greeks as had a taste for philosophical researches adhered to Aristotle, as their conductor and guide; but we may learn from the tracts of Theodorus Metochita in what manner they explained the principles and tenets of the Stagirite. Plato also had his followers, especially among those who were fond of mysticism, which had for many ages been holden in the highest veneration by the Greeks. In the sublime sciences of mathematics and astronomy, Nicolas Cabasilas surpassed all his contemporaries. Balaam adopted the sentiments and precepts of the Stoics with respect to the obligations of morality and the duties of life, and digested them into a work which is known by the title of *Ethica ex Stoicis*.[a]

III. In all the Latin provinces, schemes were carried into execution with considerable success, for promoting the study of letters, improving taste, and dispelling the pedantic spirit of the times. This laudable disposition gave rise to the erection of many schools and academies, at Cologne, Orleans, Cahors, Perusia, Florence, and Pisa, in which all the liberal arts and sciences, distributed into the same classes that still subsist in those places, were taught with assiduity and zeal. Opulent persons founded and amply endowed particular colleges, in the public universities, in which, beside the monks, young men of narrow circumstances were educated in all the branches of literature. Libraries were also collected, and men of learning animated to aspire to fame and glory, by the prospect of honourable rewards. It must be acknowledged, indeed, that the advantages arising to the church and state, from so many professors and learned men, did not wholly answer the expense and care bestowed on this undertaking by men of rank and fortune; yet we are by no means to conclude, as many have rashly done, that all the doctors of this age, who rose gradually from the lower to the higher and more honourable stations, were only distinguished by their stupidity and ignorance.

IV. Clement V., who was now raised to the pontificate, ordered the Hebrew and other Oriental languages to be taught in the public schools, that the church might never want a sufficient number of missionaries properly qualified to dispute with the Jews and Mohammedans, and to diffuse the divine light of the Gospel throughout the east;[b] in consequence of which appointment, some eminent proficients in these tongues, and especially in the Hebrew, flourished during this age. The Greek language, which hitherto had been much neglected, was now revived, and taught with general applause, first by Leontius Pilatus, a Calabrian, who wrote a commentary upon Homer, and a few others,[c] but afterwards, with far greater success and reputation, by Manuel Chrysoloras,[d] a native of Constantinople. Nor were there wanting some extraordinary geniuses, who, by their zeal and application, contributed to the restoration of the ancient and genuine eloquence of the Latins, among whom the excellent and justly renowned Petrarch held the first place,[e] and Dante Alighieri the second. Full of this worthy design, they both acted as if they had received an extraordinary commission to promote the reign of true taste and the progress of polite learning; and their success was answerable to the generous ambition that animated their efforts; for they had many followers and admirers, not only among their countrymen, but also among the French and Germans.

V. The writings of this age furnish us with a long list of grammarians, historians, lawyers, and physicians, of whom it would be easy to speak more particularly; but, as such a detail is unnecessary, it will be sufficient to inform our readers, that there were few of this multitude, whose labours were strikingly useful to society. Great numbers applied themselves to the study of the civil and canon laws, because it was the readiest way to preferment both in church and state. Such as have any tolerable acquaintance with history, cannot be entirely strangers to the fame of Bartolus, Baldus, Andreas, and other doctors of laws in this century, who reflected honour on the universities of Italy. But, after all, it is certain that the jurisprudence of this age was a most intricate, disagreeable study, unenlivened either by history or style, and destitute of every allurement that could recommend it to a man of genius. As for the mathematics, they were cultivated by many; yet, if we except Thomas Bradwardine, the acute and learned archbishop of Canterbury, there were few who acquired any degree of reputation by this kind of study.

[a] Henrici Canisii Lectiones Antiquæ, tom. iv. p. 405.

[b] See Ant. Wood, Antiq. Oxoniens. tom. i. p. 156, 159.

[c] See Humph. Hody, de Græcis illustribus, Linguæ Græcæ Literarumque humaniorum Instauratoribus, lib. i.—Calogera, Opusculi Scientifici, tom. xxv. p. 258.

[d] Hody, lib i. p. 10.—Calogera, p. 348.—and more especially Christ. Fred. Borner's Lib. de Græcis Literarum Græcarum in Italiâ Instaurat.

[e] See Jac. Phil Thomasini Vita Petrarchæ in Jo. Ger. Meuschen Vit. claror. Viror. tom. iv. who, in his preface, enumerates all the other writers of his life. Of the celebrated poet Dante, several have treated, particularly his translator Benvenuto of Imola, from whom Muratori has borrowed large extracts in his Antiquit. Ital. medii Ævi, tom. i.

VI. The vast number of philosophers, who rather disgraced than adorned this century, looked upon Aristotle as their infallible oracle and guide, though they stripped him of all those excellences that really belonged to him, and were incapable of entering into the true spirit of his writings. So great was the authority of the peripatetic philosophy, that, in order to diffuse the knowledge of it as widely as possible, even kings and emperors ordered the works of Aristotle to be translated into the native language of their respective dominions. Among the most eminent of this class was Charles V. king of France, who ordered all the writings of the ancients, and especially those of Aristotle, to be translated into French by Nicolas Oresme.[a] Those, however, who professed themselves philosophers, instead of being animated by the love of truth, were inflamed by a rage of disputation, which led them to perplex and deform the pure, simple doctrines of reason and religion, by a multitude of idle subtleties, trifling questions, and ridiculous distinctions. It is needless to enlarge either on the barbarity of their phraseology, in which they supposed the chief strength of their art consisted, or on that utter aversion to every branch of polite learning, in which they foolishly gloried. Those who wish to be acquainted with their methods of argumentation, and whatever else relates to this wrangling tribe, need only consult John Scotus, or Walter Burlæus. But, though they all followed one common track, there were several points on which they differed among themselves.

VII. The old disputes between the *Realists* and *Nominalists*, which had lain dormant a long time, were now revived, with an ardour seemingly inextinguishable, by an English Franciscan of the severe order, named William Occam, who was a follower of the great Scotus, and a doctor of divinity at Paris. The Greeks and Persians never fought against each other with more hatred and fury, than these two discordant sects, whose angry disputations subsisted without any abatement, till the appearance of Luther, who soon obliged the scholastic divines to terminate their mutual wranglings, and to listen to terms of accommodation. The Realists despised their antagonists as philosophers of a recent date, branding them with the name of Moderns, while, through a great mistake, they ascribed a very high antiquity to the tenets of their own party. The Nominalists, on the other hand, inveighed against them as a set of doting visionaries, who, despising substantial matters, were pursuing mere shadows. The Nominalists had the most eloquent, acute, and subtle doctors of Paris for their leaders, among whom, beside Occam, the famous John Buridan[b] was very eminent; the Realists, nevertheless, through the countenance given them by successive popes, prevailed; for, when Occam had joined the party of the Franciscan monks, who strenuously opposed John XXII., that pope himself, and his successors, left no means untried to extirpate the philosophy of the Nominalists, which was deemed highly prejudicial to the interests of the church:[c] and hence it was, that, in 1339, the university of Paris, by a public edict, solemnly condemned and prohibited the philosophy of Occam, which was that of the Nominalists.[d] But, as it is natural for men to love and pursue what is forbidden, the consequence was, that the party of the Nominalists flourished more than ever.

VIII. Among the philosophers of these times, there were many who with their philosophy mingled *astrology*, *i. e.* the art of telling fortunes by the aspect of the heavens and the influence of the stars; and, notwithstanding the obvious folly and absurdity of this pretended science, both the higher and lower ranks were fond of it even to distraction. Yet, in spite of all this popular prejudice in favour of their art, these astrological philosophers, to avoid being impeached of witchcraft, and to keep themselves out of the hands of the inquisitors, were obliged to behave with great circumspection. The neglect of this caution was remarkably fatal to Ceccus Asculanus, a famous peripatetic philosopher, astrologer, and mathematician, who first acted as physician to pope John XXII. and afterwards to Charles Sineterra, duke of Calabria. This unfortunate man, having performed some experiments in mechanics, that seemed miraculous to the vulgar, and having also offended many, and among the rest his master, by giving out some predictions, which were said to have been fulfilled, was universally supposed to deal with infernal spirits, and was committed to the flames, in 1327, by the inquisitors of Florence.[e] There is yet extant his commentary upon the Sphere of John de Sacrobosco, otherwise named Holywood, which shows him to have been deeply tainted with superstition.[f]

IX. Raymond Lully was the author of a new and singular kind of philosophy, which he endeavoured to illustrate and defend by his voluminous writings. He was a native of Majorca, and admirable for the extent and fecundity of his genius; but was, at the same time, a strange compound of reason and folly. Being full of zeal for the propagation of the Gospel, and having performed many voyages, and undergone various hardships to promote it, he was slain at Bugia, in Africa, in 1315, by the Mohamedans whom he was attempting to convert. The Franciscans, to whose third order it is said he belonged, exto him to the skies, and have taken great pains to persuade several popes to canonise him; while many, on the contrary, and especially the Dominicans, inveigh bitterly against him, calling him a wild and visionary chemist, a hot-headed fanatic and heretic, a magician, and a mere compiler from the works of the more learned Moslems. The popes entertained different opinions of him; some regarding him as a harmless pious man, while others pronounced him a vile heretic. But whoever peruses the writings of Lully without prejudice, will not be biassed by either of these parties. It is at least certain, that he would have been a great man, had the warmth and fertility of his imagination been tempered with a sound judgment.[g]

[a] Launoy, Hist. Gymnas. Navarr. tom. iv. op. part i. p. 504.—Boulay, Histor. Acad. Paris. tom. iv. p. 379.—Le Bœuf, Dissert. sur l'Hist. Eccles. et Civile de Par. tom. iii. p. 456.

[b] Rob. Gaguin wrote a particular account of this famous man, as we learn from Launoy, in his Historia Gymnasii Navarreni, tom. iv. op. part i. p. 722. See also Boulay, Histor. Acad. Paris. tom. iv. p. 282, 307, 341, &c.

[c] Steph. Baluzii Miscel. tom. iv. p. 532.

[d] Boulay, Hist. Acad. Paris. tom. iv. p. 257; tom. v. p. 708.—Car. Pless. d'Argentre, Collectio judiciorum de novis erroribus, &c.

[e] Paul Ant. Appianus wrote a defence of this unhappy man, which is inserted in Domen. Bernini Storia di tutte l' Heresie, tom. iii. sect. xiv. cap. iii. p. 210. We have also a farther account of him by Giov. Maria Crescimbeni, Commentari della volgar Poesia, vol. ii. part ii. lib. iii. cap. xiv.

[f] Gabr. Naudæus, Apologie pour les grands hommes qui ont été soupçonnez de Magie, p. 270.

[g] See John Salzinger's Preface to Raymond Lully's works, which John William, elector Palatine, caused to be collected at a great expense,

CHAPTER II.

Concerning the Doctors and Government of the Church during this Century.

I. THE governors of the church in this period, from the highest to the lowest orders, were addicted to vices peculiarly dishonourable to their sacred character. We shall say nothing of the Grecian and Oriental clergy, who lived, for the most part, under a rigid, severe, and oppressive government, though they deserve their part in this heavy and ignominious charge. But, with regard to the Latins, our silence would be inexcusable, since the flagrant abuses that prevailed among them were attended with consequences equally pernicious to the interests of religion and the well-being of civil society. It is, however, necessary to observe, that there were, even in these degenerate times, some pious and worthy men, who ardently longed for a reformation of the church, both in *its head and members*, as they used to express themselves.[a] To prevent the accomplishment of these laudable desires, many circumstances concurred; such as the exhorbitant power of the popes, so confirmed by length of time that it seemed immoveable, and the excessive superstition that enslaved the minds of the generality, together with the wretched ignorance and barbarity of the age, by which every spark of truth was stifled, as it were, in its very birth. Yet, firm and lasting as the dominion of the Roman pontiffs seemed to be, it was gradually undermined and weakened, partly by the pride and rashness of the popes themselves, and partly by unexpected events.

II. This important change may be dated from the quarrel which arose between Boniface VIII., who filled the papal throne about the beginning of this century, and Philip the Fair, king of France. This prince, who was endowed with a bold and enterprising spirit, soon convinced Europe, that it was possible to set bounds to the overgrown arrogance of the bishop of Rome, although many crowned heads had attempted it without success. Boniface sent Philip the haughtiest letters imaginable, in which he asserted, that the king of France, and all other kings and princes, were obliged, by a divine command, to submit to the authority of the popes, as well in all political and civil matters, as in those of a religious nature. The king answered him with great spirit, and in terms expressive of the utmost contempt. The pope rejoined with more arrogance than ever; and, in that famous *bull* (*unam sanctum*) which he published about this time, asserted that Jesus Christ had granted a twofold power to his church, or, in other words, the spiritual and temporal swords; that he had subjected the whole human race to the authority of the Roman pontiff, and that all who dared to dispute it, were to be deemed heretics, and excluded from all possibility of salvation.[b] The king, on the other hand, in an assembly of the peers of his kingdom, holden in 1303, ordered William de Nogaret, a celebrated lawyer,[c] to draw up an accusation against the pope, in which he publicly charged him with heresy, simony, and other vices and crimes, demanding, at the same time, the convocation of an œcumenical council, for the speedy deposition of such an execrable pontiff. The pope, in his turn, passed a sentence of excommunication, in that very year, against the king and all his adherents.

III. Philip, shortly after he received his sentence, held an assembly of the states of the kingdom, where he again employed some persons of the highest rank and reputation to sit in judgment upon the pope, and appeal to a general council. After this, he sent William de Nogaret with some others into Italy, to excite a sedition, to seize the pope's person, and then to convey him to Lyons, where the king was determined to hold the above-mentioned council. Nogaret, being a resolute active man, soon drew over to his assistance the powerful Colonna family, (then at variance with the pope,) levied a small army, seized Boniface, who lived in apparent security at Anagni, and treated him in the most shocking manner, carrying his resentment so far as to wound him on the head by a blow with his iron gauntlet. The inhabitants of Anagni rescued him out of the hands of this fierce and implacable enemy, and conducted him to Rome, where he died soon after of an illness occasioned by the rage and anguish into which these insults had thrown him.[d]

IV. Benedict XI., who succeeded him, and whose name, before his accession to the papal chair, was Nicolas Boccacini, learned prudence by this fatal example, and pursued more moderate and gentle measures. He repealed, of his own accord, the sentence of excommunication which his predecessor had thundered out against the king of France and his dominions; but never could be prevailed upon to absolve Nogaret of his treason against the spiritual majesty of the pontificate. Nogaret, on the other hand, set a small value upon the papal absolution, and prosecuted, with his usual vigour and intrepidity, in the Roman court, the accusation that he had formerly adduced against Boniface; and, in the name of his royal master, insisted, that the memory of that pontiff should be branded with a notorious mark of infamy. During these transactions, Benedict died, A. D. 1304; upon which Philip, by his artful intrigues in the conclave, obtained the see of Rome for Bertrand de Got, archbishop of Bourdeaux, who was accordingly elected to that high dignity, on the 5th of June, 1305. This step was so much the more necessary, as the breach between the king and the court of Rome was not yet entirely healed, and (Nogaret not being absolved) might easily be renewed. Besides, the French monarch, inflamed with the desire of revenge, insisted upon the formal condemnation of Boniface by the court of Rome, the abolition of the order of Templars, and other concessions of great importance, which he could not reasonably expect from an Italian pontiff. Hence he looked upon a French pope, in whose zeal and compliance

and to be published in 1720. Luc. Wadding, Annal. Minor. tom. iv. p. 421; tom. v. p. 157, 316; tom. vi. p. 229. Concerning the famous invention of Lully, see the Polyhistor of Dan. George Morhoff, lib. ii. cap. v. p. 352.

[a] Matt. Flacius, Catalog. testium Veritatis, lib. xiii. p. 1697. Jo. Laurentius, de variâ Fortunâ Aristotelis p. 217. Jo. Henr. Hottinger, Historia Eccles. sæc. xiv. p. 754.

[b] This *bull* is yet extant in the Corpus Juris Canon. Extravagant. Commun. lib. i. tit. de majoritate et obedientia.

[c] Of this distinguished man, who was the most intrepid and inveterate enemy the popes ever had before Luther, no writers have given us a more copious account than the Benedictine monks, Hist. Generale de Languedoc, tom. iii. p. 114, 117. Philip made him chancellor of France for his resolute opposition to the pope.

[d] See the Acta inter Bonifacium VIII. Bened. XI. Clement. V. et Philippum Pulchrum, published in 1614 by Peter Puteanus.—Adr. Baillet, Hist. des Demelez du Pape Boniface VIII. avec Philippe le Bel. —Jo. Rubeus, in Bonifacio, cap. xvi. p. 137. The other writers on this subject are mentioned by Baillet, in his Preface, p. 9.—See also Boulay Hist. Acad. Paris. tom. iv.

he could confide, as necessary to the execution of his designs. Bertrand assumed the name of Clement V., and, at the king's request, remained in France, and removed the papal residence to Avignon, where it continued during the space of seventy years. This period, the Italians call, by way of derision, the Babylonish captivity.[a]

V. There is no doubt, that the continued residence of the popes in France greatly impaired the authority of the Roman see. For, during the absence of the pontiffs from Rome, the faction of the Ghibellines, their inveterate enemies, rose to a greater height than ever; and they not only invaded and ravaged St. Peter's patrimony, but even attacked the papal authority by their writings. This caused many cities to revolt from the popes: even Rome itself was the grand source and fomenter of cabals, tumults, and civil wars; insomuch, that the laws and decrees sent thither from France were publicly treated with contempt by the populace, as well as by the nobles.[b] The influence of this example was propagated from Italy through most parts of Europe; it being evident, from a vast number of instances, that the Europeans in general were far from paying so much regard to the decrees and thunders of the Gallic popes, as they did to those of Rome. This gave rise to various seditions against the pontiffs, which they could not entirely crush, even with the aid of the inquisitors, who exerted themselves with the most barbarous fury.

VI. The French pontiffs, finding that they could draw only small revenues from their Italian dominions, which were now torn in pieces by faction and ravaged by sedition, were obliged to contrive new methods of accumulating wealth. For this purpose, they not only sold indulgences to the people, more frequently than they had formerly done, whereby they made themselves extremely odious to several potentates, but also disposed publicly of scandalous licences, of all sorts, at an excessive price. John XXII. was remarkably shrewd and zealous in promoting this abominable traffick; for, though he was not the first inventor of the taxes and rules of the apostolical chancery, the Romish writers acknowledge that he enlarged and rendered them more extensively profitable to the holy treasury.[c] It is certain, that the origin of the tribute paid to the popes under the name of *Annates*, a tax which is generally affirmed to have been first imposed by him, is of a much earlier date.[d] Beside the abuses now mentioned, these Gallic popes, having abolished the right of election, arrogated to themselves a power of conferring all the offices of the church, whether great or small, according to their fancy, by which they soon amassed prodigious wealth. It was also under their government that reserves, provisions, expectatives, and other impositions of the like odious nature, which had seldom (if ever) been heard of before, became familiar to the public ear, and filled all Europe with bitter complaints.[e] These complaints exceeded all bounds, when some of these pontiffs, particularly John XXII., Clement VI., and Gregory XI., openly declared that they had reserved to themselves all churches and parishes within their jurisdiction, and were determined, in consequence of that sovereign authority and plenitude of power which Christ had conferred upon them, his vicars, to provide for them, and dispose of them without exception.[f] It was by these and other mean and selfish contrivances, which had no other end than the acquisition of riches, that these inconsiderate and rapacious pontiffs excited a general hatred against the Roman see, and thereby greatly weakened the papal empire, which had been visibly upon the decline from the time of Boniface.

VII. Clement V. was a mere creature of Philip the Fair, and was absolutely directed and governed by that prince as long as he lived. William de Nogaret, the implacable enemy of the late pontiff, although he was under a sentence of excommunication, had the boldness to prosecute his master's cause, and his own, against Boniface, even in the pope's court; an instance of assurance not easy to be paralleled. Philip insisted, that the dead body of Boniface should be dug up and publicly burned; but Clement averted this infamy by his advice and intreaties, promising implicit obedience to the king in every thing else. In order therefore to keep his word, he was obliged to abrogate the laws enacted by Boniface, to grant the king a bounty of five years' tithes, fully to absolve Nogaret of all his crimes, on condition of his submitting to a light penance, (which, however, he never performed,) to restore the citizens of Anagni to their reputation and honour, and to call a general council at Vienne, in 1311, in order to condemn the Templars, on whose destruction Philip was most ardently bent. In this council every thing was determined as the king thought proper; for Clement, terrified by the melancholy fate of Boniface, durst not venture to oppose this intrepid and obstinate monarch.[g]

VIII. Upon Clement's death, which happened in 1314, fierce contentions arose in the conclave about choosing a successor, the French cardinals insisting upon a French, and those of Italy demanding an Italian pope. After a contest, which continued two years, the French party prevailed, and, in 1316, elected James d'Euse, (a native of Cahors, and cardinal bishop of Porto,) who assumed the name of John XXII. He had a tolerable share of learning, but was crafty, proud, weak, imprudent, and covetous, which is allowed even by those writers who, in other respects, speak well of him. He is deservedly censured on account of his temerity, and the ill success

[a] For an account of the French popes, consult chiefly Vitæ Pontif. Avenionensium, published by Baluze in 1693. The reader may also peruse, but it must be with the utmost caution, Longueval's History of the Gallican Church, and the continuation of that work.—See more especially tom. xii. This Jesuit, and his successors, have shown great industry and eloquence in the composition of this history; but they, for the most part, artfully conceal the vices and enormities of the Roman pontiffs.

[b] See Baluze, Pontif. Avenion. tom. ii. p. 290, 301, 309.—Muratori, Antiq. Ital. tom. iii. p. 397, 401, &c.—Giannone, Historia di Napoli, t. iii.

[c] Jo. Ciampinus, de Vice-Cancellario Ecclesiæ Rom. p. 39.—Chais, Lettres sur les Jubilés, tom. ii. p. 673.

[d] Bern. van Espen, *Jus Eccles. universale*, tom. ii. p. 876.—Boulay, Histor. Acad. Paris. tom. iv. p. 911.—Ant. Wood, Antiquit. Oxon. tom. i. p. 213.—Guil. Franc. Berthier, Diss. sur les Annates, tom. xii. Hist. de l'Eglise Gallic.

[e] Steph. Baluzii Miscellan. tom. iii. p. 479, 518.—Ejus Vit. Pontif Avenion. tom. ii. p. 60, 74, 154.—Gallia Christiana Benedictinor. tom. i. Append. p. 13.—Wood, Antiquit. Oxon. tom. i. p. 148, 201.—Boulay, Hist. Acad. Paris. tom. iv. p. 411.

[f] Baluzii Pontif. Avenion. tom. ii. p. 873. tom. i. p. 285, 311, 681.—Ant. Matthæi Analecta vet. Ævi, tom. v. p. 249.—Gallia Christiana, tom. i. p. 69, 1208.—*Histoire du Droit Eccles. François*, tom. ii. p. 129.

[g] Beside the common writers already cited, see Guil. Fran. Berthier, Discours sur le Pontificat de Clement V. tom. xiii. Hist. Eccles. Gallic.—Colonia, Hist. Liter. de Lyon, tom. i. p. 340—Gallia Christiana, tom. i. ii.

that attended him, through his own imprudence, in many of his enterprises; but he is more especially blamed for that calamitous and unhappy war into which he entered against Louis of Bavaria. This powerful prince disputed the imperial throne of Germany with Frederic, duke of Austria; and they had been both chosen to that high dignity, in 1314, by their respective partisans among the electors and princes of the empire. John took it for granted, that the decision of this contest came under his spiritual jurisdiction. But, in 1322, the duke of Bavaria, having vanquished his competitor by force of arms, assumed the administration of the empire without asking the pope's approbation, and would by no means allow, that the dispute, already determined by the sword, should be again decided by the pontiff's judgment. John interpreted this refusal as a heinous insult upon his authority, and, by an edict issued in 1324, pretended to deprive the emperor of his crown. But this impotent resentment was very little regarded; and he was even accused of heresy by Louis, who, at the same time, appealed to a general council. Highly exasperated by these and other deserved affronts, the pontiff presumed, in 1327, to declare the imperial throne vacant a second time, and even to publish a sentence of excommunication against the chief of the empire. This new mark of papal arrogance was severely resented by Louis, who, in 1328, published an edict at Rome, by which John was declared unworthy of the pontificate, deposed from that dignity, and succeeded in it by one of his bitterest enemies, Peter de Corbieri, a Franciscan monk, who assumed the name of Nicolas V., and crowned the emperor at Rome, in a solemn and public manner. But, in 1330, this *imperial* pope voluntarily abdicated the chair of St. Peter, and surrendered himself to John, who kept him in close confinement at Avignon for the rest of his life. Thus ended the contest between the duke of Bavaria and John XXII., both of whom, notwithstanding their efforts to dethrone each other, continued in the possession of their respective dignities.[a]

IX. The numerous tribes of the Fratricelli, Beghards, and Spiritual Franciscans, adhered to the party of Louis. Supported by his patronage, and dispersed through the greatest part of Europe, they boldly attacked the reigning pontiff, as an enemy to the true religion, and loaded him with the heaviest accusations, and the bitterest invectives, both in their writings and in their ordinary conversation. These attacks did not greatly affect the pontiff, as they were made only by private persons, by a set of obscure monks, who, in many respects, were unworthy of his notice; but, toward the conclusion of his life, he incurred the disapprobation and censures of almost the whole Catholic church: for, in 1331, and the succeeding year, he asserted, in some public discourses, that the souls of the faithful, in their intermediate state, were permitted to behold Christ as man, but not the face of God, or the divine nature, before their re-union with the body at the last day. This doctrine highly offended Philip VI., king of France, was opposed by the pope's friends as well as by his enemies, and condemned in 1333 by the divines of Paris. This favourite tenet of the pope was thus severely treated, because it seemed highly prejudicial to the felicity of happy spirits in their unembodied state; otherwise the point might have been yielded to a man of his positive temper, without any material consequence. Alarmed by these vigorous proceedings, he immediately offered something by way of excuse for having espoused this opinion; and afterwards, in 1334, when he was at the point of death, though he did not entirely renounce, he in some measure softened it, by saying he believed that the unembodied souls of the righteous 'beheld the divine essence as far as their separate state and condition would permit.'[b] This declaration did not satisfy his adversaries: hence his successor, Benedict XII., after many disputes about it, put an end to this controversy by an unanimous resolution of the Parisian doctors, ordering it to be received as an article of faith, that the souls of the blessed, during their intermediate state, were capable of contemplating, fully and perfectly, the divine nature.[c] Benedict's publishing of this resolution could be in no way injurious to the memory of John; for, when the latter lay upon his death-bed, he submitted his opinion to the judgment of the church, that he might not be deemed a heretic after his decease.[d]

X. John dying in 1334, new contentions arose in the conclave between the French and Italian cardinals, about the election of a pope; but toward the end of the year they chose James Fournier, a Frenchman, and cardinal of St. Prisca, who took the name of Benedict XII. The writers of these times represent him as a man of great probity, who was not chargeable with that avarice, or that ambition, which had dishonoured so many of his predecessors.[e] He put an end to the papal quarrel with the emperor Louis; and though he did not restore him to the communion of the church, because prevented, as it is said, by the king of France, yet he did not attempt any thing against him. He carefully attended to the grievances of the church, redressed them as far as was in his power, endeavoured to reform the fundamental laws of the monastic societies, whether of the mendicant, or more opulent orders; and died in 1342, while he was

[a] The particulars of this violent quarrel may be learned from the Records published by Steph. Baluze in his Vit. Pontif. Avenion. tom. ii. p. 512.—Edm. Martenne, Thesaur. Anecdotor. tom. ii. p. 641.—Jo. Georg. Herwart, in Ludovico Imperatore defenso contra Bzovium, et Christ. Gewold. in Apologia pro Ludovico Bavaro, against the same Bzovius, who, in the Annals he had published, basely aspersed the memory of the emperor. See also Wadding, in Annalib. Minor. tom. vii. p. 77, 106, &c. Whoever attentively peruses the history of this war, will perceive that Louis of Bavaria followed the example of Philip the Fair, king of France. As Philip brought an accusation of heresy against Boniface, so did Louis with respect to John XXII. The French monarch made use of Nogaret and other accusers against one pontiff: Louis employed Occam and the Franciscans, in that quality against the other. Each insisted upon the convocation of a general council, and the deposition of an obnoxious pontiff. I omit other circumstances that might be alleged to render the parallel more striking.

[b] See Steph. Baluzii Vit. Pontif. Avenion. tom. i. p. 175, 182, 197, 221, 786, &c.—Luc. D'Acherii Spicil. Scriptor. Veter. tom. i. p. 760, ed. vet.—Jo. Launoii Historia Gymnas. Navarreni, part i. cap. vii. p. 319. tom. iv. part i. op.—Boulay, Histor. Acad. Paris. tom. iv. p. 235, 250.—Wadding, Annal. Minor. tom. vi. p. 371; tom vii. p. 145.—Echard, Scriptor. Prædicator. tom. i. p. 599, 608.

[c] Baluzii Vit. Pontif. Avenion. tom. i. p. 197, 216, 221.

☞ [d] All the heretical fancies of this pope about the *Beatific Vision* were nothing in comparison with a vile and most enormous practica. heresy, that was found in his coffers after his death, *viz.* five and twenty millions of florins, of which there were eighteen in specie, and the rest in plate, jewels, crowns, mitres, and other precious baubles, which he had squeezed out of the people and the inferior clergy during his pontificate. See Fleury, Hist. Eccles. liv. xciv. sect. xxxix.

[e] See the Fragmenta Histor. Roman. in Muratorii Antiquit. Ital. tom. iii. p. 275.—Baluzii Vit. Pont. Avenion. tom. i. p. 205, 218, &c.—Boulay, Hist. Acad. Par. tom. iv.

devising the most noble schemes for promoting a yet more extensive reformation. In short, if we overlook his superstition, the prevailing blemish of this barbarous age, it must be allowed that he was a man of integrity and merit.

XI. He was succeeded by a man of a very different disposition, Clement VI., a native of France, whose name was Peter Roger, and who was cardinal of St. Nereus and St. Achilles, before his elevation to the pontificate. Not to insist upon the most unexceptionable parts of this pontiff's conduct, we shall only observe, that he trod faithfully in the steps of John XXII. in *providing* for vacant churches and bishopricks, by *reserving* to himself the disposal of them, which showed his sordid and insatiable avarice; that he conferred ecclesiastical dignities and benefices of the highest consequence upon strangers and Italians, which drew upon him the warm displeasure of the kings of England and France; and lastly, that by renewing the dissensions that had formerly subsisted between Louis of Bavaria and the Roman see, he exposed his excessive vanity and ambition in the most odious colours. In 1343, he assailed the emperor with his thundering edicts; and when he heard that they were treated by that prince with the utmost contempt, his rage was augmented, and he not only threw out new maledictions, and published new sentences of excommunication against him, in 1346, but also excited the German princes to elect Henry VII., son of Charles IV., emperor in his place. This violent measure would infallibly have occasioned a civil war in Germany, had it not been prevented by the death of Louis, in 1347. Clement survived him above five years, and died near the close of the year 1352, famous for nothing but his excessive zeal for extending the papal authority, and for his having added Avignon, which he purchased of Joan, queen of Naples, to the patrimony of St. Peter.

XII. His successor, Innocent VI., whose name was Stephen Albert, was much more remarkable for integrity and moderation He was a Frenchman, and before his election had been bishop of Ostia. He died in 1362, after having governed the church for almost ten years. His greatest blemish was, that he promoted his relatives with an excessive partiality; but, in other respects, he was a man of merit, and a great encourager of pious and learned men. He kept the monks closely to their duty, carefully abstained from *reserving churches*, and, by many good actions, acquired a great and deserved reputation. He was succeeded by William Grimoard, abbot of St. Victor at Marseilles, who took the name of Urban V., and was entirely free from all the grosser vices, if we except those which cannot easily be separated from the papal dignity. This pope, being prevailed on by the entreaties of the Romans, returned to Rome in 1367; but, in 1370, he revisited Avignon, to reconcile the differences that had arisen between the kings of England and France, and died there in the same year.

XIII. He was succeeded by Peter Roger, a French ecclesiastic of illustrious descent, who assumed the name of Gregory XI., a man who, though inferior to his predecessors in virtue, far exceeded them in courage and audacity. In his time, Italy in general, and the city of Rome in particular, were distressed with most outrageous and formidable tumults. The Florentines carried on with success a terrible war against the ecclesiastical state;[a] upon which, Gregory, in hopes of quieting the disorders of Italy, and also of recovering the cities and territories which had been taken from St. Peter's patrimony, transferred the papal seat, in 1376, from Avignon to Rome. To this he was in a great measure determined by the advice of Catharine, a virgin of Sens, who, in this credulous age, was thought to be inspired with the spirit of prophecy, and made a journey to Avignon on purpose to persuade him to take this step.[b] It was not, however, long before Gregory repented that he had followed her advice; for, by the long absence of the popes from Italy, their authority was reduced to so low an ebb, that the Romans and Florentines made no scruple to insult him with the grossest abuse, which made him resolve to return to Avignon; but, before he could execute his determination, he was taken off by death, in 1378.

XIV. After the death of Gregory XI., the cardinals were assembled to consult about choosing a successor, when the people of Rome, unwilling that the vacant dignity should be conferred on a Frenchman, approached the conclave in a tumultuous manner, and with great clamours, accompanied with outrageous menaces, insisted that an Italian should be advanced to the popedom. The cardinals, terrified by this uproar, immediately proclaimed Bartholomew Pregnano, who was a Neapolitan, and archbishop of Bari, and assumed the name of Urban VI. This new pontiff, by his impolite behaviour, injudicious severity, and intolerable arrogance, had entailed upon himself the odium of people of all ranks, and especially of the leading cardinals. These latter, therefore, tired of his insolence, withdrew from Rome to Anagni, and thence to Fondi, where they elected to the pontificate Robert, count of Geneva, (who took the name of Clement VII.,) and declared at the same time, that the election of Urban was nothing more than a mere ceremony, which they had found themselves obliged to perform, in order to calm the turbulent rage of the populace. Which of these two we ought to consider as having been the true and lawful pope, is to this day, a doubtful point; nor will the records and writings, alleged by the contending parties, enable us to adjust that point with certainty.[c] Urban remained at Rome: Clement went to Avignon. His cause was espoused by France, Spain, Scotland, Sicily, and Cyprus, while all the rest of Europe acknowledged Urban as the true vicar of Christ.

XV. Thus the union of the Latin church under one head, was destroyed at the death of Gregory XI., and was succeeded by that deplorable dissension, commonly known by the name of the *great western schism*.[d] This dis-

[a] See Colucii Salutati Epistolæ, written in the name of the Florentines, part i. See also the preface to the second part.

[b] See Longueval, Hist. de l'Eglise Gallicane, tom. xiv. p. 159, 192.

[c] See the acts and documents in Boulay, Hist. Acad. Paris. tom. iv. p. 463.—Luc. Wadding, Annal. Minor. tom. ix. p. 12.—Steph. Baluze, Vit. Pontif. Avenion. tom. i. p. 442, 998.—Acta. Sanctor. tom. i. April. p 728.

[d] An account of this dissension may be seen in Pierre du Puy, Histoire Generale du Schisme qui a été en l'Eglise depuis l'an. 1378 jusqu' en l'an. 1428, which, as we are informed in the preface, was compiled from the royal records of France, and is entirely worthy of credit Nor should we wholly reject Louis Maimbourg's Histoire du grand Schisme d'Occident, though in general it be deeply tainted with the leaven of party spirit. Many documents are to be met with in Boulay's Histor. Acad. Paris. tom. iv. and v.; and also in Martenne's Thesaur. Anecdotor. tom. ii. I always pass over the common writers upon this subject, such as Alexander, Raynald, Bzovius, Spondanus, and Du-Pin.

sension was fomented with such dreadful success, and arose to such a shameful height, that, for fifty years, the church had two or three different heads at the same time; each of the contending popes forming plots, and thundering out anathemas against their competitors. The distress and calamity of these times are beyond all power of description; for, not to insist upon the perpetual contentions and wars between the factions of the several popes, by which multitudes lost their fortunes and lives, all sense of religion was extinguished in most places, and profligacy rose to a most scandalous excess. The clergy, while they vehemently contended which of the reigning popes ought to be deemed the true successor of Christ, were so excessively corrupt, as to be no longer studious to keep up even an appearance of religion or decency: and, in consequence of all this, many plain well-meaning people, who concluded that no one could partake of eternal life, unless united with the vicar of Christ, were overwhelmed with doubt, and plunged into the deepest mental distress.[a] Nevertheless, these abuses were, by their consequences, greatly conducive both to the civil and religious interests of mankind; for, by these dissensions, the papal power received an incurable wound; and kings and princes, who had formerly been the slaves of the lordly pontiffs, now became their judges and masters; and many of the least stupid among the people had the courage to disregard and despise the popes, on account of their odious disputes about dominion, to commit their salvation to God alone, and to admit it as a maxim, that the prosperity of the church might be maintained, and the interests of religion secured and promoted, without a visible head, crowned with a spiritual supremacy.

XVI. The Italian cardinals, attached to the interests of Urban VI., on the death of that pope, in 1389, set up for his successor Peter Thomacelli, a Neapolitan, who took the name of Boniface IX.; and Clement VII., dying in 1394, the French cardinals raised to the pontificate Peter de Luna, a Spaniard, who assumed the name of Benedict XIII. During these transactions, various methods were proposed and attempted for healing this melancholy breach in the church. Kings and princes, bishops and divines, appeared with zeal in this salutary project. It was generally thought that the best course to be taken was, what they then styled, the *Method of Cession:* but neither of the popes could be prevailed on, either by entreaties or threats, to give up the pontificate. The Gallican church, highly incensed at this obstinacy, renounced solemnly, in a council holden at Paris, in 1397, all subjection and obedience to both pontiffs; and, on the publication of this resolution, in 1398, Benedict was, by the express orders of Charles VI., detained prisoner in his palace at Avignon.[b]

XVII. Some of the popes, particularly Benedict XII., were perfectly acquainted with the prevailing vices and scandalous conduct of the greatest part of the monks, which they zealously endeavoured to rectify and remove; but the disorder was too inveterate to be easily cured, or effectually remedied. The Mendicants, and more especially the Dominicans and Franciscans, were at the head of the monastic orders, and had, indeed, become the heads of the church: so extensive was the influence they had acquired, that all matters of importance, both in the court of Rome, and in the cabinets of princes, were carried on under their supreme and absolute direction. The multitude had such a high notion of the sanctity of these *sturdy beggars*, and of their credit with the Supreme Being, that great numbers of both sexes, some in health, others in a state of infirmity, others at the point of death, earnestly desired to be admitted into the Mendicant order, which they looked upon as a sure and infallible method of rendering Heaven propitious. Many made it an essential part of their last wills, that their carcasses, after death, should be wrapped in ragged Dominican or Franciscan habits, and interred among the Mendicants; for, amidst the barbarous superstition and wretched ignorance of this age, the generality of people believed that they might readily obtain mercy from Christ at the day of judgment, if they should appear before his tribunal associated with the Mendicant friars.

XVIII. The high esteem attached to the Mendicant orders, and the great authority which they had acquired, only served to render them still more odious to such as had hitherto been their enemies, and to draw upon them new marks of jealousy and hatred from the higher and lower clergy, the monastic societies, and the public universities. So general was this odium, that in almost every province and university of Europe, bishops, clergy, and doctors, were warmly engaged in opposition to the Dominicans and Franciscans, who employed the power and authority they had received from the popes, in undermining the ancient discipline of the church, and assuming to themselves a certain superintendence in religious matters. In England, the university of Oxford made a resolute stand against the encroachments of the Dominicans,[c] while Richard, archbishop of Armagh, Henry Cromp, Norris, and others, attacked all the Mendicant orders with great vehemence and severity.[d] But Richard, whose animosity was much keener against them than that of their other antagonists, went to the court of Innocent VI., in 1356, and vindicated the cause of the church against them with the greatest fervour, both in his writings and discourse, until the year 1360, in which he died.[e] They had also many opponents in France, who, together with the university of Paris, were secretly engaged in contriving means to overturn their exorbitant power: but John de Polliac set himself openly against them, publicly denying the validity of the absolution granted by the Dominicans and Franciscans to those who confessed to them, maintaining that the popes were disabled from granting them a power of absolution by the authority of the canon entitled *Omnis utriusque sexus*, and proving from these premises, that all those who would be sure of their salvation, ought to confess their sins to the priests of their respective parishes, even though they had been absolved by the monks. They suffered little or nothing, however, from the efforts of these numerous adversaries, being resolutely protected against all opposition, whether open or secret, by the popes, who

[a] Of the mischievous consequences of this schism, we have a full account in the Histoire du Droit public Eccles. François, tom. ii. p. 166, 193, 202.

[b] Beside the common historians, and Longueval's Histoire de l'Eglise Gallicane, t. xiv. see the acts of this council in Boulay's Hist. t. iv.

[c] See Wood's Antiquit. Oxon. tom. i. p. 150, 196, &c.

[d] See Wood, tom. i. p. 181; tom. ii. p. 61.—Baluzii Vitæ Pontif Avenion. tom. i. p. 338, 950.—Boulay, tom. iv. p. 336.—Wadding, tom. viii. p. 126.

[e] See Simon's Lettres Choisies, tom. i. p. 164. I have in my possession a manuscript treatise of Bartholomew de Brisac, entitled, "Solutiones oppositæ Ricardi, Armachani episcopi, propositionibus contra Mendicantes in curiâ Romanâ coram Pontifice et cardinalibus factis, anno 1360."

regarded them as their best friends and most effectual supports. Accordingly, John XXII., by an extraordinary decree, in 1321, condemned the opinions of John de Polliac.[a]

XIX. But, among all the enemies of the Mendicant orders, no one has been transmitted to posterity with more exalted encomiums on the one hand, or black calumnies on the other, than John Wickliff, an English doctor, professor of divinity at Oxford, and afterwards rector of Lutterworth; who, according to the testimony of the writers of these times, was a man of an enterprising genius, and extraordinary learning. In 1360, animated by the example of Richard, archbishop of Armagh, he defended the statutes and privileges of the university of Oxford, against all the orders of the Mendicants, and had the courage to throw out some slight reproofs against the popes, their principal patrons, which no true Briton ever imputed to him as a crime. After this, in 1367, he was deprived of the wardenship of Canterbury Hall, in the university of Oxford, by Simon Langham, archbishop of Canterbury, who substituted a monk in his place; upon which he appealed to pope Urban V., who confirmed the sentence of the primate against him, on account of the freedom with which he had inveighed against the monastic orders. Highly exasperated at this treatment, he threw off all restraint, and not only attacked all the monks, and their scandalous irregularities, but even the pontifical power itself and other ecclesiastical abuses, both in his sermons and writings. He proceeded to yet greater lengths, and, detesting the wretched superstition of the times, refuted, with great acuteness and spirit, the absurd notions that were generally received in religious matters, and not only exhorted the laity to study the Scriptures, but also translated into English these divine books, in order to render the perusal of them more general. Though neither the doctrine of Wickliff was void of error, nor his life without reproach, yet it must be allowed, that the changes he attempted to introduce, both in the faith and discipline of the church, were, in many respects, wise, useful, and salutary.[b]

XX. The monks, whom Wickliff had principally exasperated, commenced a violent prosecution against him at the court of Gregory XI., who, in 1377, ordered Simon Sudbury, archbishop of Canterbury, to take cognisance of the affair in a council convoked at London. Imminent as this danger evidently was, Wickliff escaped it, by the interest of the duke of Lancaster, and some other peers, who had a high regard for him; and soon after the death of Gregory, the fatal schism of the Romish church commenced, during which there was one pope at Rome, and another at Avignon; so that of course the controversy lay dormant a long time. The process against Wickliff was afterwards revived, however, by William de Courtenay, archbishop of Canterbury, in 1385, and was carried on with great vehemence in two councils holden at London and Oxford. The event was, that of the twenty-three opinions, for which Wickliff had been prosecuted by the monks, ten were condemned as heresies, and thirteen as errors.[c] He himself, however, returned in safety to Lutterworth, where he died peaceably in 1387. The latter attack was much more dangerous than the former; but by what means he got safely through it, whether by the interest of the court, or by denying or abjuring his opinions, is to this day a secret.[d] He left many followers in England, and other countries, who were styled Wickliffites and Lollards, which last was a term of popular reproach translated from the Flemish tongue into English. Wherever they could be found, they were terribly persecuted by the inquisitors, and other instruments of papal vengeance. In the council of Constance, in 1415, the memory and opinions of Wickliff were condemned by a solemn decree; and, about thirteen years after, his bones were dug up, and publicly burned.

XXI. Although the Mendicants were thus vigorously attacked on all sides, by such a considerable number of ingenious and learned adversaries, they could not be persuaded to abate any thing of their excessive pride, to set bounds to their superstition, or to desist from imposing upon the multitude, but were as diligent as ever in propagating opinions highly detrimental to religion in general, and particularly injurious to the majesty of the Supreme Being. The Franciscans, forgetting, in their enthusiastic phrensy, the veneration which they owed to the Son of God, and animated with a mad zeal for advancing the glory of their order and its founder, impiously maintained, that the latter was a second Christ, in all respects similar to the first, and that their institution, doctrine, and discipline, were the true Gospel of Jesus. Yet, shocking as these foolish and impious pretensions were, the popes were not ashamed to patronise and encourage them by their letters and mandates, in which they made no scruple to assert, that the absurd fable of the stigmas, or five wounds impressed upon Francis by Christ himself, on mount Alvernus, was worthy of credit, because matter of undoubted fact.[e] Nor was this all; for they not only permitted to be published, without any mark of their disappro-

[a] See Jo. Launoius, de Canone Omnis utriusque Sexus, tom. i. part i. cap. p. 271 257, &c.—Baluzii Vit. Pontif. Avenion. tom. i. et ii. Etus. Miscellanea, tom. i.—D'Acherii Spicil. Scriptor. Veter. tom. i.—Martenne, Thesaur. Anecdotor. tom. i.

[b] A work of his was published at Leipsic and Frankfort in 1753, entitled, Dialogorum Libri quatuor, which, though it does not contain all the branches of his doctrine, yet shows sufficiently the spirit of the man, and his way of thinking in general.

☞ [c] In the original, Dr. Mosheim says, that, of eighteen articles imputed to Wickliff, nine were condemned as heresies, and fifteen as errors. This contradiction, which we have taken the liberty to correct in the text, is an oversight of the learned author, who appears to have confounded the eighteen heresies and errors that were enumerated and refuted by William Woodford, in a letter to Arundel, archbishop of Canterbury, with the twenty-three propositions that had been condemned by his predecessor Courtenay at London, of which ten were pronounced heretical, and thirteen erroneous. See the very curious collection of pieces, entitled, Fasciculus rerum expetendarum et fugiendarum Orthuini Gratii, published first at Cologne by the compiler, in 1535, and afterwards at London in 1690, with an additional volume of ancient pieces and fragments, by the learned Mr. Edward Brown. The letter of Woodford is at full length in the first volume of this collection.

[d] We have a full and complete History of the Life and Sufferings of John Wickliff, published at London, in 1720, by Mr. John Lewis, who also published, in 1731, Wickliff's English translation of the New Testament from the Latin version called the Vulgate. This translation is enriched with a learned preface by the editor, in which he enlarges upon the life, actions, and sufferings, of that eminent reformer. The pieces, relative to the controversies which were occasioned by the doctrines of Wickliff, are to be found in the learned work of Wilkins, entitled, Concilia Magnæ Britanniæ et Hiberniæ, tom. iii. p. 116, 156.—See also Boulay's Hist. tom. iv. and Wood's Antiq. tom. i.

[e] The story of the *marks*, or *stigmas*, impressed on Francis, is well known, as are also the letters of the Roman pontiffs, which enjoin the belief of it, and which Wadding has collected with great care, and published in his Annales Minorum, tom. viii. and ix. The Protestants formerly made a public jest of this ridiculous fable; but, being awed into silence by the papal bulls, they are now obliged to deride it in secret, while the Franciscans, on the other hand, continue to propagate it with the most fervent zeal. That St. Francis had upon his body

bation, but approved, and even recommended, an impious piece, stuffed with tales yet more improbable and ridiculous than either of the above-mentioned fictions, and entitled, The Book of the Conformities of St. Francis with Jesus Christ, which was composed, in 1385, by Bartholomew Albizi, a Franciscan of Pisa, with the applause of his order. This infamous tract, in which the Son of God is put upon a level with a wretched mortal, is an eternal monument of the outrageous enthusiasm and abominable arrogance of the Franciscan order, and also of the excessive imprudence of the pontiffs who extolled and recommended it.[a]

XXII. The Franciscans, who adhered to the genuine and austere rule of their founder, and opposed the popes who attempted to mitigate the severity of its injunctions, were not in the least wiser than those of the order, who acknowledged the jurisdiction and respected the decisions of the Roman pontiffs. By those antipapal Franciscans I mean the Fratricelli, or Minorites, and the Tertiaries of that order, otherwise called Beghards, together with the Spirituals, who resided principally in France, and embraced the opinions of Pierre d'Olive. These monastic factions were turbulent and seditious beyond expression; they gave incredible vexation to the popes, and for a long time disturbed, wherever they appeared, the tranquillity both of church and state. About the beginning of this century,[b] the less austere Franciscans were outrageous in their resentment against the Fratricelli, who had deserted their communion;[c] upon which such of the latter as had the good fortune to escape the fury of their persecutors, retired into France, in 1307, and associated themselves with the Spirituals, or followers of Pierre d'Olive, in Provence, who had also abandoned the society. Soon after this, the whole Franciscan order in France, Italy, and other countries, formed two parties. Those who embraced the severe discipline and absolute poverty of St. Francis, were called Spirituals; such as insisted upon mitigating the austere injunctions of their founder, were styled the Brethren of the Community. The latter, being far more numerous and powerful, exerted themselves to the utmost, to oppress the former, whose faction was still weak, and, as it were, in its infancy; yet they cheerfully submitted to these hardships, rather than return to the society of those who had deserted the rules of their master. Pope Clement V., having drawn the leaders of these two parties to his court, took great pains to compose these dissensions; nevertheless, his pacific scheme advanced but slowly, on account of the inflexible obstinacy of each sect, and the great number of their mutual accusations. In the mean while, the Spirituals of Tuscany, instead of waiting for the decision of his holiness, chose a president and inferior officers; while those of France, being in the neighbourhood of Avignon, patiently expected the papal determination.[d]

XXIII. After many deliberations, Clement, in a general council at Vienne in Dauphine, (where he issued the famous bull,[e] *Exivi de paradiso*,) proposed an expedient for healing the breach between the jarring parties, by wise concessions on both sides. He gave up many points to the Spirituals, or rigid Franciscans, enjoining upon the whole order the profession of absolute poverty, according to their primitive rule, and the solemn renunciation of all property, whether common or personal, confining them to what was necessary for their immediate subsistence, and allowing them, even for that, a very scanty pittance. He, however, on the other hand, permitted the Franciscans, who lived in places where it was extremely difficult to procure by begging the necessaries of life, to erect granaries and store-houses, where they might deposit a part of their alms as a stock, in case of want; and ordered that all such repositories should be under the inspection and management of overseers and store-keepers, who were to determine what quantity of provisions should be laid up in them. And, finally, in order to satisfy the Brethren of the Community, he condemned some opinions of Pierre d'Olive.[f] These proceedings silenced the monastic commotions in France; but the Tuscan and Italian Spirituals were so exceedingly perverse and obstinate, that they could not be brought to consent to any method of reconciliation. At length, in 1313, many of them, not thinking themselves safe in Italy, went into Sicily, where they met with a friendly reception from Frederic, the nobility, and bishops.[g]

XXIV. Upon the death of Clement V. the tumult, which had been appeased by his authority, revived in France with as much fury as ever. For, in 1314, a hundred and twenty of the Spirituals made a violent attack upon the Brethren of the Community, drove them out of the convents of Narbonne and Beziers by force of arms, and inflamed the quarrel in a yet higher degree, by relinquishing their ancient habits, and assuming such as were short, close, and mean. They were soon joined by a considera-

---

the marks or impressions of the five great wounds of Christ, is not to be doubted, since this is a fact proved by a great number of unexceptionable witnesses. But, as he was a most superstitious and fanatical mortal, it is undoubtedly evident that he imprinted on himself these holy wounds, that he might resemble Christ, and bear about on his body a perpetual memorial of the Redeemer's sufferings. It was customary in these times, for such as were willing to be thought more pious than others, to imprint upon their bodies marks of this kind, that, having thus continually before them a lively representation of the death of Christ, they might preserve a becoming sense of it in their minds. The words of St. Paul (Galat. vi. 17,) were sufficient to confirm in this wretched delusion an ignorant and superstitious age, in which the Scriptures were neither studied nor understood. A long list of these *stigmatised fanatics* might be extracted from the Acta Sanctorum, and other records of this and the following century: nor is this ancient piece of superstition entirely abolished, even in our times. Be that as it may, the Franciscan monks, having found these marks upon the dead body of their founder, took this occasion of making him appear to the world as honoured by Heaven above the rest of mortals, and invented, for this purpose, the story of Christ's having miraculously transferred his wounds to him.

[a] For an account of Albizi and his book, see Wadding, tom. ix. p. 158.—Fabricii Biblioth. Lat. medii Ævi, tom. i. p. 131.—Schelhornii Amœn. Liter. tom. iii. p. 160.—Bayle's Dictionary, at the article François, and the Nouveau Dictionnaire Hist. Crit. at the article Albizi. Erasmus Albert made several extracts from this book, and published them under the title of the Koran of the Franciscans, which was frequently printed in Latin, German, and French.

☞ The conformities between Christ and St. Francis, are only carried to forty, in the book of Albizi: but they are multiplied to 4000, by a Spanish monk of the order of Observants, in a work published, in 1651, under the following title, Prodigiosum Naturæ et Gratiæ Portentum. The conformities mentioned by Pedro de Alva Astorga, the austere author of this most ridiculous book, are whimsical beyond expression. See the Bibl. des Sciences et des Beaux Arts, t. iv. p. 318.

[b] In 1306 and 1307.

[c] Wadding, t. vi. ad an. 1307.

[d] Wadding, tom. iv. ad an. 1310, p. 217.—Eccardi Corpus Histor. medii Ævi, tom. i. p. 1480.—Boulay, tom. iv. p. 129.—Eccardi Scriptor. Prædicator. tom. i.

[e] This bull is inserted in the Jus Canonicum inter Clementinas, tit. xi. de verbor. signif. tom. ii. p. 1095, edit. Böhmeri.

[f] Wadding, tom. vi. p. 194, 197, 199.

[g] Wadding, tom. vi. p. 213, 214.—Boulay, tom. iv. p. 152, 165.—Argentre, Collectio judicior. de novis error. tom. i. p. 392.

ble number from other provinces; and the citizens of Narbonne, where Olive was interred, enlisted themselves in the party. John XXII., who was raised to the pontificate in the year 1317, took great pains to heal this new disorder. The first thing he did for this purpose, was to publish a special bull, by which he ordered the abolition of the Fratricelli or Minorites, and their Tertiaries, whether Beguines or Beghards, who formed a body distinct from the Spirituals.[a] In the next place, he admonished the king of Sicily to expel all the Spirituals who had taken refuge in his dominions,[b] and then ordered the French Spirituals to appear at Avignon, where he exhorted them to return to their duty, and as the first step to it, to lay aside the short, close habits, with the small hoods. The greatest part of them obeyed; but Fr. Bernard Delitiosi, who was the head of the faction, and twenty-four of the brethren, boldly refused to submit to the injunction. In vindication of their conduct, they alleged that the rules prescribed by St. Francis, were the same with the Gospel of Jesus Christ; that the popes therefore had no authority to alter them; that the pontiffs had acted sinfully in permitting the Franciscans to have granaries and storehouses; and that they added to their guilt in not allowing those habits to be worn that were enjoined by St. Francis. John, highly exasperated by this opposition, gave orders that these obstinate brethren should be proceeded against as heretics. And surely nothing could make them appear viler heretics in the papal eye, than their venturing thus audaciously to oppose the authority and majesty of the Roman see. As for Delitiosi, who is sometimes called Delli Consi, he was imprisoned, and died in his confinement. Four of his adherents were condemned to the flames, in 1318, at Marseilles;[c] and this horrible sentence was accordingly executed without mercy.

XXV. Thus these unhappy friars, and many more of their fraternity, who were afterwards cut off by this cruel persecution, suffered merely for their contempt of the decisions of the pontiffs, and for maintaining that the institute of St. Francis, their founder, which they imagined he had established under the direction of an immediate inspiration, was the very Gospel of Christ, and therefore ought not to be altered by the pope's authority. The controversy, considered in itself, was rather ridiculous than important, since it did not affect religion in the least, but turned wholly on these two points, the form of the habits to be worn by the Franciscan order, and their granaries and store-houses. The Brethren of the Community, or the less rigid Franciscans, wore long, loose, and good habits, with ample hoods; but the Spirituals went in short, scanty, and very coarse ones, which they asserted to be precisely the dress enjoined by the institute of St. Francis, and what therefore no power upon earth had a right to alter. And whereas the former, immediately after the harvest and vintage, were accustomed to lay up a stock of corn and wine in their granaries and cellars, the latter resolutely opposed this practice, as entirely repugnant to that profession of absolute poverty which had been embraced by the Fratricelli or Minorites. In order to put an end to these broils, the pope, in this very year, published a long mandatory letter, in which he ordered the contending parties to submit their disputes, upon the two points above-mentioned, to the decision of their superiors.[d]

XXVI. The effects of this letter, and of other decrees, were prevented by the unseasonable and impious severity of John, whose cruelty was condemned and detested even by his adherents. For the Spiritual Franciscans and their votaries, being highly exasperated at the cruel death of their brethren, maintained, that John, by procuring the destruction of these holy men, had rendered himself utterly unworthy of the papal dignity and was the true Antichrist. They moreover revered their four brethren, who were burned at Marseilles, as so many martyrs, paying religious veneration to their bones and ashes; and inveighed yet more vehemently than ever against long habits, large hoods, granaries, and store-houses. The inquisitors, on the other hand, having, by the pope's order apprehended as many of these people as they could find condemned them to the flames, and sacrificed them without mercy to papal resentment and fury: so that from this time a vast number of those zealous defenders of the institute of St. Francis, *viz.* the Minorites, Beghards, and Spirituals, were most barbarously put to death, not only in France, but also in Italy, Spain, and Germany.[e]

XXVII. This dreadful flame continued to spread till it invaded the whole Franciscan order, which, in 1321, had revived the old contentions concerning the poverty of Christ and his apostles. A certain Beguin, or monk of the third order of St. Francis, who was apprehended this year at Narbonne, taught, among other things, "That neither Christ nor his apostles ever possessed any thing, whether in common or personally, by right of property or dominion." John de Belna, an inquisitor of the Dominican order, pronounced this opinion erroneous; but Berengarius Taloni, a Franciscan, maintained it to be orthodox, and perfectly consonant to the bull, *Exiit qui seminat*, of Nicolas III. The judgment of the former was approved by the Dominicans; the determination of the latter was adhered to by the Franciscans. At length the matter was brought before the pope, who prudently endeavoured to put an end to the dispute. With this view he called into his council Ubertinus de Casalis, the patron of the Spirituals, and a person of great weight and reputation. This eminent monk gave captious, subtle and equivocal answers to the questions that were proposed to him. The pontiff, however, and the cardinals, persuaded that his decisions, however ambiguous, might contribute to terminate the quarrel, acquiesced in them, seconded them with their authority, and, at the same time, enjoined silence and moderation on the contending parties.[f]

XXVIII. But the Dominicans and Franciscans were

[a] This law is called Sancta Romana, &c. and is to be found among the Extravagantes Johannis XXII. tit. vii. de religiosis domibus, tom. ii. Jur. Canon. p. 1112. [b] Wadding, tom. vi. p. 265.

[c] Baluze, Vitæ Pontif. Avenion. tom. i. p. 116; tom. ii. p. 341, et Miscellan. tom. i. p. 195, 272. Wadding, tom. vi. p. 267. Martenne, Thesaur. Anecdotor. tom. v. p. 175. Martinus Fuldensis, in Eccardi Corpore Histor. medii Ævi, tom. i. p. 1725, et Herm. Cornerus, ibid. tom. ii. p. 981. Histoire generale de Languedoc, tom. iv. p. 179. Argentre, Collectio Judicior. de novis errorib. tom. i. p. 294.

[d] It may be seen in the Jus Canon. among the Extravag. communes de verbor. signif. See also Wadding, tom. vi.

[e] Beside many other pieces that serve to illustrate the intricate history of this persecution, I have in my possession a treatise, entitled, Martyrologium Spiritualium et Fratricellorum, which was delivered to the tribunal of the inquisition at Carcassone, A. D. 1454. It contains the names of 113 persons of both sexes, who, from the year 1318 to the time of Innocent VI., were committed to the flames in France and Italy, for their inflexible attachment to the poverty of St. Francis. I reckon that from these and other records, published and unpublished, we may make out a list of two thousand martyrs of this kind. See Codex Inquis. Tolosanæ.

[f] Wadding, tom. vi. p. 361. Baluzii Miscellan. tom. i. p. 307. Ger. du Bois, Histor. Eccles. Paris. p. 611.

so exceedingly exasperated against each other, that they could by no means be brought to conform themselves to this order. The pope, perceiving this, permitted them to renew the controversy in 1322; and he himself proposed to some of the most celebrated divines of the age, and especially to those of Paris, the determination of this point, namely, "Whether those were to be deemed heretics, who maintained that Jesus Christ, and his apostles, had no common or personal property in any thing they possessed?" The Franciscans, who held an assembly in that year at Perugia, having gained intelligence of this proceeding, decreed that those who held this tenet were not heretics, but maintained an opinion that was holy and orthodox, and perfectly agreeable to the decisions and mandates of the popes. They also sent a deputy to Avignon, to defend this unanimous determination of their whole order against all opponents whatever. The person whom they commissioned for this purpose was F. Bonagratia, of Bergamo, who also went by the name of Boncortese,[a] one of their fraternity, and a man famous for his extensive learning. John, being highly incensed at this step, issued a decree, wherein he espoused an opinion diametrically opposite to that of the Franciscans, and declared them to be heretics, for obstinately maintaining "that Christ and his apostles had no common or personal property in what they possessed, nor a power of selling or alienating any part of it." Soon after, he proceeded yet farther, and, in another constitution, exposed the weakness and inefficacy of those arguments, commonly reduced from a bull of Nicolas III., concerning the property of the Franciscan possessions being transferred to the church of Rome, whereby the monks were supposed to be deprived of what we call right, and were only allowed the *simple use* of what was necessary for their *immediate* support. In order to confute this plea, he showed that it was absolutely impossible to separate *right* and *property* from the *lawful use* of such things as were immediately consumed by that use. He also solemnly renounced all property in the Franciscan effects, which had been reserved to the church of Rome by former popes, their churches and some other things excepted. And whereas the revenues of the order had been hitherto received and administered by procurators, on the part of the Roman church, he dismissed these officers, and abolished all the decrees and constitutions of his predecessors relating to this affair.[b]

XXIX. By this method of proceeding, the dexterous pontiff entirely destroyed that boasted *expropriation*, which was the main bulwark of the Franciscan order, and which its founder had esteemed the distinguishing glory of the society. It was therefore natural, that these measures should determine the Franciscans to an obstinate resistance. And such indeed was the effect they produced: for, in 1323, they sent their brother Bonagratia in the quality of legate to the papal court, where he vigorously and openly opposed the recent constitution of John, boldly affirming, that it was contrary to human as well as divine law.[c] The pope, on the other hand, highly exasperated against this audacious defender of the Franciscan poverty, threw him into prison, and ordained, by a new edict, that all who maintained that Christ, and his apostles, had no common or special property in any of their possessions, should be deemed heretics, and corrupters of the true religion.[d] Finding, however, that the Franciscans were not terrified in the least by this decree, he published another yet more flaming constitution, about the end of the year 1324, in which he confirmed his former edicts, and pronounced that tenet concerning the expropriation of Christ and his apostles, 'a pestilential, erroneous, damnable, and blasphemous doctrine, hostile to the catholic faith,' and declared all such as adhered to it, obstinate heretics, and rebels against the church.[e] In consequence of this merciless decree, great numbers of those who persisted in asserting that Christ and his apostles were exactly such mendicants as Francis would have his brethren to be, were apprehended by the Dominican inquisitors, who were implacable enemies of the Franciscans, and committed to the flames. The histories of France and Spain, Italy and Germany, during this and the following century, abound with instances of this atrocious cruelty.

XXX. The zealous pontiff pursued this affair with great warmth for several years; and, as this contest seemed to have taken its rise from the books of Pierre d'Olive, he branded with infamy, in 1325, the Postilla and other writings of that author, as pernicious and heretical.[f] The next step he took, was to summon to Avignon, some of the more learned and eminent brethren of the Franciscan order, of whose writings and eloquence he was particularly apprehensive, and to detain them at his court: and then, to arm himself against the resentment and indignation of this exasperated society, and to prevent their attempting any thing to his prejudice, he kept a strict guard over them in all places, by means of his friends the Dominicans. Michael of Cesena, who resided in Italy, and was the head of the order, could not easily dissemble the hatred he had conceived against the pope, who therefore ordered him to repair to Avignon, in 1327, and there deprived him of his office.[g] But, prudent as this rigorous measure might appear at first sight, it served only to inflame the enraged Franciscans more than ever, and to confirm them in their attachment to the scheme of absolute poverty. For no sooner did the bitter and well-known contest, between John XXII. and Louis of Bavaria, break out, than the principal champions of the Franciscan cause, such as Marsilius of Padua, and John of Genoa, fled to the emperor, and under his protection published the most virulent pieces imaginable, in which they not only attacked John personally, but also levelled their satire at the power and authority of the popes in

[a] I insert this caution, because I have observed that some eminent writers, by not attending to this circumstance, have taken these two names for two different persons.

[b] These constitutions are recorded in the Corpus Juris Canonici, and also among the Extravagantes, tit. xiv. de verbor. signific. cap. ii. iii. p. 1121. For an account of the transaction itself, the reader should chiefly consult that impartial writer, Alvarus Pelagius, de Planctu Ecclesiæ, lib. ii. cap. 60. as also Wadding, tom. vi. p. 394. Both these authors blame pope John.

[c] Wadding, tom. vii. p. 2, 22.—Alvar. Pelagius, *de Planctu Ecclesiæ*, lib. ii. p. 167.—Trithemius, Annal. Hirsaug. tom. ii. p. 157.—Theod. de Niem, in Eccardi Corpore Histor. med. Ævi, t. vii. p. 1491.

[d] Wadding, tom. vii. p. 36.—Contin. de Nangis, in D'Acherii Spicilegio, tom. iii. p. 83.—Boulay, tom. iv. p. 205.—Benedictinor. Gallia Christiana, tom. ii. p. 1515.

[e] This constitution, and the two former already mentioned, are published among the Extravagantes, tit. xiv. de verbor. signif. Wadding, (t. vii. p. 36,) vigorously opposed this last; which is rather extraordinary in a man so immoderately attached to the cause of the popes as he was.

[f] Wadding, tom. vii. p. 47.—Eccardi Corpus Histor. medii Ævi, tom. i. p. 592, and 1491.

[g] Wadding, tom. vii. p. 69, 74.

general.[a] This example was soon followed by others, particularly by Michael of Cesena, and William Occam, who excelled most men of his time in subtlety and acuteness of genius, and also by F. Bonagratia of Bergamo. They made their escape by sea from Avignon, in 1328, went first to the emperor, who was at that time in Italy, and thence proceeded to Munich. They were soon joined by many others, such as Berengarius, Francis de Esculo, and Henry de Halem, who were highly and deservedly esteemed, on account of their eminent parts and extensive learning.[b] All these learned fugitives defended the institute of their founder in long and laboured treatises, in which they reduced the papal dignity and authority within a very narrow compass, and loaded the pontiffs with reproaches and invectives. Occam surpassed them all in the keenness and spirit of his satire; and hence his Dialogues, together with his other productions, which were perused with avidity, and transmitted to succeeding generations, gave a very severe blow to the ambition and majesty of the Roman pontiffs.

XXXI. On the other hand, Louis, to express his gratitude to these his defenders, not only made the cause of the Franciscans his own, but also adopted their favourite sentiment concerning the poverty of Christ and his apostles; for, among the heresies and errors of which he publicly accused John, and for which he deprived him of the pontificate, the principal and most pernicious one, in the opinion of the emperor, was his maintaining that the poverty of Christ did not exclude all right and property in what he used as a subsistence.[c] The Fratricelli, Beghards, Beguines, and Spirituals, then at variance with the pope, were effectually protected by the emperor, in Germany, against the attempts of the inquisitors; so that, during his reign, that country was over-run with shoals of Mendicant friars. There was scarcely a province or city in the empire that did not abound with Beghards and Beguines; that is, monks and nuns who professed the third rule of St. Francis, and placed the chief excellence of the Christian life in a voluntary and absolute poverty.[d] The Dominicans, on the other hand, as enemies to the Franciscans, and friends to the pope, were treated with great severity by his imperial majesty, who banished them with ignominy out of several cities.[e]

XXXII. The rage of the contending parties subsided greatly from the year 1329. The pope ordered a diet of the Franciscans to be holden in that year at Paris, where, by means of Cardinal Bertrand, who was president of the assembly, and by the efforts of the Parisian doctors, who were attached to his interests, he so far softened the resentment of the greatest part of the brethren, that they ceased to defend the conduct of Michael of Cesena and his associates, and permitted another president, Gerard Odo, to be substituted in his room. They also acknowledged John to be a true and lawful pope; and then terminated the dispute concerning the poverty of Christ in such an ambiguous manner, that the constitutions and edicts of Nicolas III. and John XXII., however contradictory, maintained their authority.[f] But, notwithstanding these pacific and mutual concessions, there were great numbers of the Franciscans in Germany, Spain, and Italy, who would by no means consent to this reconciliation. After the death of John, Benedict XII. and Clement VI. took great pains to close the breach, and showed some clemency and tenderness toward such of the order as thought the institute of their founder more sacred than the papal bulls. This lenity had some good effects. Many who had withdrawn themselves from the society, were hereby induced to return to it, in which number were Francis de Esculo and others, who had been some of John's most inveterate enemies.[g] Even those who could not be prevailed on to return to their order, ceased to insult the popes, observed the rules of their founder in a quiet and inoffensive manner, and would have no sort of connexion with those Fratricelli and Tertiaries in Italy, Spain, and Germany, who condemned the papal authority.[h]

XXXIII. The German Franciscans, who were protected by the emperor Louis, held out their opposition much longer than any of the rest. But, in 1347, their imperial patron being dead, the halcyon days of the Spirituals, as also of their associates the Beghards or Tertiaries, were at an end in Germany. For Charles IV., who, by the interest of the pope, had been declared king of the Romans in 1345, was ready, in his turn, to gratify the desires of the court of Rome, and accordingly supported, both by his edicts and by his arms, the inquisitors who were sent by the Roman pontiff against his enemies, and suffered them to apprehend and put to death all obnoxious individuals who came within their reach. These ministers of papal vengeance acted chiefly in the districts of Magdeburg and Bremen, Thuringia, Saxony, and Hesse, where they extirpated all the Beghards and Beguines, or Tertiaries, the associates of those Franciscans, who held that Christ and his apostles had no property in any thing. These severe measures were approved by Charles IV., who then resided at Lucca, whence, in 1369, he issued several edicts, commanding all the German princes to extirpate out of their dominions the Beghards and Beguines, or, as he himself interpreted the names, the *voluntary beggars*,[i] as enemies of the church, and of the Roman empire, and to assist the inquisitors in their proceedings against them. By another edict, published not long after, he gave the houses of the Beghards to the tribunal of the inquisition, ordering them to be converted into prisons for heretics; and, at the same time, ordered all the effects of the Beguines to be publicly sold, and the profits thence arising, to be equally divided among the inquisitors, the magistrates, and the poor of those towns and cities where such sale should take place.[k] The Beghards, being reduced to great distress, by this and

[a] Luc. D'Acherii Spicilegium, tom. iii. p. 85. Bullar. Roman. tom. vi. p. 167. Martenne, Thesaur. Anecdotor. tom. ii. p. 695, 704. Boulay, tom. iv. p. 216. There is a very noted piece on this subject written by Marsilius of Padua, who was professor at Vienna, and entitled, Defensor Pacis pro Ludovico Bavaro adversus usurpatam Romani Pontificis jurisdictionem.

[b] Wadding, tom. vii. p. 81.—Martenne, Thesaur. Anecdotor. tom. iii. p. 749, 757.—Trithemii Annal. Hirsaug. tom. ii. p. 167.—Boulay, tom iv. p. 217.—Eccardi Corpus Histor. tom. ii. p. 1034.—Baluzii Miscellan. tom. i. p. 293, 315.—The reader may also consult those writers who have compiled indexes and collections of Ecclesiastical historians.

[c] See Processus Ludovici contra Johannem, an. 1328, d. 12. Dec. datus, in Baluzii Miscellaneis, t. ii. p. 522, and also his Appellatio, p. 494.

[d] I have many pieces upon this subject that were never published.

[e] Mart. Diefenbach, de mortis genere, quo Henricus VII. obiit, p. 145, and others.—Eccardi Corpus Hist. t. i. p. 2103.—Boulay, t. iv. p. 220.

[f] Wadding, tom. vii. p. 94.—D'Acherii Spicilegium, tom. iii. p. 91.

[g] Argentre, Collectio Judicior. de novis erroribus, tom. i. p. 343.—Boulay, tom. iv. p. 281.—Wadding, tom. vii. p. 313.

[h] Wadding, tom. vii. p. 116, 126.—Argentre, tom. i. p. 343, &c.

[i] Called, in the German language, *die wilgen Armen*.

[k] I have in my possession this edict, with other laws of Charles IV.

other mandates of the emperor, and by the constitutions of the popes, sought a refuge in those provinces of Switzerland that border upon the Rhine, and also in Holland, Brabant, and various parts of Germany.[a] But the edicts and mandates of the emperor, together with the papal bulls and inquisitors, harassed them in their most distant retreats; and, during the reign of Charles IV., all Germany (except the provinces bordering upon Switzerland) was thoroughly purged of the Beghards, or rebellious Franciscans, both perfect and imperfect.

XXXIV. But no edicts, bulls, or inquisitors, could entirely pluck up the roots of this inveterate discord; for so ardently were many of the brethren bent upon observing, in the most perfect and rigorous manner, the institute of St. Francis, that numbers were to be found in all places, who either withstood the president of the society, or at least obeyed him with reluctance. At once, therefore, to satisfy both the lax and the rigid party, after various methods had been tried to no purpose, a division of the order was agreed to. Accordingly, in 1368, the president consented that Paulutius Fulginas, the chief of the more rigid Franciscans in Italy, together with his associates, who were numerous, should live separately from the rest of the brethren, according to the rules and customs they had adopted, and follow the institutes of their founder, in the strictest and most rigorous manner. The Spirituals and the followers of Pierre d'Olive, whose scattered remains were yet observable in several places, joined themselves gradually and imperceptibly to this party. And, as the number of those who were fond of the severe discipline continually increased in many provinces, the popes thought proper to approve that institute, and to give it the solemn sanction of their authority. In consequence of this, the Franciscan order was divided into two large bodies, namely, the Conventual Brethren, and the Brethren of the regular observance. Those who neglected the strict sense of the expressions in which the institute of their founder was conceived, and adopted the modifications given of them by the pontiffs, were called by the former name; and the council of Constance conferred the latter upon those who chose to be determined by the words of the institute itself, rather than by any explications of it.[b] But the Fratricelli and the Beghards absolutely rejected this reconciliation, and persisted in disturbing the peace of the church during this and the following century, in the marquisate of Ancona, and in other districts.

XXXV. This century gave rise to other religious societies, some of which did not long subsist, and the rest never became famous. John Colombini, a nobleman of Sienna, founded in 1367, the order of the Apostolic clerks, who, because they frequently pronounced the name of Jesus, were afterwards called *Jesuates*. This institution was confirmed by Urban V., in the following year, and subsisted till the seventeenth century, when it was abolished by Clement IX.[c] The brethren belonging to it professed poverty, and adhered to the institute of St. Augustin. They were not, however, admitted to holy orders, but assisted the poor by their prayers and other pious offices, and prepared medicines for them, which they distributed *gratis*.[d] But these statutes were in a manner abrogated when Clement dissolved the order.

XXXVI. Soon after the commencement of this century, the famous sect of the Cellite Brethren and Sisters arose at Antwerp; they were also styled the Alexian Brethren and Sisters, because St. Alexius was their patron; and they were named Cellites, from the cells in which they were accustomed to live. As the clergy of this age took little care of the sick and dying, and deserted such as were infected with those pestilential disorders which were then very frequent, some compassionate and pious persons at Antwerp formed themselves into a society for the performance of these religious offices, which the sacerdotal orders so shamefully neglected. In the prosecution of this agreement, they visited and comforted the sick, assisted the dying with their prayers and exhortations, took care of the interment of those who were cut off by the plague, and on that account forsaken by the terrified clergy, and committed them to the grave with a solemn funeral dirge. It was with reference to this last office, that the common people gave them the name of Lollards.[e] The ex-

enacted on this occasion, as also many of the papal constitutions, and other records which illustrate this affair, and which undoubtedly deserve to see the light. It is certain that Charles himself, in his edicts and mandates, clearly characterizes those people, whom he there styles Beghards and Beguines, as Franciscan Tertiaries, belonging to that party of the order then at variance with the pope. "They are (to use the emperor's own words, in his edict of the 18th of June, 1369) a pernicious sect, who pretend to a sacrilegious and heretical poverty, and who are under a vow, that they neither ought to have, nor will have, any property, whether special or common, in the goods they use;" (this is the poverty of the Franciscan institute, which John XXII. so strenuously opposed) "which they extend even to their wretched habits."—For so the spirituals and their associates used to do.

[a] See Odor. Raynaldus, Annal. Eccles. ad an. 1372, sect. xxxiv. See also the books of Felix Malleolus, written in the following century against the Beghards of Switzerland.

[b] See Wadding, tom. viii. ix.

[c] In the year 1668.

[d] Helyot, Hist. des Ordres, tom. iii. p. 411.—Pagi Breriav. Pontif. tom. iv. p. 189.—Bonanni, and others, who have compiled histories of the religious orders.

[e] Many writers have given us copious accounts concerning the sect and name of the Lollards; yet none of them can be commended for their fidelity, diligence, or accuracy, on this head. This I can confidently assert, because I have carefully and expressly inquired into whatever relates to the Lollards, and from the most authentic records concerning them, both published and unpublished, have collected copious materials from which their true history may be compiled. Most of the German writers, as well as those of other countries, affirm, that the Lollards were a particular sect, who differed from the church of Rome in many religious points; and that Walter Lolhard, who was burned in this century at Cologne, was their founder. How so many learned men came to adopt this opinion, is beyond my comprehension. They indeed refer to Jo. Trithemius as the author of this opinion: yet it is certain, that no such account of these people is to be found in his writings. I shall therefore endeavour, with all possible brevity, to throw all the light I can upon this matter, that they who are fond of ecclesiastical history may have a just notion of it.

The term *Lollhard*, or *Lullhard*, (or, as the ancient Germans wrote it, *Lollert*, *Lullert*,) is compounded of the old German word *lullen*, *lollen*, *lallen*, and the well-known termination *hard*. *Lollen*, or *lullen*, signifies to sing with a low voice. It is yet used in the same sense among the English, who say, *lull a-sleep*, which signifies to sing any one into a slumber with a sweet indistinct voice. See Franc. Junii Etymologicon Anglicanum. The word is also used in the same sense among the Flemings, Swedes, and other nations, as appears by their respective dictionaries. Among the Germans, both the sense and pronunciation of it have undergone some alteration; for they say, *lallen*, which signifies to pronounce indistinctly, or stammer. *Lolhard*, therefore, is a singer, or one who frequently sings. For, as the word *beggen*, which universally signifies to request any thing fervently, is applied to devotional requests or prayers, and, in the stricter sense in which it is used by the Germans, denotes praying fervently to God; in the same manner the word *lollen*, or *lullen*, is transferred from a common to a sacred song, and signifies, in its most limited sense, to sing a hymn. *Lolhard*, therefore, in the vulgar tongue of the ancient Germans, denotes a person who is continually praising God with a song, or singing hymns to his honour. Hocsemius, a canon of Liege, has well apprehended and expressed the force of this word in his Gesta Pontificum Leodiensium, lib. i. cap. xxxi. in Jo. Chapeauvilli Gestis Pontificum Tungrensium et Leodiensium, tom. ii. p. 350. "In the same year," (1309,) says he, "certain strolling hypocrites, who were called *Lollards*,

ample of these good people had such an extensive influence, that in a little time societies of the same kind, consisting both of men and women, were formed in most parts of Germany and Flanders, and were supported, partly by their manual labours, and partly by the charitable donations of pious persons. The magistrates and inhabitants of the towns, where these brethren and sisters resided, gave them peculiar marks of favour and protection on account of their great usefulness to the sick and needy. But the clergy, whose reputation was not a little hurt by them, and the Mendicant friars, who found their profits diminished by the growing credit of these strangers, persecuted them vehemently, and accused them to the popes of many vices and intolerable errors. Hence it was, that the word *Lollard*, which originally carried a good meaning, became a term of reproach, to denote a person who, under the mask of extraordinary piety, concealed either pernicious sentiments or enormous vices. But the magistrates, by their recommendations and testimonials, supported the Lollards against their malignant rivals, and obtained several papal constitutions, by which their institute was confirmed, and their persons, exempted from the cognisance of the inquisitors, were subjected entirely to the jurisdiction of the bishops. But, as these measures were insufficient to secure them from molestation, Charles, duke of Burgundy, in 1472, obtained a solemn bull from pope Sixtus IV., ordering that the Cellites, or Lollards, should be ranked among the religious orders, and delivered from the jurisdiction of the bishops; and, in 1506, Julius II. granted them yet greater privileges. Many societies of this kind are yet subsisting at Cologne, and in the cities of Flanders, though they have evidently departed from their ancient rules.[a]

XXXVII. Among the Greek writers of this century, the following were the most eminent:

Nicephorus Callistus, whose *Ecclesiastical History* we have already mentioned;

Matthew Blastares, who illustrated and explained the canon law of the Greeks;

Balaam, who was a very zealous champion in behalf of the Grecian cause against the Latins;

Gregory Acindynus, an inveterate enemy of the Palamites;

John Cantacuzenus, famous for his history of his own time, and his confutation of the Mohammedan law;

Nicephorus Gregoras, who compiled the Byzantine history, and left some other monuments of his genius to posterity;

Theophanes, bishop of Nice, a laborious defender of the truth of Christianity against the Jews, and the rest of its enemies;

Nilus Cabasilas, Nilus Rhodius, and Nilus Damyla, who most warmly maintained the cause of their nation against the Latin writers;

Philotheus, several of whose tracts are yet extant, and seem well adapted to excite a devotional temper and spirit;

Gregory Palamas, of whom more will be said hereafter.

XXXVIII. From the prodigious number of the Latin writers of this century, we shall only select the most famous. Among the scholastic doctors, who blended philosophy with divinity, John Duns Scotus, a Franciscan, and the great antagonist of Thomas, held the first rank;

---

or praisers of God, deceived some women of quality in Hainault and Brabant." Because those who praised God generally did it in verse, *to praise God*, in the Latin style of the middle ages, meant to sing to him; and such as were frequently employed in acts of adoration, were called religious singers; and, as prayers and hymns are regarded as a certain external sign of piety toward God, those who aspired to a more than ordinary degree of piety and religion, and for that purpose were more frequently occupied in singing hymns than others, were, in the popular language, called *Lollhards*. Hereupon this word acquired the same meaning with the term *Beghard*, which denoted a person remarkable for piety; for in all the old records, from the eleventh century, these two words are synonymous: so that all who were styled Beghards are also called Lollards, which may be proved to a demonstration from many authors.

The Brethren of the free spirit, of whom we have already given a large account, are by some styled Beghards, by others Lollards. The followers of Gerard Groote, or Priests of the community, are frequently called Lollard Brethren. The good man Walter, who was burned at Cologne, and whom so many learned men have unadvisedly represented as the founder of the sect of the Lollards, is by some called a Beghard, by others a Lollard, and by some a Minorite. The Franciscan Tertiaries, who were remarkable for their prayers and other pious exercises, were frequently called Lollards; and the Cellite Brethren, or Alexians, whose piety was very exemplary, no sooner appeared in Flanders, about the beginning of this century, than the people gave them the title of Lollards. A particular reason indeed for their being distinguished by this name was, that they were public singers, who made it their business to inter the bodies of those who died of the plague, and sang a dirge over them in a mournful and indistinct tone as they carried them to the grave. Among the many testimonies that might be alleged to prove this, we shall confine ourselves to the words of Jo. Bapt. Gramaye, a man eminently skilled in the history of his country, in his work entitled Antwerpia, lib. ii. "The Alexians," says he, "who constantly employed themselves about funerals, had their rise at Antwerp; at which place, about the year 1300, some honest pious laymen formed a society. On account of their extraordinary temperance and modesty, they were styled Matemanni, (or *Moderatists*,) and also Lollards, from their attendance on funeral obsequies. From their cells, they were named Cellite brethren." To the same purpose is the following passage in his work entitled Lovanium: "The Alexians, who were wholly engaged in taking care of funerals, now began to appear. They were laymen, who, having wholly devoted themselves to works of mercy, were named Lollards and Matemanni. They made it their sole business to take care of all such as were sick, or out of their senses. These they attended both privately and publicly, and buried the dead." The same learned author tells thus, that he transcribed some of these particulars from an old diary written in Flemish rhyme. Hence we find in the Annals of Holland and Utrecht, in Ant. Matthæi Analect. vet. Ævi, tom. i. p. 431, the following words: "Die Lollardtjes die brochten de dooden by een, i. e. the Lollards who collected the dead bodies;" which passage is thus paraphrased by Matthæus: "The managers of funerals, and carriers of the dead, of whom there was a fixed company, were a set of mean, worthless creatures, who usually spoke in a canting mournful tone, as if bewailing the dead; and hence it came to pass, that a street in Utrecht, in which most of these people lived, was called the Loller street." The same reason that changed the word *Beghard* from its primitive meaning, contributed also to give, in process of time, a different signification to that of *Lollard*, even to its being assumed by persons that dishonoured it; for, among those Lollards who made such extraordinary pretences to piety and religion, and spent the greatest part of their time in meditation, prayer, and the like acts of piety, there were many abominable hypocrites, who entertained the most ridiculous opinions, and concealed the most enormous vices, under the specious mask of this extraordinary profession. But it was chiefly after the rise of the Alexians, or Cellites, that the name Lollard became infamous. For the priests and monks, being inveterately exasperated against these good men, propagated injurious suspicions of them, and endeavoured to persuade the people, that, innocent and beneficent as the Lollards seemed to be, they were in reality the contrary, being tainted with the most pernicious sentiments of a religious kind, and secretly addicted to all sorts of vices. Thus by degrees it came to pass, that any person, who covered heresies or crimes under the appearance of piety, was called a Lollard. Hence it is certain, this was not a name to denote any one particular sect, but was formerly common to all persons and all sects, who were supposed to be guilty of impiety toward God and the church, under an external profession of extraordinary piety.

[a] Beside many others, whom it is unnecessary to mention here, see Ægid. Gelenius, de admirandâ sacrâ et civili magnitudine urbis Coloniæ, lib. iii. Syntagm. li. p. 534, 598.—Jo. Bapt. Gramaye, in Antiquit. Belg.—Anton. Sanderus, in Brabantia et Flandria illustrat.—Aub. Miræus, in *Operibus Diplomatico-Historicis*, and many other writers of this period in various places of their works. I may add, that the Lollards are by many called *die Nollbruder*, from *nollen*, an ancient German word.

and, though not entitled to any praise for his candour and ingenuity, was by no means inferior to any of his contemporaries in acuteness and subtlety of genius.[a]

After him, the most celebrated writers of this class were Durand of St. Portian, who combated the commonly received doctrine of the divine co-operation with the human will,[b] Antonius Andreas, Hervæus Natalis, Francis Mayronius, Thomas Bradwardine, an acute, ingenious man,[c] Peter Aureolus, John Bacon, William Occam, Walter Burlæus, Peter de Alliaco, Thomas of Strasburg, and Gregory de Rimini.[d]

Among the Mystic divines, Jo. Tauler and Jo. Ruysbrock, though not entirely free from errors, were eminent for their wisdom and integrity;

Nicolas Lyranus, or de Lyra, acquired great reputation by his Compendious Exposition of the whole Bible;

Rayner of Pisa is celebrated for his Summary of Theology, and Astesanus for his Summary of Cases of Conscience.

CHAPTER III.

Concerning the Doctrine of the Christian Church during this Century.

I. ALL those who are well acquainted with the history of these times, must acknowledge, that religion, either as it was taught in the schools, or inculcated upon the people as the rule of their conduct, was so extremely adulterated and deformed, that there was not a single branch of the Christian doctrine, which retained its primitive lustre and beauty. Hence it may easily be imagined, that the Waldenses and others, who ardently wished for a reformation of the church, and had separated themselves from the jurisdiction of the bishop of Rome, though every where exposed to the fury of the inquisitors and monks, yet increased from day to day, and baffled all the attempts that were made for their extirpation. Many of these poor people, having observed, that great numbers of their party perished by the flames and other punishments, fled out of Italy, France, and Germany, into Bohemia, and the adjacent countries, where they afterwards associated with the Hussites, and other separatists from the church of Rome.

II. Nicolas Lyranus deservedly holds the first rank among the commentators on the Scriptures, having explained them in a manner far superior to the prevailing taste and spirit of his age. He was a perfect master of the Hebrew language, but not well versed in the Greek, and was therefore much happier in his exposition of the Old Testament, than in that of the New.[e] All the other divines, who applied themselves to this kind of writing, were servile imitators of their predecessors. They either culled choice sentences from the writings of the more ancient doctors; or, departing from the obvious meaning of the words, they tortured the sacred writers to accommodate them to senses that were mysterious and abstruse. They who are desirous of being acquainted with this art, may have recourse to Vitalis a Furno, in his Moral Mirror of the Scriptures,[f] or to Ludolphus of Saxony, in his Psalter Spiritualized.[g] The philosophers, who commented upon the sacred writings, sometimes proposed subtle questions, drawn from what was called, in this century, Internal Science, and solved them in a dexterous and artful manner.

III. The greatest part of the doctors of this century, both Greek and Latin, followed the rules of the peripatetic philosophy, in expounding and teaching the doctrines of religion; and the Greeks, from their commerce with the Latins, seemed to have acquired some knowledge of those methods of instruction which were used in the western schools. Even to this day, the Greeks read, in their own tongue, the works of Thomas, and other capital writers of the scholastic class, which in this age were translated and introduced into the Greek church by Demetrius Cydonius and others.[h] Prodigious numbers among the Latins were fond of this subtle method, in which John Scotus, Durand of St. Portian, and William Occam, peculiarly excelled. Some few had recourse to the decisions of Scripture and tradition in explaining divine truths, but they were overborne by the immense tribe of logicians, who carried all before them.

IV. This superiority of the schoolmen did not, however, prevent some wise and pious men among the Mystics, and in other sects, from severely censuring this presumptuous method of bringing before the tribunal of philosophy matters of pure revelation. Many, as it appears, were bold enough to oppose the reigning passion, and to recall the youth designed for the ministry, to the study of the Scriptures, and the writings of the ancient fathers. This proceeding kindled the flame of discord almost every where; but this flame raged with peculiar violence in some of the more famous universities, especially in those of Paris and Oxford, where many sharp disputes were continually carried on against the philosophical divines by those of the biblical party, who, though greatly inferior to their antagonists in point of number, were sometimes victorious. For the philosophical legions, chiefly tutored by Dominicans and Franciscans, were often extremely rash in their manner of disputing; they defined and explained the principal doctrines of revealed religion in such a way, as really tended to overturn them, and fell into opinions that were evidently absurd and impious. Hence it came to pass, that some of them were compelled to abjure their errors, others to seek their safety in flight; some had their writings publicly burned, and others were thrown into prison.[i] However, when these commotions

[a] The very laborious and learned Wadding favoured the public with an accurate edition of the works of Scotus, printed at Lyons, 1639, in twelve volumes folio. See Wood, Antiq. Oxon. tom. i.—Wadding, Annal. Minor. fratr. tom. vi.—Boulay, tom. iv.

[b] See Launoy's treatise, entitled, Syllabus rationum, quibus Durandi causa defenditur; also Gallia Christ. tom. ii.

[c] Rich. Simon, Lettres Choisies, tom. iv. p. 232; and Critique de la Biblioth. des Auteurs Ecclesiast. par M. Du-Pin, tom. i. p. 360. Steph. Souciet, in Observationibus ad h. l. p. 703.—Nouv. Dict. Hist. et Crit. tom. ii. p. 500. He was archbishop of Canterbury.

[d] For a full account of all these persons, see Histoire de l'Eglise Gallicane, tom. xiv.

[e] Rich. Simon, Histoire des principaux Commentateurs du N. T. p. 447, and Critique de la Biblioth. des Auteurs Eccles. par M. Du-Pin, tom. i. p. 352.—Wadding, tom. v. p. 264.

[f] Speculum Morale totius Scripturæ.

[g] Psalterium juxta spiritualem Sensum.

[h] Rich. Simon, Creance de l'Eglise Orientale sur la Transubstantiation, p. 166.

[i] See Boulay, tom. iv.—In 1340, several opinions of the schoolmen, concerning the Trinity and other doctrines, were condemned, p. 266.—In 1347, M. Jo. de Mercuria and Nic. de Ultricuria were obliged to adjure their errors, p. 298, 308.—In 1348, one Simon was convicted of some horrible errors, p. 322.—The same fate, in 1354, befell Guido of the Augustine order, p. 329. In 1362, the like happened to one Louis p. 374, to Jo. de Calore, p. 377; in 1365, to Dion. Soullechat, p. 382.

were quelled, most of them returned, though with prudence and caution, to their former way of thinking, perplexed their adversaries by various contrivances, and deprived them of their reputation, their profits, and many of their followers.

V. It is remarkable, that the scholastic doctors, or philosophical theologists, far from agreeing among themselves, were furiously engaged in disputations with each other concerning many points. The flame of their controversy was, in this century, supplied with copious accessions of fuel, by John Duns Scotus, a learned friar already mentioned, who, animated against the Dominicans by a warm spirit of jealousy, had attacked and attempted to disprove several doctrines of Thomas Aquinas. Upon this, the Dominicans, taking the alarm, united from all quarters to defend their favourite doctor, whom they justly considered as the leader of the scholastics, while the Franciscans espoused with ardour the cause of Scotus, whom they looked upon as a divine sage sent down from heaven to enlighten bewildered and erring mortals. Thus these powerful and flourishing orders were again divided; and hence originated the two famous sects, the Scotists and Thomists, which, to this day, dispute the field of controversy in the Latin schools. The chief points about which they disagree are, the nature of the divine co-operation with the human will, the measure of divine grace that is necessary to salvation, the unity of form in man, or personal identity, and other abstruse and minute questions, the enumeration of which is foreign to our purpose. We shall only observe, that what contributed most to exalt the reputation of Scotus, and to cover him with glory, was his demonstration and defence of what was called the Immaculate Conception of the Virgin Mary against the Dominicans, who entertained different notions of that point.[a]

VI. A prodigious number of the people, denominated Mystics, resided, and propagated their tenets, in almost every part of Europe. There were, undoubtedly, among them many persons of eminent piety, who endeavoured to wean men from an excessive attachment to the external part of religion, and to form them to the love of God, and the practice of genuine virtue. Such, among others, were Taulerus, Ruysbrockius, Suso, and Gerard of Zutphen,[b] who, it must be allowed, have left many writings that are exceedingly well calculated to excite pious dispositions in the minds of their readers, though want of judgment, and a propensity to indulge enthusiastic visions, are failings common to them all. But there were also some senseless fanatics belonging to this party, who ran from one place to another, recommending a most unaccountable extinction of all the rational faculties, whereby they idly imagined the human mind would be transfused into the divine essence, and thus led their proselytes into a foolish kind of piety, that in too many cases bordered nearly upon licentiousness. The religious phrensy of these enthusiasts rose to such a height, as rendered them detestable to the sober sort of Mystics, who charged their followers to have no connexions with them.[c]

VII. It is needless to say much concerning those who applied themselves to the study of morality, as their spirit is nearly of the same kind with that of the authors whom we have already noticed; though it may be proper to mention two circumstances, by which the reader may ascertain the true state of this science. The first is, that, about this time, more writers than in any former century made it their business to collect and solve, what they styled, *Cases of Conscience;* by which Astesanus, an Italian, Monaldus, and Bartholomew of St. Concordia, acquired a reputation superior to that of any of their contemporaries. This kind of writing was of a piece with the education then received in the schools, since it taught people to quibble and wrangle, instead of forming them to a sound faith and a suitable practice. A second thing worthy of notice is, that moral duties were explained, and their practice enforced, by allegories and comparisons of a new and whimsical kind, even by examples drawn from the natures, properties, and actions of the brute creation. These writers began, for instance, by explaining the nature and qualities of some particular animal, and then applied their description to human life and manners, to characterize the virtues and vices of moral agents. The most remarkable productions of this sort are Nieder's Formicarius, a treatise concerning Bees by Thomas Brabantinus, dissertations upon Beasts by Hugh of St. Victor, and a tract by Thomas Whalley, entitled, The Nature of Brute Animals moralized.

VIII. The defenders of Christianity in this age were, in general, unequal to the glorious cause they undertook to support; nor do their writings discover any striking marks of genius, dexterity, perspicuity, or candour. Some productions, indeed, appeared from time to time, that were not altogether unworthy of notice. The learned Bradwardine, an English divine, advanced many pertinent and ingenious remarks, tending to confirm the truth of Christianity, in a Book upon Providence. The work, entitled, Collyrium Fidei contra Hæreticos, or, the "Eye-salve of Faith against the Heretics," shows, that its author, Alvaro Pelagio, was a well-meaning and judicious man, though he has by no means exhausted the subject in this performance. Nicolas de Lyra wrote against the Jews, as did also Porchetus Salvaticus, whose treatise, entitled, "The Triumph of Faith," is chiefly borrowed from the writings of Raymond Martin. Both these writers are much inferior to Theophanes, whose "Book against the Jews, and his Harmony between the Old and New Testament," contain many observations that are by no means contemptible.

IX. During this century, there were some promising appearances of a reconciliation between the Greeks and Latins. For the former, apprehending that they might want assistance to set bounds to the power of the Turks, which about this time was continually increasing, often pretended a willingness to submit to the Latin canons. Accordingly, in 1339, Andronicus the Younger sent Balaam as his ambassador into the west, to desire a reconciliation in his name. In 1349, another Grecian mbassy was sent to Clement VI. for the same purpose, and, in 1356, a third was despatched upon a like errand to Innocent VI. Nor was this all; for, in 1367, the Grecian

Oxford also had its share in transactions of this nature. See Ant. Wood, tom. i. p. 153, 183.

[a] See Wadding, tom. vi. p. 52.

[b] Concerning these authors, see Petr. Poiret, Biblioth. Mysticorum, and Godofr. Arnold, Historia et Descriptio Theol. Mysticæ. Of Taulerus and Suso, Echard treats expressly in his Scriptor. Prædicat. tom. i. p. 653, 677. See also Acta Sanctor. Januar. tom. ii. p. 652.

[c] Joh. Ruysbrockius inveighed bitterly against them, as appears from his Works, published by Laur. Surius, p. 50, 378, and also from his treatise de vera Contemplatione, cap. xviii. p. 608.

patriarch arrived at Rome, in order to negotiate this important matter, and was followed, in 1369, by the emperor himself, John Palæologus, who, in order to conciliate the friendship and good-will of the Latins, published a confession of his faith, which was agreeable to the sentiments of the Roman pontiff. But, notwithstanding these prudent and pacific measures, the major part of the Greeks could not be persuaded by any means to drop the controversy, or to be reconciled to the church of Rome, though several of them, from views of interest or ambition, expressed a readiness to submit to its demands; so that this whole century was spent partly in furious debates, and partly in fruitless negotiations.[a]

X. In 1384, a furious controversy arose at Paris, between the university and the Dominican order. The author of it was John de Montesono, a native of Arragon, a Dominican friar and professor of divinity, who, in pursuance of the decisions and doctrine of his order, publicly denied that the blessed Virgin Mary was conceived without any stain of original sin; and moreover asserted, that all who believed the immaculate Conception were enemies of the true faith. The quarrel occasioned by this proceeding would certainly have been soon compromised, had not John, in a public discourse delivered in 1387, revived this opinion with more violence than ever. For this reason the college of divines, and afterwards the whole university, condemned this, and some other tenets of Montesonus. For it may be proper to inform the reader, that the university of Paris, principally induced thereto by the discourses of John Duns Scotus, had, from the beginning almost of this century, publicly adopted the doctrine of the sinless conception of the holy Virgin.[b] Upon this, the Dominicans, with their champion John de Montesono, appealed from the sentence of the university to pope Clement VII. at Avignon, and clamorously affirmed that St. Thomas himself was condemned by the judgment passed upon their brother. But, before the pope could decide the affair, the accused friar fled from the court of Avignon, went over to the party of Urban VI., who resided at Rome, and, during his absence, was excommunicated. Whether the pope approved the sentence of the university of Paris, we cannot say. The Dominicans, however, deny that he did, and affirm, that the professor was condemned purely on account of his flight;[c] though there are many others who assert, that his opinion was also condemned; and, as the Dominicans would not acknowledge the validity of the academic sentence, they were expelled in 1389, and were not restored to their ancient honours in the university before the year 1404.[d]

CHAPTER IV.

Concerning the Rites and Ceremonies used in the Church during this Century.

I. WE must confine ourselves to a general and superficial view of the alterations which were introduced into the ritual of the church during this century, since it cannot reasonably be expected that we should insist largely upon this subject within the narrow limits of such a work as this. A principal circumstance that strikes us here, is the change that was made in the time of celebrating the jubilee. In 1350, Clement VI., in compliance with the request of the people of Rome, enacted that the jubilee, which Boniface VIII. had ordered to be celebrated in every hundredth year, should be celebrated twice in every century.[e] In favour of this alteration he might have assigned a very plausible pretext, since it is well known that the Jews, whom the Roman pontiffs were always ready to imitate in whatever related to pomp and majesty, celebrated this sacred solemnity in every fiftieth year. But Urban VI., Sixtus VI., and other popes, who ordered a more frequent celebration of this salutary and profitable institution, would have had more difficulty in attempting to satisfy those who might have demanded sufficient reasons to justify this inconstancy.

II. Innocent V. instituted festivals, sacred to the memory of the lance with which our Saviour's side was pierced, of the nails that fastened him to the cross, and the crown of thorns he wore at his death.[f] This, though evidently absurd, may be deemed pardonable upon the whole, if we consider the gross ignorance and stupidity of the times. But nothing can excuse the impious fanaticism and superstition of Benedict XII., who, by appointing a festival in honour of the marks of Christ's wounds, which, the Franciscans tell us, were imprinted upon the body of their chief and founder by a miraculous interposition of the divine power, gave credit to that grossly ridiculous and blasphemous fable. John XXII., beside the sanction he gave to many other superstitions, ordered Christians to add to their prayers those words with which the angel Gabriel saluted the Virgin Mary.

CHAPTER V.

Concerning the Divisions and Heresies that troubled the Church during this Century.

I. DURING some part of this century, the Hesychasts, or, as the Latins call them, the Quietists, gave great trouble to the Greek church. To assign the true source of it, we must observe that Barlaam, or Balaam, a native of Calabria, who was a monk of St. Basil, and afterwards bishop of Gieracê in Calabria, made a progress through Greece to inspect the behaviour of the monks, among whom he found many things highly reprehensible. He was more especially offended at the Hesychasts of mount Athos, in Thessaly, who were the same with the Mystics, or more perfect monks, and who, by a long course of intense contemplation, endeavoured to arrive at a tranquillity of mind entirely free from tumult and perturbation. These Quietists, in compliance with an ancient opinion of their principal doctors, (who imagined that there was a celestial light concealed in the deepest recesses of the mind,) used to sit in a solitary corner, during a certain portion of every day, with their eyes eagerly and immoveably fixed upon

[a] See Henr. Canisii Lectiones Antiquæ, tom. iv. p. 369.—Leo Allatius, de perpetuâ consensione eccles. Orient. et Occident. lib. ii. cap. xvi. xvii. p. 782.—Wadding, tom. viii. p. 29, 40, 107, 201, 289. Baluze, Vitæ Pontif. Avenion. tom. i. p. 348, 380, 403, 772.

[b] See Wadding's Annals, tom. vi.

[c] See Jac. Echardi Scriptor. Prædicator. tom. i. p. 691.

[d] Boulay, tom. iv. p. 599, 618 638.—Baluzii Vit. Pont. Av. tom. i. p. 521; tom. ii. p. 992.—Argentre, Collectio judicior. de novis errorib. tom, i. p. 61.—Jac. de Longueval, Hist. de l'Eglise Gallicane, tom. xiv. p. 347.

[e] Baluze, tom. i. p. 247, 287, 312, 887.—Muratori, Antiquit. Ital. tom. iii. p. 344, 481.

[f] See Jo. Henr. a Seelen, Diss. de festo Lanceæ et Clavorum Christi. —Baluzii Miscell. tom. i. et Vit. Pontif. tom. i.

the middle region of the belly, or navel; and boasted, that while they remained in this posture, they found, in effect, a divine light beaming forth from the soul, which diffused through their hearts inexpressible sensations of pleasure and delight.[a] To such as inquired what kind of light this was, they replied, by way of illustration, that it was the glory of God, the same celestial radiance that surrounded Christ during his transfiguration on the mount. Balaam, entirely unacquainted with the customs and manners of the Mystics, looked upon all this as highly absurd and fanatical, and therefore styled the monks who adhered to this institution, Massalians and Euchites,[b] and also gave them the new name of Umbilicani.[c] On the other hand, Gregory Palamas, archbishop of Thessalonica, defended the cause of these monks against Balaam.[d]

II. In order to put an end to this dissension, a council was convoked at Constantinople, in 1341, in which the emperor himself, Andronicus the younger, and the patriarch, presided. Here Palamas and the monks triumphed over Balaam, who was condemned by the council; whereupon he left Greece, and returned to Italy. Not long after this, another monk, named Gregory Acindynus, renewed the controversy, and, in opposition to the opinion maintained by Palamas, denied that God dwelt in an eternal light distinct from his essence, as also that such a light was beheld by the disciples on mount Tabor. This dispute was now no longer concerning the monks, but turned upon the light seen at mount Tabor, and also upon the nature and residence of the Deity. Nevertheless, he was condemned as a follower of Balaam, in another council holden at Constantinople. Many assemblies were convened about this affair; but the most remarkable of them all, was that of the year 1351, in which the Balaamites and their adherents received such a fatal wound, in consequence of the severe decrees enacted against them, that they were forced to yield, and leave the victory to Palamas. This prelate maintained, that God was encircled, as it were, with an eternal light, which might be styled his energy or operation, and was distinct from his nature and essence; and that he favoured the three disciples with a view of this light upon mount Tabor. Hence he concluded that this divine operation was really different from the substance of the Deity; and farther, that no being could partake of the divine substance or essence, but that finite natures might possess a share of his divine light, or operation. The Balaamites, on the contrary, denied these positions, affirming, that the properties and operations of the Deity were not different from his essence, and that there was really no difference between the attributes and essence of God, considered in themselves, but only in our conceptions of them, and reasonings upon them.[e]

III. In the Latin church the inquisitors, those active ministers and executioners of papal justice, extended their vigilance to every quarter, and most industriously hunted out the remains of those sects who opposed the religion of Rome, even the Waldenses, the Catharists, the Apostolists, and others; so that the history of these times abounds with numberless instances of persons who were burned or otherwise barbarously destroyed, by those unrelenting instruments of superstitious vengeance. But none of these enemies of the church gave the inquisitors and bishops so much employment of this sanguinary kind, as the Brethren and Sisters of the free spirit, who went under the common name of Beghards and Beguines in Germany and the Netherlands, and were differently denominated in other provinces. For, as this sort of people professed an uncommon and sublime species of devotion, endeavouring to call off men's minds from the external and sensible parts of religion, and to win them over to the inward and spiritual worship of God, they were greatly esteemed by many plain, well-meaning persons, whose piety and simplicity were deceived by a profession so seducing; and thus they made many converts to their opinions. It was on this account that such numbers of this turn and disposition perished in the flames of persecution during this century in Italy, France, and Germany.

IV. This sect was most numerous in the cities of Germany that lay upon the Rhine, especially at Cologne; which circumstance induced Henry I., archbishop of that diocese, to publish a severe edict against them, A. D. 1306;[f] an example that was soon followed by the bishops of Mentz, Treves, Worms, and Strasburg.[g] And as there were some subtle acute men belonging to this party, that eminently keen logician, John Duns Scotus,[h] was sent to Cologne, in 1308, to dispute against them, and to vanquish them by dint of syllogism. In 1310, the famous

[a] We have no reason to be surprised at, and much less to disbelieve, this account. For it is a fundamental rule with all those people in the eastern world, whether Christians, Mohammedans, or Pagans, (who maintain the necessity of abstracting the mind from the body, in order to hold communion with God, which is exactly the same thing with the contemplative and mystic life among the Latins,) that the eyes must be steadily fixed every day for some hours upon some particular object; and that he who complies with this precept will be thrown into an ecstasy, in which, being united to God, he will see wonderful things, and be entertained with ineffable delights. See what is said of the Siamese monks and Mystics by Engelb. Kæmpfer, in his History of Japan, tom. i. and also of those of India, in the Voyages of Bernier, tom. ii. Indeed, I can easily admit, that they who continue long in the above-mentioned posture, will imagine they behold many things which no man in his senses ever beheld or thought of; for certainly the combinations they form of the unconnected notions that arise to their fancy while their minds are in this odd and unnatural state, must be most singular and whimsical; so much the more, as the rule itself, which prescribes the contemplation of a certain object as the means of arriving at a vision of the Deity, absolutely forbids all use of the faculty of reason during that ecstatic and sublime interval. This total suspension of reason and reflection, during the period of contemplation, was not, however, peculiar to the eastern Quietists; the Latin Mystics observed the same rule, and inculcated it upon their disciples. On a due examination of the subject, we may safely conclude, that the many surprising visions, of which these fanatics boast, are fables utterly destitute of reason and probability. But this is not the proper place for enlarging upon prodigies of this nature.

[b] The *Massalians* (so called from a Hebrew word which signifies *prayer*, and *Euchites* from a Greek word of the same signification) formed themselves into a sect, during the fourth century, in the reign of Constantius. Their tenets resembled those of the Quietists in several respects.

[c] Ὀμφαλόψυχοι.

[d] For an account of these two famous men, Balaam and Gregory Palamas, see, in preference to all other writers, Jo. Alb. Fabricius, Biblioth. Græca, tom. x. p. 427, and 454.

[e] See Jo. Cantacuzenus, Hist. lib. ii. cap. xxxix. p. 263, and the observations of Gregor. Pontanus; also Nicephorus Gregoras, Hist. Byzant. lib. xi. cap. x. p. 277, and in many other places. But these two writers disagree in several circumstances. Many materials relative to this controversy are yet unpublished (see Montfaucon, Biblioth. Coisliniana, p. 150, 174, 404.) Nor have we ever been favoured with an accurate and well-digested history of it. In the mean time, the reader may consult Leo Allatius, de perpetuâ consensione Orient. et Occid. Eccles. lib. ii. cap. xxii. p. 824.—Henr. Canisii Lectiones Antiquæ, tom. iv. p. 361.—Dion Petavius, Dogmat. Theol. tom. i. lib. i. cap. xii.—Steph. de Altimura, Panoplia contra Schisma Græcor. p. 381, &c.

[f] See Statuta Coloniensia, published in 1554.

[g] Johannes, apud Scriptores rerum Moguntinar. tom. iii. p. 298.—Martenne, Thesaur. Anecdotor. tom. iv. p. 250.

[h] Wadding, Annal. Minor. tom. vi. p. 108.

Margaret Poretta, who made such a shining figure in this sect, was committed to the flames at Paris with one of the brethren. She had undertaken to demonstrate in an elaborate treatise, "That the soul, when absorbed in the love of God, is free from the restraint of every law, and may freely gratify all its natural appetites, without contracting any guilt."[a] Pope Clement V., exasperated by this and other instances of the pernicious fanaticism that prevailed among this sect, published in a general council at Vienne, A. D. 1311, a special constitution against the Beghards and Beguines of Germany; and though the edict only mentions imperfectly the opinions of this sect, yet, by the numeration of them, we may easily perceive that the Mystic brethren and sisters of the free spirit are the persons principally intended.[b] Clement, in the same council, issued another constitution, by which he suppressed another and a very different sort of Beguines,[c] who had hitherto been considered as a lawful and regular society, and lived in fixed habitations appropriated to their order, but were now corrupted by the fanatics above mentioned; for the Brethren and Sisters of the free spirit had insinuated themselves into the greatest part of the convents of the Beguines, where they inculcated with great success their mysterious and sublime system of religion to these simple women; and these credulous females were no sooner initiated into this brilliant and chimerical system, than they were captivated with its delusive charms, and babbled, in the most absurd and impious manner, concerning the true worship of the Deity.[d]

V. The Brethren of the free spirit, oppressed by so many severe edicts and constitutions, formed the intention of removing from Upper Germany into the lower parts of the empire; and this scheme was so far put in execution, that Westphalia was the only province which refused admission to these dispersed fanatics, and was free from their disturbances. This tranquillity was produced by the provident measures of Henry, archbishop of Cologne, who, having called a council, in 1322, seriously admonished the bishops of his province of the approaching danger, and thus excited them to exert their utmost vigilance to prevent any of these people from coming into Westphalia. About the same time the Beghards[e] upon the Rhine lost their chief leader and champion, Walter, a Dutchman of remarkable eloquence, and famous for his writings, who came from Mentz to Cologne, where he was apprehended and burned.[f] The death of this person was highly detrimental to the affairs of the Brethren of the free spirit: it did not, however, ruin their cause, or extirpate their sect. For it not only appears from innumerable testimonies, that, for a long time afterwards, they held their private assemblies at Cologne, and in many other parts of Germany, but also that they had several men among them of high rank and great learning, of which number Henry Aycardus, or Eccard, a Saxon, was the most famous. He was a Dominican, and also the superior of that order in Saxony; a man of a subtle genius, and one who had acquitted himself with reputation as professor of divinity at Paris.[g] In 1330, pope John XXII., endeavoured to suppress this obstinate sect by a new and severe constitution, in which the errors of the sect of the free spirit are marked out in a more distinct and accurate manner than in the Clementina.[h] But this attempt was fruitless; the disorder continued, and was combated both by the inquisitors and bishops in most parts of Europe to the end of this century.

VI. The Clementina, or constitution of the council of Vienne against the Beguines, or the female societies that lived together in fixed habitations, under a common rule of pious discipline and virtuous industry, gave rise to a persecution of these people, which lasted till the reformation by Luther, and ruined the cause both of the Beguines and Beghards in many places. For though the pope, in his last constitution, had permitted pious women to live as nuns in a state of celibacy, with or without taking the vow, and refused a toleration only to such of them as were corrupted with the opinions of the Brethren of the free spirit, yet the vast number of enemies which the Beguines and Beghards had, partly among the mechanics, especially the weavers, and partly among the priests and monks, took a handle from the Clementina to molest them in their houses, to seize and destroy their goods, and offer them many other insults. John XXII. afforded some relief under these oppressions, in 1324, by means of a special constitution, in which he gave a favourable explication of the Clementina, and ordered that the persons, goods, and habitations, of the innocent Beguines, should be preserved from every kind of violence and insult;—an example of clemency and moderation which was afterwards followed by other popes. On the other hand, the Beguines, in hopes of disappointing more effectually the malicious attempts of their enemies, and avoiding their snares, embraced in many places the third rule of St. Francis, and of the

[a] Luc. d'Acherii Spicil. veter. Scriptor. tom. iii. p. 63.—J. Bale, de Scriptor. Britan. Centur. iv. n. 88. p. 367.

[b] It is extant in the Corpus Juris Canon. inter Clementinas, lib. v. tit. iii. de Hæreticis, cap. iii. p. 1088.

[c] In Jure Canonico inter Clementinas, lib. iii. tit. xi. de religiosis domibus, cap. i. p. 1075, edit. Böhmer.

[d] For this reason, in the German records of this century, we often find a distinction of the Beguines into those of the right and approved class, and those of the sublime and free spirit; the former of whom adhered to the public religion, while the latter were corrupted by the opinions of the Mystics.

☞ [e] By Beghards, here, Dr. Mosheim means particularly the Brethren of the Free Spirit, who frequently passed under this denomination.

[f] Jo. Trithemii Annal. Hirsaug. tom. ii. p. 155.—Schaten, Annal. Paderborn. tom. ii. p. 250.—This is that famous Walter, whom so many ecclesiastical historians have represented as the founder of the sect of the Lollards, and as an eminent martyr to their cause. Learned men conclude all this, and more, from the following words of Trithemius; 'That same Walter Lohareus, (so it stands in my copy, though I fancy it ought to have been *Lolhardus*, especially as Trithemius, according to the custom of his time, frequently uses this word when treating of the sects that dissented from the church,) a native of Holland, was not well versed in the Latin tongue.' I say, from this short passage, learned men have concluded that Walter's surname was Lolhard; whence, as from its founder and master, they supposed his sect derived the name of Lollards. But it is very evident, not only from this, but from other passages of Trithemius, that Lolhard was no surname, but merely a term of reproach applied to all heretics who concealed the poison of error under the appearance of piety. Trithemius, speaking of the very same man, in a preceding passage, calls him, 'the head of the Fratricelli, or Minorites;' but these terms were very extensive, including people of various sects. This Walter embraced the opinions of the Mystics, and was the principal doctor among those Brethren of the free spirit, who lived on the banks of the Rhine.

[g] See Echardi Scriptor. Prædicator. tom. i. p. 507.—Odor. Raynaldus, Annal. tom. xv. ad an. 1329. sect. lxv p. 389.

[h] This new constitution was never published entire. It began with the words, 'in agro Dominico;' and was inscribed thus, *contra singularia, dubia, suspecta, et temeraria, quæ Beghardi et Beghinæ prædicant et observant.*' We are favoured with a summary of it by Herm. Cornerus in Eccardi Corp. Histor. medii Ævi, tom. ii. p. 1035. It is also mentioned by Paul Langius, in Chronico Citizensi, apud Jo. Pistorii Scriptores rerum German. tom. i. p. 1200.

Augustines. Yet all these measures in their favour could not prevent the loss both of their reputation and substance; for from this time they were oppressed in several provinces by the magistrates, the clergy, and the monks, who had cast a greedy eye upon their treasures, and were extremely eager to divide the spoil.[a]

VII. Some years before the middle of this century, while Germany and many other parts of Europe were distressed with various calamities, the Flagellants, a sect forgotten almost every where, and especially in Germany, made their appearance anew, and, rambling through many provinces, occasioned great disturbances. These new Flagellants, whose enthusiasm infected every rank, sect, and age, were much worse than the old ones. They not only supposed that God might be prevailed upon to show mercy to those who underwent voluntary punishments, but propagated other tenets highly injurious to religion. They held, among other things, "That flagellation was of equal virtue with baptism, and the other sacraments: that it would procure from God the forgiveness of all sins, without the merits of Jesus Christ: that the old law of Christ was soon to be abolished, and that a new law, enjoining the baptism of blood, to be administered by whipping, was to be substituted in its place," with other tenets more or less enormous than these; whereupon Clement VII. thundered out anathemas against these sectaries, many of whom were committed to the flames by the inhuman inquisitors. It was, however, found as difficult to extirpate them, as it had been to suppress the other sects of wandering fanatics.[b]

VIII. Directly the reverse of this melancholy sect was the merry one of the Dancers, which, in 1373, arose at Aix-la-Chapelle, whence it spread through the district of Liege, Hainault, and other parts of the Netherlands. It was customary among these fanatics, for persons of both sexes, publicly as well as in private, suddenly to begin dancing, and, holding each other's hands, to continue their motions with extraordinary violence, till, being almost suffocated, they fell down breathless together; and they affirmed, that, during these intervals of vehement agitation, they were favoured with wonderful visions. Like the Flagellants, they wandered about from place to place, had recourse to begging for their subsistence, treated with the utmost contempt both the priesthood and the public rites and worship of the church, and held secret assemblies. Such was the nature of this new phrensy, which the ignorant clergy of this age looked upon as the work of evil demons, who possessed, as they thought, this dancing tribe. Accordingly, the priests of Liege endeavoured to cast out the devils which rendered these fanatics so merry, by singing hymns and applying fumigations of incense; and they gravely tell us, that the evil spirit was entirely vanquished by these powerful charms.[c]

IX. The most heinous and abominable tribe of heretics that infected this century, (if the enormities with which they stand charged be true,) were the Knights Templars, who had been established in Palestine about two hundred years before this period, and who were represented as enemies and deriders of all religion. Their principal accuser indeed was a person whose testimony ought not to be admitted without caution. This was Philip the Fair, an avaricious, vindictive, and turbulent prince, who loudly complained to Clement V. of their opinions and conduct. The pope, though at first unwilling to proceed against them, was under a necessity of complying with the king's desire; so that, in 1307, on an appointed day, and for some time afterwards, all the knights, who were dispersed throughout Europe, and not in the least apprehensive of any impending evil, were seized and imprisoned. Such as refused to confess the enormities of which they were accused, were put to death; and those who, by tortures and promises, were induced to acknowledge the truth of what was laid to their charge, obtained their liberty. In 1311, the whole order was extinguished by the council of Vienne. Of the rich revenues they possessed, a part was bestowed upon other orders, especially on the knights of St. John, and the rest confiscated to the respective treasuries of the sovereign princes in whose dominions their possessions lay.

X. The Knights Templars, if their judges be worthy of credit, were a set of men who insulted the majesty of God, turned into derision the Gospel of Christ, and trampled upon the obligation of all laws, human and divine. For it is affirmed, that candidates, upon their admission to this order, were commanded to spit, as a mark of contempt, upon an image of Christ; and that, after admission, they were bound to worship either a cat, or a wooden head covered with gold. It is farther affirmed, that, among them, the odious and unnatural act of sodomy was a matter of obligation; that they committed to the flames the unhappy fruit of their lawless amours; and added, to these, other crimes too horrible to be mentioned, or even imagined. It will, indeed, be readily allowed, that in this order, as in all the other religious societies of this age, there were shocking examples of impiety and wickedness; but that the Templars in general were thus enormously corrupt, is so far from being proved, that the contrary may be concluded even from the acts and records, yet extant, of the tribunals before which they were tried and examined. If to this we add, that some of the accusations advanced against them, flatly contradict each other, and that many members of this unfortunate order solemnly avowed their innocence, while languishing under the severest tortures, and even with their dying breath, it would seem probable, that Philip set on foot this bloody tragedy, with a view of gratifying his avarice, and glutting his resentment against the Templars,[d] and especially against their grand master, who had highly offended him.

[a] I have collected a great number of particulars relating to this long persecution of the Beguines. But the most copious of all the writers who have published any thing upon this subject (especially if we consider his account of the persecution at Basil, and of Mulbergius, the most inveterate enemy of the Beguines,) is Christian Wurstisen, or Urstisius, in his Chronicon Basiliense, written in German, lib. iv. cap. ix p. 201, published at Basil, 1580. There are now in my hands, and also in many libraries, manuscript tracts of this celebrated Mulbergius, written against the Beguines in the following century.

[b] See Baluzii Vit. Pontif. Avenion. tom. i. p. 160, 316, and Miscellan. tom. i. p. 50.—Matthæi Analecta vet. Ævi, tom. i. iii. iv.—Herm. Gygis Flores Tempor. p. 139.

[c] Baluz. tom. i. p. 485.—Matth. Analecta, tom. i. p. 51, where we find the following passage in the Belgic Chronicle, which gives but an obscure account of the sect in question: A. 1374. *Gingen* de Dancers, and then in Latin, *Gens, impacata cadit, cruciata salvat.* The French *convulsionists*, (or prophets,) who, in our age, were remarkable for the vehemence and variety of their agitations, greatly resembled *these brethren and sister dancers.*

[d] See the Acts annexed to Putean's Histoire de la Condemnation des

THE FIFTEENTH CENTURY.

PART I.

THE EXTERNAL HISTORY OF THE CHURCH.

CHAPTER I.

Concerning the prosperous Events that happened to the Church during this Century.

I. The new subjects, that were added to the kingdom of Christ in this century, were altogether unworthy of that sublime title, unless we prostitute it by applying it to those who made an external and insincere profession of Christianity. Ferdinand, surnamed the Catholic, by the conquest of Granada, in the year 1492, entirely overturned the dominion of the Moors or Saracens in Spain. Some time after this happy revolution, he issued a sentence of banishment against a prodigious multitude of Jews, who, to avoid the execution of this severe decree, dissembled their sentiments, and feigned an assent to the Gospel;[a] and it is well known that, to this very day, there are both in Spain and Portugal a great number of that dispersed and wretched people, who wear the outward mask of Christianity, to secure them against the rage of persecution, and to advance their worldly interests. The myriads of Saracens, that remained in Spain after the dissolution of their government, were at first solicited by exhortations and entreaties to embrace the Gospel. When these gentle methods proved ineffectual to bring about their conversion, the famous Ximenes, archbishop of Toledo, and prime minister of the kingdom, judged it expedient to try the force of the secular arm, in order to accomplish that salutary purpose. But even this rigorous measure was without the desired effect: the greatest part of the Mohammedans persisted, with astonishing obstinacy, in their fervent attachment to their voluptuous prophet.[b]

II. The light of the Gospel was also carried in this century among the Samogetæ [*in Poland*] and the neighbouring nations, but with less fruit than was expected.[c] Toward the conclusion of this age, the Portuguese, who cultivated with ardour and success the art of navigation, had penetrated as far as Ethiopia and the Indies. In 1492, Christopher Columbus, by discovering the islands of Hispaniola, Cuba, and Jamaica, opened a passage into America;[d] and, after him, Americus Vesputius, a citizen of Florence, landed on the continent of that vast region.[e] The new Argonauts, who thus discovered nations hitherto unknown to the inhabitants of Europe, deemed it their duty to enlighten them with the knowledge of the truth. The first attempt of this pious nature was made by the Portuguese among those Africans who inhabited the kingdom of Congo, and who, with their monarch, were suddenly converted to the Romish faith, in 1491.[f] But what must we think of a conversion effected with such astonishing rapidity, and of a people who at once, without hesitation, abandoned their inveterate prejudices? Has not such a conversion, a ridiculous or rather an afflictive aspect? After this religious revolution in Africa, Alexander VI. gave a rare specimen of papal presumption, in dividing America between the Portuguese and Spaniards, but showed at the same time his zeal for the propagation of the Gospel, by the ardour with which he recommended, to these two nations, the instruction and conversion of the Americans, both in the isles and on the continent of that immense region.[g] In consequence of this exhortation of the pontiff, a great number of Franciscans and Dominicans were sent into those countries, to enlighten the darkness of their inhabitants; and the success of the mission is abundantly known.[h]

CHAPTER II.

Concerning the calamitous Events that happened to the Church during this Century.

I. In the vast regions of the eastern world Christianity daily lost ground; and the Moslems, whether Turks or Tartars, united their barbarous efforts to extinguish its bright and salutary lustre. Asiatic Tartary, Mogolestan, Tangut, and the adjacent provinces, where the religion of Jesus had long flourished, were now become the dismal seats of superstition, which reigned among the people under the vilest forms. Nor in these immense tracts of land were there at this time any traces of Christianity visible, except in China, where the Nestorians still preserved some scattered remains of their former glory, and appeared like a faint and dying taper in the midst of a dark and gloomy firmament. That some Nestorian churches were still subsisting in these regions of darkness,

Templiers, and other writings of his relating to the history of France, published at Paris, in 1654. The most valuable edition of the history appeared at Brussels in 1751, enlarged by the addition of a great number of documents, by which every diligent and impartial reader will be convinced that the Templars were greatly injured. See also Nicolai Gurtleri Historia Templariorum. If the reader has an opportunity, he would do well to consult Steph. Baluzius, Vit. Pontif. Avenion. tom. i. p. 8, 11, &c. Ger. du Bois, Hist. Eccles. Paris. tom. ii. p. 540. The principal cause of Philip's indelible hatred against the Templars, was, that in his quarrel with Boniface VIII. the knights espoused the cause of the pope, and furnished him with money to carry on the war; an offence which the king could never pardon.

[a] J. de Ferreras, Hist. Generale d'Espagne, tom. viii. p. 123, 132, &c.

[b] Esprit Flechier, Histoire du Cardinal Ximenes, p. 89.—Geddes' History of the Expulsion of the Moresdoes, in his Miscellaneous Tracts, tom. i.

[c] Jo. Henry Hottinger, Hist. Ecclesiast. sæc. XV. p. 856.

[d] See Charlevoix, Histoire de l'Isle de St. Domingue, tom. i. p. 64.

[e] See the Life of Americus Vesputius, written in Italian by the learned Angelo Maria Bandini.

[f] Labat, Relation de l'Europe Occidentale, tom. ii. p. 366.—Jos. Franc. Lafitau, Histoire des Decouvertes des Portugais dans le nouveau Monde, tom. i. p. 72.

[g] See the Bull itself, in the Bullarium Romanum, tom. i. p. 466.

[h] See Thom. Maria Mamachius, Orig. et Antiquitat. Christian. tom. ii. p. 326, where we have an account of the gradual introduction of the Christian religion into America.—See also Wadding, Annal. Minor. tom. xv. p. 10.

is undoubtedly certain; for in this century the Nestorian pontiff, in Chaldea, sent missionaries into Cathay and China, who were empowered to exercise the authority of bishops over the Christian assemblies, which lay concealed in the remoter provinces of those great empires.[a] It is, at the same time, almost equally certain, that even these assemblies did not survive this century.

II. The ruin of the Grecian empire was a new source of calamities to the Christian church in a considerable part of Europe and Asia. When the Turks, conducted by Mohammed II., an able prince and a formidable warrior, had made themselves masters of Constantinople, in 1453, the cause of Christianity received a blow, from which it has not yet recovered. Its adherents in these parts had no resources left, which could enable them to maintain it against the perpetual insults of their fierce and incensed victors; nor could they stem that torrent of barbarism and ignorance which rushed in with the triumphant arms of the Moslem prince, and overspread Greece with a fatal rapidity. The Turks took one part of Constantinople by force of arms; the other surrendered upon terms.[b] Hence, in the former division, the public profession of the Gospel was prohibited, and every vestige of Christianity effaced; while the inhabitants of the latter were permitted to retain their churches and monasteries during the whole course of this century, and to worship God according to the precepts of the Gospel, and the dictates of their consciences. This valuable liberty was, indeed, considerably diminished in the reign of Selim I., and the Christian worship was loaded with severe and despotic restrictions.[c] The outward form of the Christian church was not, indeed, either changed or destroyed by the Turks; but its lustre was eclipsed, its strength was undermined, and it was gradually attenuated to a mere shadow under their tyrannic empire. Pope Pius II. wrote a warm and urgent letter to Mohammed II. to persuade that prince to profess the Gospel; but this letter is equally destitute of piety and prudence.[d]

[a] This circumstance was communicated to the author in a letter from the learned Mr. Theophilus Sigefred Bayer, one of the greatest adepts in eastern history and antiquities, that this or any other age has produced.

☞ [b] In this account Dr. Mosheim has followed the Turkish writers. And indeed their account is much more probable than that of the Latin and Greek historians, who suppose that the whole city was taken by force, and not by capitulation. The Turkish relation diminishes the glory of the conquest, and therefore probably would not have been adopted, had it not been true.

[c] Demet. Cantemir, Histoire de l'Empire Ottoman t. i. 11, 46, 54.

[d] Dictionnaire Hist. et Critique de Bayle.

PART II.

THE INTERNAL HISTORY OF THE CHURCH.

CHAPTER I.

Concerning the state of Letters and Philosophy during this Century.

I. The Grecian and Oriental Muses languished under th despotic yoke of the Mohammedans; their voices were mute, and their harps unstrung. The republic of letters had a quite different aspect in the Latin world, where the liberal arts and sciences were cultivated with zeal and spirit, under the most auspicious encouragement, and recovered their ancient lustre and glory. Several of the popes became their zealous patrons and protectors, among whom Nicolas V. deserves an eminent and distinguished rank; the munificence and authority of kings and princes were also nobly exerted in this excellent cause, and animated men of learning and genius to display their talents. The illustrious family of the Medici in Italy,[a] Alphonso VI. king of Naples, and the other Neapolitan monarchs of the house of Arragon,[b] acquired immortal renown by their love of letters, their liberality to the learned, and their ardent zeal for the advancement of science. Under their auspices, or in consequence of their example, many academies were founded in Germany, France, and Italy, libraries were collected at a prodigious expense, and honours and rewards were lavished on the studious youth, to animate their industry by the views of interest and the desire of glory. To all these happy circumstances, in favour of the sciences, was now added an admirable discovery, which contributed, as much as any thing else, to their propagation, I mean the *art of Printing*, (first with wooden, and afterwards with metal types,) which was invented about the year 1440, at Mentz, by John Guttemberg. By the aid of this incomparable art, the productions of the most eminent Greek and Latin writers, which had lain concealed, before this interesting period, in the libraries of the monks, were now spread abroad with facility, and perused by many, who could never have had access to them under their primitive form.[c] The perusal of these noble compositions purified the taste, excited the emulation of men of genius, and animated them with a noble ambition of excelling in the same way.[d]

II. The ruin of the Grecian empire contributed greatly to the propagation and advancement of learning in the west. For, after the reduction of Constantinople, the most eminent of the Greek literati passed into Italy, and were thence dispersed into the other countries of Europe, where, to gain subsistence, these venerable exiles instructed the youth in Grecian erudition, and propagated throughout the western world the love of learning, and a true and elegant taste for the sciences. Hence it was, that every distinguished city and university possessed one or more of these learned Greeks, who formed the studious youth to literary pursuits.[e] But they received no where such encouraging marks of protection and esteem as in Italy, where they were honoured in a singular manner in various cities, and were more especially distinguished by the family of Medici, whose liberality to the learned seemed to have no bounds. It was consequently in Italy that these ingenious fugitives were most numerous; and hence that country became, in some measure, the centre of the arts and sciences, and the general rendezvous of all who were ambitious of literary glory.[f]

III. The learned men who adorned at this time the various provinces of Italy, were principally employed in publishing accurate and elegant editions of the Greek and Latin classics, in illustrating these authors with useful commentaries, in studying them as their models, both in poetry and prose, and in throwing light upon the precious remains of antiquity, that were discovered from day to day. In all these branches of literature, many arrived at such degrees of excellence, as it is almost impossible to surpass, and extremely difficult to equal. Nor were the other languages and sciences neglected. In the university of Paris there was now a public professor, not only of the Greek, but also of the Hebrew tongue;[g] and in Spain and Italy the study of that language, and of Oriental learning and antiquities in general, was pursued with the greatest success.[h] John Reuchlin, otherwise called Capnion, and Trithemius, who had made an extraordinary

[a] We have a full account of the obligations of the republic of letters to the family of Medici, in a valuable work of Joseph Bianchini de Prato, dei gran Duchi di Toscana della reale Casa de' Medici, Protettori delle Lettere e delle Belle Arti, Ragionamenti Historici, published at Venice, in 1741.

[b] See Giannone, Historia di Napoli, tom iii.—Anton. Panormitani Dicta et Facta memorabilia Alphonsi I. denuo edita à Jo. Ger. Meuschenio, in Vit. Erud. Viror. tom. ii.

☞ [c] Dr. Mosheim decides here, that Guttemberg of Mentz was the inventor of the art of printing; but this notion is opposed with zeal by several men of learning. Of the many treatises that have been published on this subject, not one is composed with greater erudition and judgment than that of professor Schoepflin, of Strasbourg, in which the learned author undertakes to prove that the art of printing, by the means of letters engraven on plates of wood, was invented at Haerlem, by Coster; that the method of printing, by moveable types, was the discovery of John Guttemberg, a discovery made during his residence at Strasbourg; and that the still more perfect manner of printing with types of metal cast in a mould, was the contrivance of John Schoeffer, and was first practised at Mentz. This learned work, in which the author examines the opinions of Marchand, Fournier, and other writers, was published in 1760, under the following title: Jo. Danielis Schoepflini Consil. Reg. ac Franciæ His. Vindiciæ Typographicæ,* &c.

[d] Mich. Maittaire, Annales Typographici.—Prosp. Marchand, Histoire de l'Imprimerie.

[e] Jo. Henr. Maii Vita Reuchlini, p. 11, 19, 28, 152, 165.—Casp. Barthius ad Statium, tom. ii. p. 1008.—Boulay, tom. v. p. 692.

[f] For a farther account of this interesting period of the history of learning, the reader may consult the learned work of Humphry Hody, de Græcis illustribus Literarum Græcarum in Italia Instauratoribus, to which may be added, Battier's Oration on the same subject, published in the Museum Helveticum, tom. iv.

[g] R. Simon, Critique de la Bibl. Eccles. par M. Du-Pin, tom. i. p. 502. Boulay, Histor. Paris. tom. v. p. 852.

[h] Pauli Colomesii Italia Orientalis, et Hispania Orientalis.

☞ * So this note stands in the first edition of this History, in 4to. Since that time, the learned and ingenious Mr. Gerard Meerman, pensionary of Rotterdam, has published his laborious and interesting account of the origin and invention of the art of printing, under the following title, "Origines Typographicæ,"—a work which sets this matter in its true light, by making certain distinctions unknown to the writers who treated this subject before him. According to the hypothesis of this writer, (an hypothesis supported by irresistible proofs,) Laurence Coster, of Haerlem, invented the moveable wooden types;—Genfleisch and Guttemberg carved metallic types at Mentz, which, though superior to the former, were still imperfect, because often unequal; Schoeffer perfected the invention at Strasbourg, by casting the types in an iron mould, or matrix, engraven with a puncheon. Thus the question is decided. Coster was evidently the *inventor* of printing; the others *improved* the art, or rendered it more perfect.

progress, both in the study of the languages and of the sciences, were the restorers of solid learning among the Germans.[a] Latin poetry was revived by Antony of Palermo, who excited a spirit of emulation among the favourites of the Muses, and had many followers in that sublime art;[b] while Cyriac of Ancona, by his own example, introduced a taste for coins, medals, inscriptions, gems, and other precious monuments of antiquity, of which he himself made a large collection in Italy.[c]

IV. It is not necessary to give here a peculiar and minute account of the other branches of literature that flourished in this century; nevertheless, the state of philosophy deserves a moment's attention. Before the arrival of the Greeks in Italy, Aristotle reigned there without a rival, and captivated, as it were by a sort of enchantment, all without exception, whose genius led them to philosophical inquiries. The veneration that was shown him, degenerated into a foolish and extravagant enthusiasm; the encomiums with which he was loaded, surpassed the bounds of decency; and many carried matters so far as to compare him with the respectable precursor of the Messiah.[d] This violent passion for the Stagirite was however abated, or rather was rendered less general, by the influence which the Grecian sages, and particularly Gemistius Pletho, acquired among the Latins, many of whom they persuaded to abandon the contentious and subtle doctrine of the Peripatetics, and to substitute in its place the mild and divine wisdom of Plato. It was in the year 1439, about the time of the famous council of Florence, that this revolution happened in the empire of philosophy. Several illustrious personages among the Latins, charmed with the sublime sentiments and doctrines of Plato, propagated them among the studious youth, and particularly among those of a certain rank and figure. The most eminent patron of this divine philosophy, as it was termed by its votaries, was Cosmo de' Medici, who had no sooner heard the lectures of Pletho, than he formed the design of founding a Platonic academy at Florence. For this purpose, he ordered Marsilius Ficinus, the son of his first physician, to be carefully instructed in the doctrines of the Athenian sage, and, in general, in the language and philology of the Greeks, that he might translate into Latin the productions of the most renowned Platonists. Ficinus answered well the expectations, and executed the intentions of his illustrious patron, by translating successively into the Latin language, the celebrated works of Hermes Trismegistus, Plotinus, and Plato. The same excellent prince encouraged by his munificence, and animated by his protection, many learned men, such as Ambrose of Camaldoli, Leonardo Bruno, Poggio, and others, to undertake works of a like nature, that the Latin literature might be enriched with translations of the best Greek writers. The consequence of all this was, that two philosophical sects arose in Italy, who debated for a long time (with the warmest animosity in a multitude of learned and contentious productions) this important question, which was the greatest philosopher, Aristotle or Plato.[e]

V. Between these opposite factions, some eminent men, among both Greeks and Latins, thought proper to steer a middle course. To this class belonged Johannes Picus de Mirandola, Bessarion, Hermolaus Barbarus, and others of less renown, who, indeed, considered Plato as the supreme oracle of philosophy, but would by no means suffer Aristotle to be treated with indifference or contempt, and who proposed to reconcile the jarring doctrines of these two famous Grecian sages, and to combine them into one system. These moderate philosophers, both in their manner of teaching, and in the opinions they adopted, followed the modern Platonic school, of which Ammonius was the original founder.[f] This sect was, for a long time, regarded with the utmost veneration, particularly among the Mystics; while the scholastic doctors, and all such as were infected with the itch of disputing, favoured the Peripatetics. But, after all, these reconciling Platonists were chargeable with many errors and follies; they fell into the most childish superstitions, and followed, without either reflection or restraint, the extravagant dictates of their wanton imaginations.

VI. Their system of philosophy was, however, much less pernicious than that of the Aristotelians, their adversaries, who still maintained their superiority in Italy, and instructed the youth in all the public schools of learning. For these subtle doctors, and more especially the followers of Averroes, (who maintained that all the human race were animated by one common soul,) imperceptibly sapped the foundations both of natural and revealed religion, and entertained sentiments very little, if at all, different from that impious pantheistical system, which confounds the Deity with the universe, and merely acknowledges one self-existent being, composed of infinite matter and infinite intelligence. Among this class of sophists, the most eminent was Peter Pomponace, a native of Mantua, a man of a crafty turn, and an arrogant, enterprising spirit, who, notwithstanding the pernicious tendency of his writings (many of which are yet extant) to undermine the principles, and corrupt the doctrines of religion,[g] was almost universally followed by the professors of philosophy in the Italian academies. These intricate doctors did not, however, escape the notice of the inquisitors, who, alarmed both by the rapid progress and dangerous tendency of their metaphysical notions, took cognisance of them, and called the Aristotelians to give an account of their principles. The latter, tempering their courage with craft, had recourse to a mean and perfidious stratagem to extricate themselves from this embarrassing trial. They pretended to establish a wide distinction between philosophical and

[a] R. Simon, Lettres Choisies, tom. i. p. 262; tom. iv. p. 131, 140.

[b] Dictionnaire Hist. et Critique de Bayle.

[c] See the Itinerarium of Cyriac, published at Florence in 1742, by Mehus, from the original manuscript, together with a preface, annotations, and several letters of that learned man, who may be considered as the first antiquary that appeared in Europe.—See also the Epistles of Leonardo Aretino, tom. ii. lib. ix. p. 149.

[d] See Christ. August. Heumanni Acta Philosophorum, tom. iii. p. 345.

[e] Boivin, dans l'Histoire de l'Academie des Inscriptions et des Belles Lettres, tom. iv. p. 381.—Launoy, de variâ Fortunâ Aristotelis, p. 225. Leo Allatius, de Georgiis, p. 391.—La Croze, Entretiens sur divers Sujets, p. 384.—Joseph Bianchini, dei Gran Duchi di Toscana.—Bruckeri Historia Critica Philosophiæ, tom. iv.

☞ It was not only the respective merit of these two philosophers, considered in that point of light, that was debated in this controversy; the principal question was, which system was most conformable to the doctrines of Christianity? And here the Platonic certainly deserved the preference, as was abundantly proved by Pletho and others. It is well known, that many of the opinions of Aristotle lead directly to atheism.

[f] See Bessarion's Letter in the Histoire de l'Academie des Inscriptions, tom. v. p. 456.—Thomasius, de Syncretismo Peripatetico, in ejus Orationibus, p. 340.

[g] See the very learned Brucker's Hist. Crit. Philosophiæ, tom. iv. p. 158.

theological truth; and maintaining that their sentiments were *philosophically true*, and conformable to right reason, they allowed them to be deemed *theologically false*, and contrary to the declarations of the Gospel. This miserable and impudent subterfuge was condemned and prohibited in the following century, by Leo X. in a council which he held at the Lateran.

VII. The Realists and Nominalists continued their disputes in France and Germany with more vigour and animosity than ever; and, finding that reason and argument were feeble weapons, they had recourse to mutual invectives and accusations, penal laws, and even to the force of arms; a strange method, surely, of deciding a metaphysical question! The contest was not only warm, but was very general in its extent; for it infected, almost without exception, the French and German colleges. In most places, however, the Realists maintained a manifest superiority over the Nominalists, to whom they also gave the appellation of Terminists.[a] While the famous Gerson and the most eminent of his disciples were living, the Nominalists were in high esteem and credit in the university of Paris. But, on the death of these powerful and respectable patrons, the scene was changed to their disadvantage. In 1473, Louis XI., by the instigation of his confessor the bishop of Avranches, issued a severe edict against the doctrines of the Nominalists, and ordered all their writings to be seized, and secured in a sort of imprisonment, that they might not be perused by the people.[b] But the same monarch mitigated this edict in the following year, and permitted some of the books of that sect to be delivered from their confinement.[c] In 1481, he went much farther; for he not only granted a full liberty to the Nominalists and their writings, but also restored that philosophical sect to its former authority and lustre in the university.[d]

CHAPTER II.

Concerning the Doctors and Ministers of the Church, and its Forms of Government, during this Century.

I. THE most eminent writers of this century unanimously lament the miserable condition to which the Christian church was reduced by the corruption of its ministers, and which seemed to portend nothing less than its total ruin, if Providence should not interpose, by extraordinary means, for its deliverance and preservation. The vices that reigned among the Roman pontiffs, and, indeed, among all the ecclesiastical orders, were so flagrant, that the complaints of these good men did not appear at all exaggerated, or their apprehensions ill-founded; nor had any of the corrupt advocates of the clergy the courage to call them to an account for the sharpness of their censures and of their complaints. The rulers of the church, who lived in luxurious indolence, and in the infamous practice of all kinds of vice, were even obliged to hear with a placid countenance, and even to commend, these bold censors, who declaimed against the degeneracy of the church, declared that there was scarcely any thing sound either in its visible head or in its members, and demanded the aid of the secular arm, and the destroying sword, to lop off the parts that were infected with this grievous and deplorable contagion. Affairs, in short, were brought to such a pass, that those were deemed the best Christians, and the most useful members of society, who, braving the terrors of persecution, and triumphing over the fear of man, inveighed with the greatest freedom and fervour against the court of Rome, its lordly pontiff, and the whole tribe of his followers and votaries.

II. At the commencement of this century, the Latin church was divided into two great factions, and was governed by two contending pontiffs, Boniface IX. who remained at Rome, and Benedict XIII. who resided at Avignon. Upon the death of the former, the cardinals of his party raised to the pontificate, in 1404, Cosmo de Meliorati, who assumed the name of Innocent VII.[e], and held that high dignity during the short space of two years only. After his decease, Angelo Corrario, a Venetian cardinal, was chosen in his room, and ruled the Roman faction under the title of Gregory XII. A plan of reconciliation was however formed, and the contending pontiffs bound themselves, each by an oath, to make a voluntary renunciation of the papal chair, if that step should be deemed necessary to promote the peace and welfare of the church; but both of them scandalously violated this solemn obligation. Benedict, besieged in Avignon by the king of France, in 1408, saved himself by flight, retiring first into Catalonia, his native country, and afterwards to Perpignan. Hence eight or nine of the cardinals, who adhered to his cause, seeing themselves deserted by their pope, went over to the other side, and, joining publicly with the cardinals who supported Gregory, they agreed to assemble a council at Pisa on the 25th of March, 1409, in order to heal the divisions and factions that had so long rent the papal empire. This council, however, which was designed to close the wounds of the church, had an effect quite contrary to that which was generally expected, and only served to open a new breach, and to excite new divisions. Its proceedings, indeed, were vigorous, and its measures were accompanied with a just severity. A heavy sentence of condemnation was pronounced, on the 5th day of June, against the contending pontiffs, who were declared guilty of heresy, perjury, and contumacy, unworthy of the smallest tokens of honour or respect, and separated *ipso facto* from the communion of the church. This step was followed by the election of *one* pontiff in their place. The election took place on the 25th of June, and fell upon Peter of Candia, known in the papal list by the name of Alexander V.,[f] but all the decrees and proceedings of this famous council were treated with contempt by the condemned pontiffs, who continued to enjoy the privileges and to perform the functions of the papacy, as if no attempts had been made to remove them from that dignity. Benedict held a council at Perpignan; and Gregory assembled one near Aquileia. The latter, however, apprehending the resentment

[a] See Brucker's Historia Critica Philosophiæ, tom iii. p. 904.—Jo. Salaberti Philosophia Nominalium Vindicata, cap. i.—Baluzii Miscellan. t. iv. p. 531.—Argentre, Coll. Docum. de nov. Error. t. i. p. 220.

[b] Naudé's Additions à l'Histoire de Louis XI. p. 203.—Du Boulay, Hist. Acad. Paris. tom. v. p. 678, 705.—Launoy's Histor. Gymnas. Navar. t. iv. op. part i. p. 201, 378.

[c] Boulay, t. v. p. 710.

[d] The proofs of this we find in Salabert's Philosophia Nominal. vindicata, cap. i.—See also Boulay, tom. v.

[e] Beside the ordinary writers, who have given us an account of the transactions that happened under the pontificate of Innocent VII., see Leon. Aretin. Epistol. lib. i. ep. iv. v. et Colluc. Salutat. Epistol. lib. ii. —We have also an account of the pontificate of Gregory, in the Epistles of the same Aretin, and in Jo. Lami, Delic. Eruditorum, tom. i.

[f] See L'Enfant Histoire, du Concile de Pise.—F. Pagi, Breviar. Pontif. Romanorum, tom. iv.—and Bossuet, Defensio Decreti Gallicani de Potestate Ecclesiastica, tom. ii.

of the Venetians,[a] made his escape in a clandestine manner from the territory of Aquileia, arrived at Caieta, where he threw himself upon the protection of Ladislaus, king of Naples, and, in 1412, fled thence to Rimini.

III. Thus was the Christian church divided into three great factions, and its government violently carried on by three contending chiefs, who loaded each other with reciprocal maledictions, calumnies, and excommunications. Alexander V., who had been elected pontiff at the council of Pisa, died at Bologna in 1410; and the sixteen cardinals, who attended him in that city, immediately filled up the vacancy, by choosing, as his successor, Balthasar Cossa, a Neapolitan, destitute of all principles both of religion and probity, who assumed the title of John XXIII. The duration of this schism in the papacy was a source of many calamities, and became daily more detrimental both to the civil and religious interests of those nations among whom the flame raged. Hence it was that the emperor Sigismund, the king of France, and several other princes, employed all their zeal and activity, and spared neither labour nor expense, in restoring the tranquillity of the church, and uniting it again under one spiritual head. On the other hand, the pontiffs could not be persuaded by any means to prefer the peace of the church to the gratification of their ambition; so that no other method of accommodating this weighty matter remained, than the assembling of a general council, in which the controversy might be examined, and terminated by the judgment and decision of the universal church. This council was accordingly convoked at Constance, in 1414, by John XXIII. who was engaged in this measure by the entreaties of Sigismund, and also from an expectation, that the decrees of this grand assembly would be favourable to his interests. He appeared with a great number of cardinals and bishops, at this famous council, which was also honoured with the presence of the emperor, of many German princes, and of the ambassadors of all the European states, whose monarchs or regents could not be personally present at the decision of this important controversy.[b]

IV. The great object of this assembly was the healing of the schism that had so long rent the papacy: and this purpose was happily accomplished. It was solemnly declared, in the fourth and fifth sessions of this council, by two decrees, that the Roman pontiff was inferior and subject to a general assembly of the universal church; and the same decrees vindicated and maintained, in the most effectual manner, the authority of councils.[c] This vigorous proceeding prepared the way for the degradation of John, who, during the twelfth session, was unanimously deposed from the pontificate,[d] on account of several flagitious crimes that were laid to his charge, and more especially for the scandalous violation of a solemn engagement which he had taken about the beginning of the council, to resign the papal chair, if that measure should appear necessary to the peace of the church; which engagement he broke some weeks after by a clandestine flight. In the same year (1415,) Gregory sent Charles de Malatesta to the council to make, in his name, a solemn and voluntary resignation of the pontificate. About two years after this, Benedict was deposed by a solemn resolution of the council,[e] and Otto de Colonna raised, by the unanimous suffrages of the cardinals, to the high dignity of head of the church, which he ruled under the title of Martin V. Benedict, who still resided at Perpignan, was far from being disposed to submit either to the decree of the council which deposed him, or to the determination of the cardinals with respect to his successor. On the contrary, he persisted until the day of his death, which happened in the year 1423, in assuming the title, the prerogatives, and the authority of the papacy. And when this obstinate man was dead, a certain Spaniard, named Giles Munoz, was chosen pope in his place by two cardinals, under the patronage of Alphonso, king of Sicily, and adopted the title of Clement VIII.; but this sorry pontiff, in 1429, was persuaded to resign his pretensions, and to leave the government of the church to Martin V.

V. If, from the measures that were taken in this council to check the lordly arrogance of the Roman pontiffs, we turn our eyes to the proceedings against those who were called heretics, we shall observe in this new scene nothing worthy of applause, but several things, on the contrary, that can only excite our indignation, and which no pretext, no consideration, can render excusable. Before the meeting of this council, great commotions had been excited in several parts of Europe, and more especially in Bohemia, by contests on religious subjects. One of the persons that gave occasion to these disputes was John Huss, who lived at Prague in the highest reputation, both on account of the sanctity of his manners, and the purity of his doctrine, who was distinguished by his uncommon erudition and eloquence, and performed, at the same time, the functions of professor of divinity in the university, and of ordinary pastor in the church of that famous city.[f] This eminent ecclesiastic declaimed with vehemence against the vices that had corrupted the clergy of all denominations; nor was he singular in this respect; for such remonstrances had become very common, and were generally approved by the wise and the good. Huss, however, went still farther; and, from the year 1408, used his most zealous endeavours to withdraw the university of Prague from the jurisdiction of Gregory XII., whom the kingdom of Bohemia had hitherto acknowledged as the true and lawful head of the church. The archbishop of Prague, and the clergy in general,

☞ [a] He had offended the Venetians by deposing their patriarch, Antony Panciarini, and putting Antony du Pont, the bishop of Concordia, in his place.

[b] The acts of this famous council were published in six volumes in folio, at Frankfort, in 1700, by Herman von der Hardt. This collection, however, is imperfect, notwithstanding the pains that it cost the laborious editor. Many of the acts are omitted, and a great number of pieces are introduced which by no means deserve a place. The history of the same council by L'Enfant, is composed with great accuracy and elegance; but the supplement that was given to it by Bourgeois de Chastenet, a French lawyer, is a performance of little merit; it is entitled, 'Nouvelle Histoire du Concile de Constance, où l'on fait voir combien la France a contribué à l'extinction du Schisme.'

[c] For an account of these two famous decrees, which set such wise limits to the supremacy of the pontiffs, see Natalis Alexand. Hist. Eccl. sæc. XV. Diss. iv.—Bossuet, Defens. Sententiæ Cleri Gallican. de Potest. Ecclesiast. tom. ii.—L'Enfant, Dissert. Historique et Apologetique pour Jean Gerson et le Concile de Constance, which is subjoined to his history of that council.

[d] On the 29th of May, 1415.

[e] On the 26th of July, 1417.

☞ [f] A Bohemian Jesuit, who was far from being favourable to John Huss, and who had the best opportunity of being acquainted with his real character, describes him thus: "He was more subtle than eloquent; but the gravity and austerity of his manners, his frugal and exemplary life, his pale and meagre countenance, his sweetness of temper, and his uncommon affability toward persons of all ranks and conditions, from the highest to the lowest, were much more persuasive than any eloquence could be." See Bohuslaus Balbinus, Epitom. Hist. Rer. Bohem. lib. iv. cap. v. p. 431.

who were warmly attached to the interests of Gregory, were greatly exasperated at these proceedings. Hence arose a violent quarrel between the incensed prelate and the zealous reformer, which the latter inflamed and augmented, from day to day, by his warm exclamations against the conduct of the court of Rome, and the corruptions that prevailed among the sacerdotal order.

VI. Such were the circumstances that first excited the resentment of the clergy against John Huss. This resentment, however, might have been easily calmed, and perhaps totally extinguished, if new incidents of a more important kind had not arisen to keep up the flame and increase its fury. In the first place, he adopted the philosophical opinions of the Realists, and showed his warm attachment to their cause, in the manner that was usual in this barbarous age, even by persecuting, to the utmost of his power, their adversaries, the Nominalists, whose number was great, and whose influence was considerable in the university of Prague.[a] He also multiplied the number of his enemies, in 1408, by procuring, through his great credit, a sentence in favour of the Bohemians, who disputed with the Germans concerning the number of suffrages to which their respective nations were entitled in all points that were carried by election in the university. That the nature of this contest may be better understood, it will be proper to observe, that this famous university was divided, by its founder Charles IV., into four nations, namely, the Bohemians, Bavarians, Poles, and Saxons; of which, according to the original laws of the institution, the first had three suffrages, and the other three, who were comprehended under the title of the German nation, only one. This arrangement, however, had not only been altered by custom, but was entirely inverted in favour of the Germans, who were vastly superior to the Bohemians in number, and assumed to themselves the three suffrages which originally belonged to the latter. Huss, therefore, whether animated by a principle of patriotism, or by an aversion to the Nominalists, who were peculiarly favoured by the Germans, raised his voice against this abuse, and employed, with success, the extraordinary credit he had obtained at court, by his flowing and masculine eloquence, in depriving the Germans of the privilege they had usurped, and in reducing their three suffrages to one. The issue of this long and tedious contest[b] was so offensive to the Germans, that a prodigious number of them, with John Hoffman, the rector of the university, at their head,[c] retired from Prague, and repaired to Leipsic, where Frederic the Wise, elector of Saxony, erected for them, in 1409, that academic institution which still subsists in a flourishing state. This event contributed greatly to render Huss odious to many, and, by the consequences that followed it, was certainly instrumental in bringing on his ruin; for no sooner had the Germans retired from Prague, than he began not only to inveigh with greater freedom than he had formerly done against the vices and corruptions of the clergy, but even went so far as to recommend, in an open and public manner, the writings and opinions of the famous Wickliffe, whose new doctrines had already made such a noise in England. Hence an accusation was brought against him, in 1410, before the tribunal of John XXII., by whom he was solemnly expelled from the communion of the church. He treated, indeed, this excommunication with the utmost contempt, and, both in his conversation and his writings, exposed the disorders that preyed upon the vitals of the church, and the vices that dishonoured the conduct of its ministers;[d] and the fortitude and zeal which he discovered on this occasion were almost universally applauded.

VII. This eminent man, whose piety was truly fervent and sincere, though his zeal, perhaps, was rather too violent, and his prudence not always equally circumspect, was summoned to appear before the council of Constance. Obedient to this order, and thinking himself secured from the rage of his enemies, by the safe conduct which had been granted to him by the emperor Sigismund, both for his journey to Constance, his residence in that city, and his return to his own country, John Huss appeared before the assembled churchmen, to demonstrate his innocence, and to prove that the charge of his having deserted the church of Rome was entirely groundless. And it may be affirmed with truth, that his religious opinions, at least in matters of importance, were conformable to the established doctrine of the church in this age.[e] He declaimed, indeed, with extraordinary vehemence against the Roman pontiffs, the bishops and monks: but this freedom was deemed lawful in these times, and it was used every day in the council of Constance, where the tyranny of the court of Rome, and the corruption of the sacerdotal and monastic orders, were censured with the utmost severity. The enemies, however, of this good man, who were very numerous, coloured the accusation that was brought against him with such artifice and success, that, by the most scandalous breach of public faith, he was thrown into prison, declared a heretic, because he refused to obey the order of the council, which commanded him to plead guilty against the dictates of his conscience, and was burned alive on the 6th of July, 1415; which dreadful punishment he endured with unparalleled magnanimity and resignation, expressing in his last moments the noblest feelings of love to God, and the most triumphant hope of the accomplishment of those transporting promises with which the Gospel fortifies the true Christian at the approach of eternity. The same unhappy fate was borne

[a] See the Literæ Nominalium ad Regem Franciæ Ludovicum VI., in Baluzii Miscellan. tom. iv. p. 534, where we read the following passage: "Legimus Nominales expulsos de Bohemiâ eo tempore, quo hæretici voluerunt Bohemicum regnum suis hæresibus inficere.—Quum dicti hæretici non possent disputando superare, impetraverunt ab Abbisseslao (*Wenceslao*) principe Bohemiæ, ut gubernarentur studia Pragensia ritu Parisiensium; quo edicto coacti sunt supradicti Nominales Pragam civitatem relinquere, et se transtulerunt ad Lipzicam civitatem, et ibidem erexerunt universitatem solemnissimam."

[b] Wenceslaus, king of Bohemia, who was bribed by both of the contending parties, protracted instead of abridging this dispute, and used to say with a smile, that he had found a good *goose*, which *laid every day a considerable number of gold and silver eggs*. This was playing upon the word *Huss*, which, in the German language, signifies a *goose*.

[c] Historians differ much in their accounts of the number of Germans that retired from the university of Prague upon this occasion. Æneas Sylvius reckons 5000; Trithemius and others 2000. Dubravius 24,000; Lupatius 44,000; Lauda (a contemporary writer) 36,000.

[d] See Laur. Byzinii Diarium Belli Hussitici, in Ludewig's Reliquiæ Manuscriptorum, tom. vi. p. 127.

[e] It was observed in the preceding section, that John Huss adopted with zeal, and openly recommended the writings and opinions of Wickliffe; but this must be understood of the writings and opinions of that great man in relation to the papal hierarchy, the despotism of the court of Rome, and the corruption of the clergy; for, in other respects, it is certain that he adhered to the most superstitious doctrines of the church, as appears from various passages in two sermons which he had prepared for the council of Constance.

with the same pious fortitude and constancy of mind by Jerome of Prague, the intimate companion of John Huss, who appeared at this council with the generous design of supporting and seconding his persecuted friend. Terrified by the prospect of a cruel death, Jerome at first appeared willing to submit to the orders of the council, and to abandon the tenets and opinions which it had condemned in his writings. This submission, however, was not attended with the advantages he expected from it; nor did it deliver him from the close and severe confinement in which he was kept. He therefore resumed his fortitude; professed anew, with an heroic constancy, the opinions which he had deserted for a while from a principle of fear; and maintained them in the flames, in which he expired on the 30th of May, 1416.[a]

Many learned men have endeavoured to investigate the reasons that occasioned the pronouncing of such a cruel sentence against Huss and his associate; and, as no adequate reasons for such a severe proceeding can be found, either in the life or opinions of that good man, they conclude that he fell a victim to the rage and injustice of his unrelenting enemies. And indeed this conclusion is both natural and well-grounded; nor will it be difficult to show how it came to pass, that the reverend fathers of the council were so eagerly bent upon burning, as a heretic, a man who neither deserved such an injurious title, nor such a dreadful fate. In the first place, John Huss had excited, both by his discourses and by his writings, great commotions in Bohemia, and had rendered the clergy of all ranks and orders extremely odious in the eyes of the people. The bishops, therefore, together with the sacerdotal and monastic orders, were very sensible that their honours and advantages, their credit and authority, were in the greatest danger of being annihilated, if this reformer should return to his country, and continue to write and declaim against the clergy with the same freedom which he had formerly exercised. Hence they left no means unemployed to accomplish his ruin; they laboured night and day, formed plots, bribed men in power; they used, in short, every method that could have any tendency to rid them of such a formidable adversary.[b] It may be observed, secondly, that in the council there were many men of great influence and weight, who looked upon themselves as personally offended by him, and demanded his life as the only sacrifice that could satisfy their vengeance. Huss, as has been already mentioned, was not only attached to the party of the Realists, but was peculiarly severe in his opposition to their adversaries. And now he was so unhappy, as to be brought before a tribunal which was principally composed of the Nominalists, with the famous John Gerson at their head, who was the zealous patron of that faction, and the mortal enemy of Huss. Nothing could equal the vindictive pleasure the Nominalists felt from an event that put this unfortunate prisoner in their power, and gave them an opportunity of satisfying their vengeance to the full; and accordingly, in their letter to Louis, king of France,[c] they do not pretend to deny that Huss fell a victim to the resentment of their sect, which is also confirmed by the history of the council. The animosities that always reigned between the Realists and Nominalists, were at this time carried to the greatest excess imaginable. Upon every occasion that offered, they accused each other of heresy and impiety, and constantly had recourse to corporal punishments to decide the dispute. The Nominalists procured the death of Huss, who was a Realist; and the Realists, on the other hand, obtained, in 1479, the condemnation of John of Wesel, who was attached to the opposite party.[d] These contending sects carried their blind fury so far as to charge each other with the sin against the Holy Ghost,[e] and exhibited the most miserable spectacle of inhuman bigotry to the Christian world. The aversion which John Huss, and Jerome, his companion, had against the Germans, was a third circumstance that contributed to determine their unhappy fate. This aversion they declared publicly at Prague, on all occasions, both by their words and actions; nor were they at any pains to conceal it even in the council of Constance, where they accused them of presumption and despotism in the strongest terms.[f] The Germans, on the other hand, remembering the affront they had received in the university of Prague, by the means of John Huss, burned with resentment and rage both against him and his unfortunate friend; and, as their influence and authority were very great in the council, there is no doubt that they employed them, with the utmost zeal, against these two formidable adversaries. Besides, John Hoffman, the famous rector of the university, whom Huss had been the occasion of expelling from that city, together with the Germans, and who in consequence thereof became his most virulent enemy, was consecrated bishop of Misnia, in 1413, and held in this council the most illustrious rank among the delegates of the German church. This cir-

☞ [a] The translator has here inserted into the text the long note [a] of the original, which relates to the circumstances that precipitated the ruin of these two eminent reformers; and he has thrown the citations therein contained into several notes.

[b] The bribery and corruption that were employed in bringing about the ruin of John Huss, are manifest from the following remarkable passages of the Diarium Hussiticum of Laur. Byzinius: "Clerus perversus, præcipue in regno Bohemiæ et marchionatu Moraviæ, condemnationem ipsius (Hussi) contributione pecuniarum et modis aliis diversis procuravit, et ad ipsius consensit interitum." "Clerus perversus regni Bohemiæ et marchionatus Moraviæ, et præcipue episcopi, abbates, canonici, plebani, et religiosi, ipsius fideles ac salutiferas admonitiones, adhortationes, ipsorum pompam, simoniam, avaritiam, fornicationem, vitæque detestandæ abominationem detegentes, ferre non valendo, pecuniarum contributiones ad ipsius extinctionem faciendo procurárunt."

[c] See Baluzii Miscell. tom. iv. p. 534, in which we find the following passage: "Suscitavit Deus doctores catholicos, Petrum de Alliaco; Johannem de Gersono, et alios quam plures doctissimos homines Nominales, qui, convocati ad concilium Constantiense, ad quod citati fuerunt hæretici, et nominatim Hieronymus et Johannes—dictos hæreticos per quadraginta dies disputando superaverunt."

[d] See the Examen Magistrale et Theologicale Mag. Joh. de Wesalia, in Ortuini Gratii Fasciculo rerum expetend. et fugiendar. Colon. 1535.

[e] In the *Examen* mentioned in the preceding note, we find the following striking passage, which may show us the extravagant length to which the disputes between the Nominalists and Realists were now carried: "Quis nisi ipse diabolus seminavit illam zizaniam inter philosophos et inter theologos, ut tanta sit dissensio, *etiam animorum*, inter diversa opinantes? Adeo ut si universalia quisquam realia negaverit, existimetur in Spiritum Sanctum peccavisse; imo summo et maximo peccato plenus creditur contra Deum, contra Christianam religionem, contra justitiam, contra omnem politiam, graviter deliquisse. Unde hæc cœcitas mentis nisi a diabolo, qui phantasias nostras illudit?" We see by this passage, that the Realists charged their adversaries (whose only crime was the absurdity of calling *universal ideas* mere *denominations*) with sin against the Holy Ghost, with transgression against God, and against the Christian religion, and with a violation of all the laws of justice and civil polity.

[f] See Theod. de Niem, Invectiva in Joh. XXIII., in Hardtii Actis Concilii Constant. tom. ii. p. 450. "Improperabat etiam in publico Alamannis, dicendo, quod essent præsumptuosi, et vellent ubique per orbem dominari——Sicque factum fuisset sæpe in Bohemiâ, ubi volentes etiam dominari Alamanni violenter exinde repulsi et male tractati fuissent."

cumstance was also most unfavourable to Huss, and was, without doubt, ultimately detrimental to his cause.

The circumstances now mentioned, as contributing to the unhappy fate of this good man, are, as we see, all drawn from the resentment and prejudices of his enemies, and have not the least colour of equity. It must, however, be confessed, that there appeared one *mark of heresy* in the conduct of this reformer, which, according to the notions that prevailed in this century, might expose him to condemnation with some shadow of reason and justice; I mean, his inflexible obstinacy, which the church of Rome always considered as a grievous *heresy*, even in those whose errors were of little moment. We must consider this man, as called before a council, which was supposed to represent the universal church, to confess his faults and to abjure his errors. This he obstinately refused to do, unless he was previously convicted of error; here, therefore, he resisted the authority of the catholic church, demanded a rational proof of the justice of the sentence it had pronounced against him, and intimated, with sufficient plainness, that he looked upon the church as *fallible*. All this certainly was most enormously criminal and intolerably heretical, according to the general opinion of the times; for it became a dutiful son of the church to renounce his eye-sight, and to submit his own judgment and will, without any exception or reservation, to the judgment and will of that holy mother, under a firm belief and entire persuasion of the infallibility of all her decisions. This ghostly mother had, for many ages past, followed, whenever her unerring perfection and authority were called in question, the rule which Pliny observed in his conduct toward the Christians: "When they persevered, (says he, in his letter to Trajan,) I put my threats into execution, from a persuasion that, whatever their confessions might be, their audacious and invincible obstinacy deserved an exemplary punishment."[a]

VIII. Before sentence had been pronounced against John Huss and Jerome of Prague, the famous Wickliffe, whose opinions they were supposed to adopt, and who was long since dead, was called from his rest before this spiritual tribunal; and his memory was solemnly branded with infamy by a decree of the council. On the 4th day of May, in 1415, many propositions, invidiously culled out of his writings, were examined and condemned, and an order was issued to commit all his works, together with his bones, to the flames. On the 14th of June following, the assembled fathers passed the famous decree, which took the cup from the laity in the celebration of the eucharist; ordered "that the Lord's supper should be received by them only in one kind, i. e. *the bread*," and rigorously prohibited the communion in both kinds. This decree was occasioned by complaints that had been made of the conduct of Jacobellus de Misa, curate of the parish of St. Michael at Prague, who, about a year before, had been persuaded by Peter of Dresden, to administer the Lord's supper in both kinds, and was followed in this by several churches.[b] The council, being informed of this matter by a Bohemian bishop, thought proper to oppose with vigour the progress of this *heresy;* and therefore they enacted the statute, which ordered "the communion to be administered to the laity only in one kind," and which obtained the force and authority of a law in the church of Rome.

IX. In the same year, the opinion of John Petit, a doctor of divinity at Paris,[c] who maintained, that every individual had an undoubted right to take away the life of a tyrant, was brought before the council, and was condemned as an odious and detestable heresy; but both the name and person of the author were spared, on account of the powerful patrons, under whose protection he had defended that pernicious doctrine. John, duke of Burgundy, had, in 1407, employed a band of ruffians to assassinate Louis duke of Orleans, only brother of Charles VI. king of France. While the whole city was in an uproar in consequence of this horrible deed, Petit vindicated it in a public oration, in presence of the dauphin and the other princes of the blood, affirming, that the duke had done a laudable action, and that it was lawful to put a tyrant to death, "in any way, either by violence or fraud, without any form of law or justice, and even in opposition to the most solemn contracts and oaths of fidelity and allegiance." It is, however, to be observed, that by *tyrants*, this doctor did not mean the supreme rulers of nations, but those powerful and insolent subjects, who abused their opulence and credit to bring about measures that tended to the dishonour of their sovereign and the ruin of their country.[d] The university of Paris pronounced a severe and rigorous sentence against the author of this pernicious opinion; and the council of Constance, after much deliberation and debate, condemned the opinion without mentioning the author. This determination, though modified with the utmost clemency and mildness, was not ratified by the new pontiff Martin V., who dreaded too much the formidable power of the duke of Burgundy, to confirm a sentence which he knew would be displeasing to that ambitious prince.[e]

X. After these and other transactions of a like nature, it was now time to take into consideration a point of greater importance than had yet been proposed, even the reformation of the church in its head and in its members, by setting bound to the despotism and corruption of the Roman pontiffs, and to the luxury and immorality of licentious ecclesiastics. It was particularly with a view to this important object, that the eyes of all Europe were fixed upon the council, from a general persuasion of the necessity of this reformation, and an ardent desire of seeing it happily brought into execution. Nor did the assembled fathers deny, that this reformation was the principal end of their meeting. Yet this salutary work had so many obstacles in the passions and interests of those very persons by whom it was to be effected, that little could be expected, and still less was done. The cardinals and dignified clergy, whose interest it was that the church should remain in its corrupt and disordered state, employ-

[a] Plin. Epist. lib. x. ep. 97. "Perseverantes duci jussi. Neque enim dubitabam, qualecumque esset quod faterentur, pervicaciam certe et inflexibilem obstinationem debere puniri." [b] Byzinii Diar. Huss. p. 124.

☞ [c] Some historians have erroneously represented Petit as a lawyer. See Dr. Smollet's History of England.

[d] This appears manifestly from the very discourse of Petit, which the reader may see in L'Enfant's History of the Council of Pisa, tom. ii. p. 303.* See also August. Leyseri Diss. quâ Memoriam Joh. Burgundi et Doctrinam Joh. Parvi de Cæde per Duellium vindicat.

[e] Boulay, tom. v.—Argentre, Collectio Judicior. de novis Erroribus, tom. i. part ii.—Gersonis Opera, edited by M. Du-Pin, tom. v.—Bayle's Diction. tom. iii.

☞ * See also the same author's History of the Council of Constance, book iii. sect. xix.

ed all their eloquence and art to prevent its reformation; and observed, among other artful pretexts, that a work of such high moment and importance could not be undertaken with any prospect of success, until a new pontiff should be elected. And, what was still more shocking, Martin V. was no sooner raised to that high dignity, than he employed his authority to elude and frustrate every effort that was made to set this salutary work on foot, and made it appear most evidently, by the laws he enacted, that nothing was more foreign from his intention than the reformation of the clergy, and the restoration of the church to its primitive purity. Thus this famous council, after sitting three years and six months, was dissolved, on the 22d day of April, 1418, without having effected its chief ostensible object; and the members postponed to a future assembly of the same kind, which was to be summoned five years after this period, that pious design of purifying a corrupt church, which had been so long the object of the expectations and desires of all good Christians.

XI. Not merely five years, but almost thirteen, elapsed without the promised meeting. The remonstrances, however, of those whose zeal for the reformation of the church interested them in this event, prevailed at length over the pretexts and stratagems which were employed to put it off from time to time; and Martin summoned a council to meet at Pavia, whence it was removed to Sienna, and thence to Basil. The pontiff did not live to be a witness of the proceedings of this assembly, being carried off by a sudden death on the 21st day of February, 1431, just about the time when the council was to meet. He was immediately succeeded by Gabriel Condolmerio, a native of Venice, and bishop of Sienna, who is known in the papal list by the title of Eugenius IV. This pontiff approved all the measures of his predecessor, in relation to the assembling of the council of Basil, which was accordingly opened on the 23d of July, 1431, under the superintendence of Cardinal Julian Cesarini, who performed the functions of president in the place of Eugenius.

The two grand points, proposed to the deliberation of this famous council, were, the union of the Grerk and Latin churches, and the reformation of the church universal, both in its head and in its members, according to the resolution that had been taken in the late council; for that the Roman pontiff, or the head of the church, and the bishops, priests, and monks, who were looked upon as its members, had become excessively corrupt, and that, to use the expression of the prophet in a similar case, the 'whole head was sick and the whole heart faint,' were matters of fact too striking to escape the knowledge of the obscurest individual. On the other hand, as it appeared by the very form of the council,[a] by its method of proceeding, and by the first decrees that were enacted by its authority, that the assembled fathers were in earnest, and firmly resolved to answer the end and purpose of their meeting, Eugenius was much alarmed at the prospect of a reformation, which he feared above all things; and beholding with terror the zeal and designs of these spiritual physicians, he twice attempted the dissolution of the council. These repeated attempts were vigorously opposed by the members, who proved by the decrees of the late assembly, and by other arguments equally conclusive, that the council was superior in point of authority to the Roman pontiff. This controversy was terminated in November, 1433, by the silence and concessions of the pope, who, in the following month, wrote a letter from Rome, expressing his approbation of the council, and his acknowledgment of its authority.[b]

XII. These preliminary measures being finished, the council proceeded with zeal and activity to the accomplishment of the important purposes for which it was assembled The pope's legates were admitted as members, but not before they had declared, upon oath, that they would submit to the decrees that should be enacted in it, and more particularly that they would adhere to the laws of the council of Constance, in relation to the supremacy of general councils, and the subordination of the pontiffs to their authority and jurisdiction. These very laws, which the popes beheld with such aversion and horror, were solemnly renewed by the assembly in 1434; and in the following year, the *Annates* (as they were called) were publicly abolished, notwithstanding the opposition that was made to this measure by the legates of the Roman see. On the 25th of March, 1436, a confession of faith was read, which every pontiff was to subscribe on the day of his election; it was voted that the number of cardinals should be reduced to twenty-four; and the papal impositions, called *Expectatives*, *Reservations*, and *Provisions*, were annulled. These measures, with others of a like nature, provoked Eugenius in the highest degree, and induced him to form the intention, either of removing this troublesome and enterprising council into Italy, or of setting up a new assembly in opposition to it, which might fix bounds to its zeal for the reformation of the church. Accordingly, on the 7th of May, 1437, the assembled fathers having, on account of the Greeks, come to a resolution of holding the new council at Basil, Avignon, or some city in the duchy of Savoy, the intractable pontiff opposed this motion, and maintained that it should be transferred into Italy. Each of the contending parties persevered, with the utmost obstinacy, in the resolution they had taken; and this occasioned a warm and violent contest between the pope and the council. The latter

☞ [a] By the form of the council, Dr. Mosheim undoubtedly means the division of the cardinals, archbishops, bishops, abbots, &c. into four equal classes, without any regard to the nation or province by which they were sent. This prudent arrangement prevented the cabals and intrigues of the Italians, whose bishops were much more numerous than those of other nations, and who, by their number, might have had it in their power to retard or defeat the laudable purpose which the council had in view, had things been otherwise ordered.

[b] The history of this grand and memorable council is yet a desideratum. The learned Stephen Baluze, (as we find in the Histoire de l'Academie des Inscriptions et des Belles Lettres, tom. vi. p. 544,) and after him M. L'Enfant, promised the world a history of this council; but neither of these valuable writers performed that promise.* The acts of this famous assembly were collected with incredible industry, in a great number of volumes, from various archives and libraries, at the expense of Rodolphus Augustus, duke of Brunswick, by the very learned and laborious Herman von der Hardt. They are preserved, as we are informed, in the library at Hanover; and they certainly deserve to be drawn from their retreat, and published to the world. In the mean time, the curious may consult the abridgment of the acts of this council, published at Paris, in 1512, of which I have made use in this history, as also the following authors: Æneæ Sylvii Lib. duo de Concilio Basiliensi.—Edm. Richerius, Histor. Concilior. General. lib. iii. cap. 1.—Henr. Canisii Lectiones Antiquæ, tom. iv. p. 447.

☞ * Dr. Mosheim has here fallen into an error; for L'Enfant did in reality perform his promise, and composed the History of the Council of Basil, which he blended with his history of the war of the Hussites, on account of the connexion between these subjects, and also because his advanced age prevented his indulging himself in the hope of being able to give, separately, a complete history of the council of Basil.

summoned Eugenius to appear at Basil, in order to give an account of his conduct; but the pontiff, instead of complying with the requisition, issued a decree, by which he pretended to dissolve the council, and to assemble another at Ferrara. This decree, indeed, was treated with the utmost contempt by the council, which, with the consent of the emperor, the king of France, and several other princes, continued its deliberations, and pronounced a sentence of contumacy against the rebellious pontiff, for having refused to obey its order.

XIII. In the year 1438, Eugenius in person opened the council, which he had summoned to meet at Ferrara, and at the second session thundered out an excommunication against the fathers assembled at Basil. The principal business that was now to be transacted, was the proposed reconciliation between the Greek and Latin churches; and, in order to bring this salutary and important design to a happy issue, the emperor John Palæologus, the Grecian patriarch Josephus, with the most eminent bishops and doctors among the Greeks, arrived in Italy, and appeared at Ferrara. The extremity to which the Greeks were reduced by the Turks, and the pleasing hope, that their reconciliation with the Roman pontiff would contribute to engage the Latins in their cause, seem to have animated, in a particular manner, their zeal in this negociation. Be that as it may, there was little done at Ferrara, where matters were carried on too slowly, to afford any prospect of an end of their dissensions: but the negociations were more successful at Florence, whither Eugenius removed the council about the beginning of the year 1439, on account of the plague that broke out at Ferrara. On the other hand, the council of Basil, exasperated by the imperious proceedings of Eugenius, deposed him from the papacy on the 25th of June, 1439; which vigorous measure was not approved by the European kings and princes. It may be easily conceived what an impression this step made upon the affronted pontiff; he lost all patience; and devoted, for the second time, to hell and damnation, the members of the obnoxious council by a solemn and most severe edict, in which also he declared all their acts null, and all their proceedings unlawful. This new peal of papal thunder was held in derision by the council of Basil, whose members, persisting in their purpose, elected another pontiff, and raised to that high dignity Amadeus, duke of Savoy, who then lived in the most profound solitude at a charming retreat, called Ripaille, upon the borders of the Leman Lake, and who is known in the papal list by the name of Felix V.

XIV. This election was the occasion of the revival of that deplorable schism, which had formerly rent the church, and which had been terminated with so much difficulty, and after so many vain and fruitless efforts, at the council of Constance. The new breach was even more lamentable than the former one, as the flame was kindled not only between rival pontiffs, but also between the contending councils of Basil and Florence. The greatest part of the church submitted to the jurisdiction, and adopted the cause of Eugenius; while Felix was acknowledged, as lawful pontiff, by a great number of universities, and, among others, by that of Paris, as also in several kingdoms and provinces. The council of Basil continued to deliberate, to enact laws, and publish edicts, until the year 1443, notwithstanding the efforts of Eugenius and his adherents to put a stop to their proceedings. And, though in that year the members of the council retired to their respective places of abode, yet they declared publicly that the council was not dissolved.

In the mean time, the council of Florence, with Eugenius at its head, was chiefly employed in reconciling the differences between the Greeks and Latins; which weighty business was committed to the prudence, zeal, and piety, of a select number of eminent men on both sides. The most distinguished among those whom the Greeks chose for this purpose was the learned Bessarion, who was afterwards raised to the dignity of cardinal in the Romish church. This great man, engaged and seduced by the splendid presents and promises of the Latin pontiff, employed the whole extent of his authority, and the power of his eloquence, and even had recourse to promises and threats, to persuade the Greeks to accept the conditions of peace that were proposed by Eugenius. These conditions required their consent to the following points:—"That the Holy Spirit proceeded from the Son, as well as from the Father; that departed souls were purified in the infernal regions, by a certain kind of fire, before their admission to the presence and vision of the Deity;—that unleavened bread might be used in the administration of the Lord's supper;"—and lastly, which was the principal thing insisted upon by the Latins, that 'the Roman pontiff was the supreme judge, the true head of the universal church.' Such were the terms of peace to which all the Greeks were obliged to accede, except Mark of Ephesus, whom neither entreaties nor rewards could move from his purpose, or engage to submit to a reconciliation founded upon such conditions. And indeed this reconciliation, which had been brought about by various stratagems, was much more specious than solid, and had by no means stability sufficient to insure its duration. We find, accordingly, that the Grecian deputies had no sooner returned to Constantinople, than they declared publicly, that all things had been carried on at Florence by artifice and fraud, and renewed the schism, which had been so imperfectly healed. The council put an end to its deliberations on the 26th of April, 1442,[a] without having executed any of the designs that were proposed by it, in a satisfactory manner; for, beside the affair of the Greeks, they proposed bringing the Armenians, Jacobites, and more particularly the Abyssinians, into the bosom of the Romish church; but this project was attended with as little success as the other.

XV. Eugenius IV., who had been the occasion of the new schism in the see of Rome, died in February, 1447, and was succeeded, in a few weeks, by Thomas de Sarzano, bishop of Bologna, who filled the pontificate under the denomination of Nicolas V. This eminent prelate had, in point of merit, the best pretensions possible to the papal throne. He was distinguished by his erudition and ge-

[a] The history of this council, and of the frauds and stratagems that were practised in it, was composed by that learned Grecian, Sylvester Sgyropulus, whose work was published at the Hague, in 1660, with a Latin translation, a preliminary Discourse, and ample notes, by the learned Robert Creighton, a native of Great Britain. This history was refuted by Leo Allatius, in a work entitled, Exercitationes in Creightoni Apparatum, Versionem, et Notas ad Historiam Concilii Florentini scriptam a Sgyropulo, Romæ, 1674. See the same author's Perpetua Consensio Ecclesiæ Oriental. et Occident. p. 875, as also Mabillon, Museum Italicum, tom. i. p. 243.—Spanheim, de perpetuâ Dissensione Eccles. Orient. et Occident. tom. ii. op. p. 491.—Hermann, Historia concertat. de Pane azymo, part ii. c. v.

nius; he was a zealous patron and protector of learned men; and, what was still more laudable, he was remarkable for his moderation, and for the meek and pacific spirit that discovered itself in all his conduct and actions. Under this pontificate, the European princes, and more especially the king of France, exerted their warmest endeavours to restore tranquillity and union to the Latin church; and their efforts were crowned with the desired success. For, in 1449, Felix V., resigned the papal chair, and returned to his delightful hermitage at Ripaille, while the fathers of the Council of Basil, assembled at Lausanne,[a] ratified his voluntary abdication, and, by a solemn decree, ordered the universal church to submit to the jurisdiction of Nicolas as their lawful pontiff. On the other hand, Nicolas proclaimed this treaty of peace with great pomp on the 18th of June, in the same year, and set the seal of his approbation and authority to the acts and decrees of the council. This pontiff distinguished himself in a very extraordinary manner, by his love of learning, and by his ardent zeal for the propagation of the liberal arts and sciences, which he promoted, with great success, by the encouragement he granted to the learned Greeks, who emigrated from Constantinople into Italy.[b] The principal occasion of his death was the fatal revolution that threw this capital of the Grecian empire into the hands of the Turks; this melancholy event preyed upon his spirits, and hastened his death, which happened on the 24th of March, 1455.

XVI. His successor Alphonso Borgia, who was a native of Spain, and is known in the papal list by the denomination of Calixtus III., was remarkable for nothing but his zeal in animating the Christian princes to make war upon the Turks; his reign also was short, for he died in 1458. Æneas Sylvius Piccolomini, who succeeded him in the pontificate in that same year, under the title of Pius II., rendered his name much more illustrious, not only by his extensive genius, and the important transactions that were carried on during his administration, but also by the various and useful productions with which he enriched the republic of letters. The lustre of his fame was, indeed, tarnished by a scandalous proof which he gave of his fickleness and inconstancy, or rather perhaps of his bad faith; for, after having vigorously defended, against the pontiffs, the dignity and prerogatives of general councils, and maintained, with peculiar boldness and obstinacy, the cause of the council of Basil against Eugenius IV., he ignominiously renounced these principles upon his accession to the pontificate, and acted in direct opposition to them during the whole course of his administration. Thus, in 1460, he denied publicly that the pope was subordinate to a general council, and even prohibited all appeals to such a council under the severest penalties. In the following year he obtained from Louis XI., king of France, the abrogation of the *Pragmatic Sanction*, which favoured, in a particular manner, the pretensions of the general councils to supremacy in the church.[c] But the most egregious instance of impudence and perfidy that he exhibited to the world was in 1463, when he publicly retracted all that he had written in favour of the council of Basil, and declared without either shame or hesitation, that, as Æneas Sylvius, he was a damnable heretic, but that, as Pius II., he was an orthodox pontiff. This indecorous declaration was the last circumstance, worthy of notice, that happened during his pontificate; for he died in July, 1464.[d]

XVII. Paul II., a Venetian by birth, whose name was Peter Barbo, was raised to the head of the church in 1464, and died in 1471. His administration was distinguished by some measures, which, if we consider the genius of the times, were worthy of praise; though it must at the same time be confessed, that he did many things which were evidently inexcusable, (not to mention his reducing the jubilee circle to twenty-five years, and thus accelerating the return of that most absurd and superstitious ceremony;) so that his reputation became at least dubious in aftertimes, and was viewed in different lights by different persons.[e] The following popes, Sixtus IV., and Innocent

[a] This abdication was made on the 9th of April, 1449, and was ratified on the 16th.

[b] See Dom. Georgii Vita Nicolai V. ad fidem veterum Monumentorum; to which is added a treatise, entitled, Disquisitio de Nicolai V. erga Literas et Literatos Viros Patrocinio, published at Rome, in 1742.

☞ [c] There was a famous edict, entitled, *The Pragmatic Sanction*, issued by Louis IX., who, though he is honoured with a place in the Kalendar, was yet a zealous assertor of the liberty and privileges of the Gallican church, against the despotic encroachments and pretensions of the Roman pontiffs. It was against their tyrannical proceedings, and intolerable extortions, that this edict was chiefly levelled; and though some creatures of the court of Rome have thrown out insinuations of its being a spurious production, yet the contrary is evident from its having been registered, as the authentic edict of that pious monarch, by the parliament of Paris, in 1461, by the states of the kingdom assembled at Tours in 1483, and by the university of Paris, in 1491.—See, for a farther account of this edict, the excellent History of France, (begun by the abbé Velly, and continued by M. Villaret,) vol. vi. p. 57.

The edict which Dr. Mosheim has in view here, is the *Pragmatic Sanction* that was drawn up at Bourges, in 1438, by Charles VII. king of France, with the consent of the most eminent prelates and grandees of the nation, who were assembled at that place. This edict (which was absolutely necessary in order to deliver the French clergy from the vexations they suffered from the encroachments of the popes, ever since the latter had fixed their residence at Avignon) consisted of twenty-three articles, in which, among other salutary regulations, the elections to vacant benefices were restored to their ancient purity and freedom,* the *annates* and other pecuniary pretensions and encroachments of the pontiffs abolished, and the authority of a general council declared superior to that of the pope. This edict was drawn up in concert with the fathers of the council of Basil, and the articles were taken from the decrees of that council, though they were admitted by the Gallican church with certain modifications, which the nature of the times and the manners of the nation rendered expedient. Such then was the Pragmatic Sanction, which Pius II. engaged Louis XI. (who received upon that occasion, for himself and his successors, the title of *Most Christian*) to abolish by a solemn declaration; the full execution of which was, however, prevented by the noble stand made by the university of Paris in favour of the edict. The king also, perceiving that he had been deluded into this declaration by the treacherous insinuations of Geoffry, bishop of Arras, (whom the pope had bribed with a cardinal's cap, and large promises of a more lucrative kind,) took no sort of pains to have it executed, but published, on the contrary, new edicts against the pecuniary pretensions and extortions of the court of Rome; so that in reality the Pragmatic Sanction was not abolished before the adjustment of the Concordat or agreement, which was transacted between Francis I. and Leo X. in 1517, and was forced upon the French nation in opposition to the united efforts of the clergy, the university, the parliament, and the people. See, for a farther account of this matter, Du Clos, Histoire de Louis XI. vol. i. p. 115—132.

[d] Beside the writers of ecclesiastical history, see Nouveau Diction. Histor. et Critique, tom. ii. at the article Enée Sylvius.

[e] Paul II. has had the good fortune to find, in one of the most eminent and learned men of this age, (the famous cardinal Quirini,) a zealous apologist. See, among the productions of that illustrious prelate, the piece entitled, "Pauli II. Vita, ex Codice Anglicæ Bibliothecæ desumpta, præmissis ipsius Vindiciis adversus Platinam aliosque obtrectatores, Romæ, 1740."

☞ * That is to say, these elections were wrested out of the hands of the popes, who had usurped them; and, by the new edict, every church had the privilege of choosing its bishop, and every monastery its abbot or prior. By the Concordat, or agreement, between Francis I. and Leo X., (which was substituted in the place of the Pragmatic Sanction,) the nomination of the bishoprics in France, and the collation of certain benefices of the higher class, were vested in the kings of

VIII., whose names were Francis Albescola and John Baptist Cibo, were neither remarkable for their virtues nor their vices. The former died in 1484, and the latter in 1492. Filled with the most terrible apprehensions of the danger that threatened Europe in general, and Italy in particular, from the growing power of the Turks, both these pontiffs attempted to put themselves in a posture of defence, and warmly exhorted the European princes to check the progress of that warlike people; but many obstacles arose, which rendered their exhortations ineffectual. The other undertakings that were projected or carried on, during their continuance at the head of the church, are not of sufficient importance to require particular notice.

XVIII. In the series of pontiffs that ruled the church during this century, the last, in order of time, was Alexander VI., a Spaniard by birth, whose name was Roderic Borgia. The life and actions of this man show, that there was a Nero among the popes, as well as among the emperors. The crimes and enormities, that history has imputed to this papal Nero, evidently prove him to have been not only destitute of all religious and virtuous principles, but even regardless of decency, and hardened against the very feeling of shame; and, though the malignity of his enemies may have forged false accusations against him, and, in some instances, exaggerated the horror of his real crimes, yet we have upon record an authentic list of undoubted facts, which, both by their number and their atrocity, are sufficient to render the name and memory of Alexander VI. odious and detestable, in the opinion even of such as have the smallest tincture of virtuous principles and feelings. An inordinate affection for his children was the principal source from which proceeded a great part of the crimes he committed. He had four sons by a concubine with whom he had lived many years; among whom was the infamous Cæsar Borgia. A daughter, named Lucretia, was likewise among the fruits of this unlawful commerce. The tenderness of the pontiff for his spurious offspring was excessive beyond all expression; his only aim was to load them with riches and honours; and, in the execution of this purpose, he trampled with contempt upon every obstacle, which the demands of justice, the dictates of reason, and the remonstrances of religion, threw in his way.[a] Thus he persisted in his profligate career until the year 1503, when the poison, which he and his son Cæsar had mingled for others who stood in the way of their avarice and ambition, cut short, by a happy mistake, his own days.[b]

XIX. The monastic societies, as we learn from a multitude of authentic records, and from the testimonies of the best writers, were, at this time, so many herds of lazy, illiterate, profligate, and licentious Epicureans, whose views in life were confined to opulence, idleness, and pleasure. The rich monks, particularly those of the Benedictine and Augustine orders, perverted their revenues to the gratification of their lusts; and renouncing, in their conduct, all regard to their respective rules of discipline, drew upon themselves great popular odium by their sensuality and licentiousness.[c] This was matter of affliction to many wise and good men, especially in France and Germany, who formed the pious design of stemming the torrent of monkish luxury, and excited a spirit of reformation among that degenerate order.[d] Among the German reformers, who undertook the restoration of virtue and temperance in the monasteries, Nicolas de Mazen, an Austrian abbot, and Nicolas Dunkelspuhl, professor at Vienna, held the first rank. They attempted, with unparalleled zeal and assiduity, the reformation of the Benedictines throughout Germany, and succeeded so far as to restore, at least, a certain air of decency and virtue in the conventual establishments of Suabia, Franconia, and Bavaria.[e] The reformation of the same order was attempted in France by many, and particularly by Guy Juvenal, a learned man, whose writings, upon that and on other subjects, were received with applause.[f] It is, however, certain, that the majority of the monks, both in France and elsewhere, resisted, with obstinacy, the salutary attempts of these spiritual physicians, and returned their zeal with the worst treatment that it was possible to show them.

XX. While the opulent monks exhibited to the world scandalous examples of luxury, ignorance, indolence, and licentiousness, accompanied with a barbarous aversion to every thing that carried the remotest aspect of science, the Mendicants, and more especially the Dominicans and Franciscans, were chargeable with irregularities of another kind. Beside their arrogance, which was excessive, a quarrelsome and litigious spirit, an ambitious desire of encroaching upon the rights and privileges of others, an insatiable zeal for the propagation of superstition, and the itch of disputing and of starting absurd and intricate questions of a religious kind, prevailed among them, and drew upon them justly the displeasure and indignation of many. It was this wrangling spirit that seriously protracted the controversies which had subsisted so long between them and the bishops, and, indeed, the whole sacerdotal order; and it was their vain curiosity, and their inordinate passion for novelty, that made the divines, in the greatest part of the European colleges, complain of the dangerous and destructive errors which they had introduced into religion. These complaints were repeated, without interruption, in all the provinces where the Mendicants had any credit; and the same complaints were often presented to the court of Rome, where they exercised sufficiently both the patience and subtlety of the pope and his ministers. The different pontiffs who ruled the church during this century, were differently affected toward the Mendicants; some patronised them, others opposed them: and this circumstance frequently changed the aspect of affairs, and, for a long time, rendered the decision of the contest dubious.[g] The persecution that was carried on against the Beguins

France. An ample and satisfactory account of this convention may be seen in bishop Burnet's excellent History of the Reformation, vol. iii. and in a book entitled, Histoire du Droit public Ecclesiastique François, published in 1737.

[a] The life of this execrable tyrant was written in English by Mr. Alexander Gordon; but the same subject has been treated with greater moderation by the ingenious and learned author of the Histoire du Droit Publ. Eccles. François, to which work are subjoined the lives of Alexander VI. and Leo X.

[b] Such is the account which the best historians have given of the death of Alexander VI. Notwithstanding these authorities, Voltaire has pretended to prove that this pontiff died a natural death.

[c] See Martin Senging, Tuitiones Ordinis S. Benedicti, seu Oratio in Concilio Basiliensi, an. 1433, contra vitia Benedict. recitata, in Bern. Pezii Bib. Ascetica, t. viii. [d] See Leibnitii Præf. ad t. ii. Script. Brans.

[e] For an account of these reformers, see Martin Kropf. Bibliotheca Mellicensis, seu de Vitis et Scrip. Benedict. Mellicens. p. 63, 162, 207.

[f] See Liron's Singularités Historiques et Literaires, tom. iii. p. 49.

[g] See Launoy, Lib. de Canone Utriusque Sexus, op. tom. i. part , . Boulay, tom. v.—Ant. Wood, tom. i.

became also an occasion of increasing the odium that had been cast upon the begging monks, and was extremely prejudicial to their interests. For the Beguins and Lollards, to escape the fury of their inveterate enemies, the bishops and others, frequently took refuge in the third order of the Franciscans, Dominicans, and Augustinians, hoping that, in the patronage and protection of these numerous and powerful societies, they might find a secure retreat from the calamities that oppressed them. Nor were their hopes entirely disappointed; but the storm that hitherto pursued them, fell upon their new patrons and protectors, the Mendicants; who, by affording a refuge to a sect so odious to the clergy, drew upon themselves the indignation of that sacred order, and were thereby involved in various difficulties and perplexities.[a]

XXI. The more austere and rebellious Franciscans, who, separating themselves from the church, renounced their allegiance to the Roman pontiffs, and were distinguished by the appellation of Fratricelli or Minorites, continued, with their Tertiaries, the Beghards, to carry on an open war against the court of Rome. Their headquarters were in Italy, in the marquisate of Ancona and the neighbouring countries; for it was there that their leader and chief ruler resided. They were persecuted, about the middle of this century, with the greatest severity, by pope Nicolas V., who employed every method he could devise to vanquish their obstinacy, sending for that purpose successively against them the Franciscan monks, armed hosts, and civil magistrates, and committing to the flames many of those who remained unmoved by all these means of conversion.[b] This heavy persecution was carried on by the succeeding pontiffs, and by none with greater bitterness and vehemence than by Paul II., though it is said, that this pope chose rather to conquer the headstrong and stubborn perseverance of this sect by imprisonment and exile, than by fire and sword.[c] The Fratricelli, on the other hand, animated by the protection of several persons of great influence, who became their patrons on account of the striking appearance of sanctity which they exhibited, had recourse to violence, and went so far as to put to death some of the inquisitors, among whom Angelo of Camaldoli fell a victim to their vengeance.[d] Nor were the commotions raised by this troublesome sect confined to Italy; other countries felt the effects of their petulant zeal; and Bohemia and Silesia (where they preached with warmth their favourite doctrine, "that the true imitation of Christ consisted in beggary and extreme poverty") became the theatres of the spiritual war.[e] The king of Bohemia was well affected to these fanatics, granted them his protection, and was on that account excommunicated by Paul II.[f] In France, their affairs were far from being prosperous; such of them as fell into the hands of the inquisitors, were committed to the flames,[g] and they were eagerly searched after in the province of Toulouse and the adjacent countries, where great numbers of them lay concealed, and endeavoured to escape the vigilance of their enemies; while several of their scattered parties removed to England and Ireland.[h] Even the dreadful series of calamities and persecutions that harassed this miserable sect did not entirely extinguish it; for it subsisted to the time of the reformation in Germany, when its remaining votaries adopted the cause, and embraced the doctrines and discipline of Luther.

XXII. Of the religious fraternities that were founded in this century, not one deserves a more honourable mention than the Brethren and Clerks of the common life, (as they called themselves,) who lived under the rule of St. Augustine, and were eminently useful in promoting the cause of religion, learning, and virtue. This society had been formed in the preceding age by Gerard Groote, a native of Deventer,[i] remarkable for his fervent piety and extensive erudition; it was not, however, before the present century, that it received a proper degree of consistence, and, having obtained the approbation of the council of Constance, flourished in Holland, the Lower Germany, and the adjacent provinces. It was divided into two classes, the Lettered Brethren or Clerks, and the Illiterate, who, though they occupied separate habitations, lived in the firmest bonds of fraternal union. The Clerks applied themselves with exemplary zeal and assiduity to the study of polite literature, and to the education of youth. They composed learned works for the instruction of their contemporaries, and erected schools and seminaries of learning wherever they went. The Illiterate Brethren, on the other hand, were employed in manual labour, and exercised with success the mechanic arts. No religious vows restrained the members of either class; yet they had all things in common, and this community was the great bond of their union. The Sisters of this virtuous society lived much in the same manner, and employed the hours, that were not consecrated to prayer and reading, in the education of young females, and in branches of industry suitable to their sex. The schools, that were erected by the clerks of this fraternity, acquired a great and illustrious reputation in this century. From them issued those immortal restorers of learning and taste which gave a new face to the republic of letters in Germany and Holland, such as Erasmus of Rotterdam, Alexander Hegius, John Murmelius, and several others.[k] But the institution of the order of Jesuits seemed to diminish the credit of these excellent schools, which, from that period, began to decline. It ought to be added, that the Brethren of the common life, however encouraged by the public, were

[a] See the history of the preceding century.

[b] Mauritius Sartius, de Antiquâ Picentum civitate Cupromontanâ, in Angeli Calogeræ Raccolta di Opusculi Scientifici, tom. xxxix. where we have several extracts from the manuscript dialogue of Jacobus de Marchia against the Fratricelli.

[c] Ang. Mar. Quirini Vita Pauli II. p. 78.—Jo. Targionius, Præf. ad claror. Venetor. Epistolas ad Magliabechium, tom. i. p. 43, where we have an account of the books that were written against the Fratricelli by Nicholas Palmerius and others under the pontificate of Paul II. and which are yet in manuscript.

[d] See the Acta Sanctor. tom. ii. Maii, p. 356.

[e] Jo. Georgii Schelhornii Acta Historica Eccles. part i.

[f] Quirini Vita Pauli II. p. 73.

[g] I have in manuscript the acts or decrees of the inquisition against John Gudulchi de Castellione and Francis d'Archata, both of them Fratricelli, who were burned in France, in 1454.

[h] Wood's Antiq. Oxoniens. tom. i. p. 232.

[i] The life of this famous Dutchman, Gerard Groote, was written by Thomas a Kempis, and is to be found in his works. It stands at the head of the lives of eleven of his contemporaries, composed by this eminent writer.

[k] Accounts of this order have been given by Aub. Miræus, in his Chronicon, ad an. 1384, and by Helyot, in his Histoire des Ordres, tom. iii. But, in that which I have here given, there are some circumstances taken from ancient records not yet published. I have in my possession several manuscripts, which furnish materials for a much more clear and circumstantial account of the institution and progress of this order, than can be derived from the books that have hitherto appeared on that subject.

exposed to the insults and opposition of the clergy and monks, who had a strong aversion to every thing that bore the remotest aspect of learning or taste.[a]

XXIII. Of the Greeks, who acquired fame by their learned productions, the most eminent were,

Simeon of Thessalonica, the author of several treatises, and, among others, of a book against the heresies that had troubled the church; to which we may add his writings against the Latins, which are yet extant;[b]

Josephus Bryennius, who wrote a book concerning the Trinity, and another against the Latins;

Macarius Macres, whose animosity against the Latins was carried to the greatest height;

George Phranza, whose historical talent makes a figure in the compilation of the Byzantine historians;

Marcus Ephesius, who was an obstinate enemy to the council of Florence;[c]

Cardinal Bessarion, the illustrious protector and supporter of the Platonic school, a man of unparalleled genius and erudition; but much hated by the Greeks, because he seemed to lean to the party of the Latins, and proposed an union of the two nations to the prejudice of the former;[d]

George Scholarius, otherwise called Gennadius, who wrote against the Latins, especially against the council of Florence, with greater learning, candour, and perspicuity, than the rest of his countrymen displayed;[e]

George Gemistius Pletho, a man of eminent learning, who excited many of the Italians to the study, not only of the Platonic philosophy in particular, but of Grecian literature in general;

George of Trapesond, who translated several of the most eminent Grecian authors into Latin, and supported the cause of the Latins against the Greeks by his dexterous and eloquent pen;

George Codinus, of whom we have yet remaining several productions relating to the Byzantine history.

XXIV. The tribe of Latin writers that adorned or dishonoured this century, cannot easily be numbered. We shall therefore confine ourselves to the enumeration of those who wrote upon theological points; and even of these we shall only mention the most eminent. At their head we may justly place John Gerson, chancellor of the university of Paris, the most illustrious ornament that this age could boast of, a man of the greatest influence and authority, whom the council of Constance looked upon as its oracle, the lovers of liberty as their patron, and whose memory is yet precious to such among the French, as are zealous for the maintenance of their privileges against papal despotism.[f] This excellent man published a considerable number of treatises that were admirably adapted to reform the corruptions of a superstitious worship, to excite a spirit of genuine piety, and to heal the wounds of a divided church; though, in some respects, he does not seem to have thoroughly understood the demands and injunctions of the Gospel. The most eminent among the other theological writers were,

Nicolas de Clemangis, a man of uncommon candour and integrity, who, in the most eloquent and affecting strains, lamented the calamities of the times and the unhappy state of the Christian church;[g]

Alphonsus Tostatus, bishop of Avila, who loaded the Scriptures with unwieldy and voluminous commentaries, and also composed other works, in which there is a great mixture of good and bad;

Ambrose of Camaldoli, who acquired a high degree of reputation by his profound knowledge of the Greek language, and his uncommon acquaintance with Grecian literature, as also by the zeal and industry he discovered in his attempts to effectuate a reconciliation between the Greeks and Latins;

Nicolas de Cusa, a man of vast erudition, and no mean genius, though not famed for the solidity of his judgment, as may appear from a work of his, entitled, "Conjectures concerning the last Day;"[h]

John Nieder, whose writings are very proper to give us an accurate notion of the manners and spirit of the age in which he lived, and whose journeys and transactions have rendered him famous;

John Capistran, who was in high esteem at the court of Rome on account of the ardour and vehemence with which he defended the jurisdiction and majesty of the pontiffs against all their enemies and opposers;[i]

John Wesselus and Jerome Savanarola, who may justly be placed among the wisest and worthiest men of this age. The former, who was a native of Groningen, and on account of his extraordinary penetration and sagacity was called the Light of the World, propagated several of those doctrines, which Luther afterwards inculcated with greater evidence and energy, and animadverted with freedom and candour upon the corruptions of the Romish church.[k] The latter was a Dominican and a native of Ferrara, remarkable for piety, eloquence, and learning; who touched the sores of the church with a heavier hand, and inveighed against the pontiffs with greater severity. For this freedom he severely suffered. He was committed to the flames at Florence in 1498, and bore his fate with the most triumphant fortitude and serenity of mind;[l]

Alphonsus Spina, who wrote a book against the Jews and Saracens, which he called Fortalitium Fidei.

---

[a] We read frequently, in the records of this century, of schools erected by the Lollards, and sometimes by the Beghards, at Deventer, Brunswick, Koningsberg, and Munster, and many other places. Now these Lollards were the clerks of the common life, who, on account of their virtue, industry, and learning, which rendered them very useful in the education of youth, were invited by the magistrates of several cities to reside among them.

[b] Jo. Alb. Fabricius, Bibl. Græc. vol. xiv. p. 49.—Rich. Simon, Critique de la Bibliotheque Eccles. par M. Du-Pin, tom. i. p. 400.

[c] Rich. Simon, tom. i. p. 431.

[d] For an account of Bessarion and the other learned men here mentioned, see Bornerus and Hody, in their histories of the restoration of letters in Italy, by the Greeks who took refuge there, after the taking of Constantinople; add to these the Bibliotheca Græca of Fabricius.

[e] Rich. Simon, Croyance de l'Eglise Orientale sur la Transubstantiation, p. 87.

[f] See Du-Pin's Gersoniana, prefixed to the edition of the works of Gerson, which we owe to that laborious author, and which appeared at Antwerp in five volumes folio, in 1706. See also Jo. Launoii Historia Gymnasii Regii Navarreni, part iii. lib. ii. cap. i. p. 514, tom. iv. p. i. op.—Herm. von der Hardt, Acta Concil. Constant. tom. i. part iv.

[g] See Launoii Hist. part iii. lib. ii. cap. iii.—Longueval, Hist. de l'Eglise Gallicane, tom. xiv. p. 436.—The works of Clemangis were published by Lydius at Leyden, with a glossary, in 1631.

[h] Bayle, Reponse aux Questions d'un Provincial, tom. ii. cap. cxvii.

[i] L'Enfant's Histoire de la Guerre des Hussites, tom. ii. Wadding, Annales Minorum, tom. ix.

[k] Jo. Henr. Maii Vita Reuchlini, p. 156.

[l] Jo. Franc. Buddei Parerga Historico-Theologica. The life of Savanarola was written by J. Francis Picus, and published at Paris, with various annotations, letters, and original pieces, by Quetif, in 1674. The same editor published also the Spiritual and Ascetic Epistles of Savanarola, translated from the Italian into Latin. See Echard, Scriptor. Prædicator. tom. i. p. 884.

To all these we must join the whole tribe of the scholastic writers, whose chief ornaments were, John Capreolus, John de Turrecremata, Antoninus of Florence, Dionysius à Ryckel, Henry Gorcomius, Gabriel Biel, Stephen Brulifer, and others. The most remarkable among the Mystics were, Vincent Ferrerius, Henry Harphius, Laurence Justinianus, Bernardine of Sienna, and Thomas à Kempis, who shone among these with a superior lustre, and to whom the famous book, concerning the imitation of Christ, is commonly attributed.[a]

CHAPTER III.

Concerning the State of Religion, and the Doctrine of the Church, during this Century.

I. THE state of religion had become so corrupt among the Latins, that it was utterly destitute of any thing that could attract the esteem of the truly virtuous and judicious part of mankind. This is a fact, which even those individuals whose prejudices render them unwilling to acknowledge it, will never presume to deny. Among the Greeks and Orientals, religion had scarcely a better aspect than among the Latins; at least, if the difference was in their favour, it was far from being considerable. The worship of the Deity consisted in a round of frivolous and insipid ceremonies. The discourses of those who instructed the people in public, were not only destitute of sense, judgment, and spirit, but even of piety and devotion, and were in reality nothing more than a motley mixture of the grossest fictions and the most extravagant inventions. The reputation of Christian knowledge and piety was easily acquired; it was lavished upon those who professed a profound veneration for the sacred order, and their spiritual head the Roman pontiff, who studied to render the saints (*i. e.* the clergy, their ministers) propitious by frequent and rich donations, who were exact and regular in the observance of the stated ceremonies of the church, and who had wealth enough to pay the fines which the papal quæstors had annexed to the commission of all the different degrees of transgression; or, in other words, to purchase indulgences. Such were the ingredients of ordinary piety; but persons who added to these a certain degree of austerity and bodily mortification were placed in the highest order of worthies, and considered as the peculiar favourites of Heaven. On the other hand, the number of those who were studious to acquire a just notion of religion, to investigate the true sense of the sacred writings, and to model their lives and manners after the precepts and example of the divine Saviour, was extremely small; and such had much difficulty in escaping the flames, at a time when virtue and sense were deemed heretical.

II. This miserable state of affairs, this enormous perversion of religion and morality, throughout almost all the western provinces, were observed and deplored by many wise and good men, who all endeavoured, though in different ways, to stem the torrent of superstition, and to reform a corrupt church. In England and Scotland, the disciples of Wickliffe, whom the multitude had stigmatized with the odious title of Lollards, continued to inveigh against the despotic laws of the pontiffs, and the licentious manners of the clergy.[b] The Waldenses, though persecuted and oppressed on all sides, raised their voices even in the remote valleys and lurking-places whither they were driven by the violence of their enemies, and called aloud for succour to the expiring cause of religion and virtue. Even in Italy, many, and among others the famous Savanarola, had the courage to declare, that Rome was become the image of Babylon; and this notion was soon adopted by multitudes of all ranks and conditions. But the greatest part of the clergy and monks, persuaded that their honours, influence, and riches, would diminish in proportion to the increase of knowledge among the people, and would receive inexpressible detriment from the downfall of superstition, vigorously opposed every thing that had the remotest aspect of a reformation, and imposed silence upon these importunate censors by the formidable authority of fire and sword.

III. The religious dissensions that had been excited in Bohemia by the ministry of John Huss and his disciple Jacobellus de Misa, were doubly inflamed by the deplorable fate of Huss and Jerome of Prague, and broke out into an open war, which was carried on with unparalleled barbarity. The followers of Huss, who pleaded for the administration of the cup to the laity in the holy sacrament, being persecuted and oppressed in various ways by the emissaries and ministers of the court of Rome, retired to a steep and high mountain in the district of Bechin, in which they held their religious meetings, and administered the sacrament of the Lord's supper under both kinds. This mountain they called Tabor, from the tents which they at first erected there for their habitation; and in process of time they raised a considerable fortification for its defence, and adorned it with a well-built and regular city. Forming more grand and important projects, they chose for their chiefs Nicolas of Hussinetz, and the famous John Ziska, a Bohemian knight, a man of the most undaunted courage and resolution; and proposed, under the standards of these violent leaders, to revenge the death of Huss and Jerome upon the creatures of the Roman pontiff, and obtain a liberty of worshipping God in a more rational manner than that which was prescribed by the church of Rome. After the death of Nicolas, which happened in 1420, Ziska commanded alone this warlike body, and had the satisfaction to see his army daily increase. During the first tumults of this war, which were no more than a prelude to calamities of a much more dreadful kind, Wenceslaus, king of Bohemia, resigned his breath in the year 1419.[c]

IV. The emperor Sigismund, who succeeded him on the throne of Bohemia, employed not only edicts and remonstrances, but also the terror of penal laws and the force of arms, to put an end to these lamentable divisions; and great numbers of the Hussites perished, by his orders,

[a] The late abbé Lenglet du Fresnoy promised the world a demonstration that this work, whose true author has been so much disputed among the learned, was originally written in French by a person named Gersen, or Gerson, and only translated into Latin by Thomas à Kempis. See Granetus in Launoianis, part ii. tom. iv. part ii. op. p. 414. The history of this celebrated production is given by Vincentius Thuillierius, in the Opera Posthuma Mabilloni et Ruinarti, tom. iii. p. 54.

[b] See Wilkins, Concilia Magnæ Britann. et Hibern. tom. iv.—Wood, Antiq. Oxon. tom. i.

[c] This prince had no sooner begun to execute the decrees of the council of Constance against the Hussites, than the inhabitants of Prague took fire at the proceeding, raised a tumult, murdered the magistrates who published the order, and committed other outrages, which filled the court of Wenceslaus with consternation, and so affected that pusillanimous

in the most barbarous manner. The Bohemians, irritated by these inhuman proceedings, threw off his despotic yoke in 1420, and, with Ziska at their head, made war against their sovereign. This famous leader, though deprived of his sight, discovered, in every step he took, such an admirable mixture of prudence and intrepidity, that his name became a terror to his enemies. Upon his death, which happened in 1424, the majority of the Hussites chose for their general Procopius Rasa, a man also of undaunted courage and resolution, who maintained their cause, and carried on the war with spirit and success. The acts of barbarity, committed on both sides, were shocking and terrible beyond expression; for, notwithstanding the irreconcilable opposition that existed between the religious sentiments of the contending parties, both agreed in this one horrible point, that it was innocent and lawful to persecute and extirpate with fire and sword the enemies of the true religion; and such they appeared to be in each other's eyes. The Bohemians maintained, that Huss had been unjustly put to death at Constance, and consequently revenged, with the utmost fury, the injury which he had suffered. They acknowledged it, nevertheless, as an incontestable principle, that heretics deserved capital punishment; but they denied obstinately that Huss was a heretic. This pernicious maxim, then, was the source of that cruelty which disgraced both parties in this dreadful war; and it is, perhaps, difficult to determine, which of the two carried this cruelty to the greatest height.

V. All those who undertook to avenge the death of the Bohemian martyr, set out upon the same principles; and, at the commencement of the war, they seemed to agree both in their religious sentiments, and in their demands upon the church and government from which they had withdrawn themselves. But, as their numbers increased, their union diminished; and their army being prodigiously augmented by a confluence of strangers from all quarters, a great dissension arose among them, which, in 1420, came to an open rupture, and divided this multitude into two great factions, which were distinguished by the titles of Calixtines and Taborites. The former, who were so called from their insisting upon the use of the chalice, or cup, in the celebration of the eucharist, were mild in their proceedings, and modest in their demands, and showed no disposition to overturn the ancient system of church-government, or to make any considerable changes in the religion which was publicly received. All that they required, may be comprehended under the four articles which follow. They demanded, first, that the word of God should be explained to the people in a plain and perspicuous manner, without the mixture of superstitious comments or inventions; secondly, that the sacrament of the Lord's supper should be administered in both kinds; thirdly, that the clergy, instead of employing all their attention and zeal in the acquisition of riches and power, should turn their thoughts to objects more suitable to their profession, and be ambitious of living and acting as became the successors of the holy apostles; and, fourthly, that transgressions of a more heinous kind, or mortal sins, should be punished in a manner suitable to their enormity. In this great faction, however, there were some subordinate sects, who were divided upon several points. The administration of the Lord's supper was one occasion of dispute; Jacobellus de Misa, who had first proposed the celebration of that ordinance under both kinds, was of opinion, that infants had a right to partake of it, and this opinion was adopted by many; while others maintained the contrary doctrine, and confined the privilege in question to persons of riper years.[a]

VI. The demands of the Taborites, who derived their name from a mountain well known in sacred history, were much more ample. They not only insisted upon reducing the religion of Jesus to its primitive simplicity, but required also, that the system of ecclesiastical government should be reformed in the same manner, the authority of the pope destroyed, the form of divine worship changed: they demanded, in a word, the erection of a new church, a new hierarchy, in which Christ alone should reign, and all things should be carried on by a divine impulse. In maintaining these extravagant demands, the principal doctors of this sect (such as Martin Loquis, a Moravian, and his followers) went so far as to flatter themselves with the chimerical notion, that Christ would descend upon earth, armed with fire and sword, to extirpate heresy, and purify the church from its multiplied corruptions. These fantastical dreams they propagated in different countries, and taught them even in a public manner with unparalleled confidence and presumption. It is this enthusiastic class of the Hussites alone, that we are to look upon as accountable for all those abominable acts of violence, rapine, desolation, and murder, which are too indiscriminately laid to the charge of the Hussites in general, and of their two leaders Ziska and Procopius in particular.[b] It must indeed be acknowledged, that a great number of the Hussites had imbibed the most barbarous sentiments with respect to the obligation of executing vengeance upon their enemies, against whom they breathed nothing but bloodshed and fury, without any mixture of humanity or compassion.

VII. In the year 1433, the council of Basil endeavoured to put an end to this dreadful war, and for that purpose invited the Bohemians to the assembly. The Bohemians, accepting this invitation, sent ambassadors, and among others Procopius their leader, to represent them in that council. But, after many warm debates, these messengers of peace returned without having effected any thing that

monarch, that he was seized with an apoplexy, of which he died in a few days.

[a] Byzinii Diarium Hussiticum, p. 130.

[b] From the following opinions and maxims of the Taborites, which may be seen in the Diarium Hussiticum of Byzinius, we may form a just idea of their detestable barbarity: "Omnes legis Christi adversarii debent puniri septem plagis novissimis, ad quarum executionem fideles sunt provocandi.—In isto tempore ultionis Christus in suâ humilitate et miseratione non est imitandus ad ipsos peccatores, sed in zelo et furore et justâ retributione.—In hoc tempore ultionis, quilibet fidelis, etiam presbyter, *quantumcunque spiritualis, est maledictus*, qui gladium suum corporalem prohibet à sanguine adversariorum legis Christi, sed debet manus suas lavare in eorum sanguine et sanctificare." From men, who adopted such horrid and detestable maxims, what could be expected but the most abominable acts of injustice and cruelty? For an account of this dreadful and calamitous war, the reader may consult (beside the ancient writers, such as Sylvius, Theobaldus, Cochlæus, and others) L'Enfant's Histoire de la Guerre des Hussites, published at Amsterdam in 1731. To this history it will, however, be advisable to add the Diarium Belli Hussitici of Byzinius, a book worthy of the highest esteem, on account of the candour and impartiality with which it is composed, and which Mr. L'Enfant does not seem to have consulted. This valuable production was published, though incomplete, in the sixth volume of the Reliquiæ Manuscriptorum of the very learned John Peter Ludwig. See also Beausobre's Supplement to the Histoire de la Guerre des Hussites, Lausanne, 1745.

might even prepare the way for a reconciliation so long and so ardently desired. The Calixtines were not averse to peace; but no methods of persuasion could engage the Taborites to yield. This matter, however, was transacted with more success by Æneas Sylvius and others, whom the council sent into Bohemia to renew the conferences; for these new legates, by allowing to the Calixtines the use of the cup in the holy sacrament, satisfied them in the point which they had chiefly at heart, and thus reconciled them with the Roman pontiff. But the Taborites adhered inflexibly to their first principles; and neither the artifice nor the eloquence of Sylvius, nor the threats, sufferings, and persecutions to which their cause exposed them, could vanquish their obstinate perseverance. From this period, indeed, they began to review their religious tenets, and their ecclesiastical discipline, with a view of rendering them more perfect. This review, as it was executed with great prudence and impartiality, produced a very good effect, and gave a rational aspect to the religion of these sectaries, who withdrew themselves from the war, abandoned the doctrines, which, upon serious examination, they found to be inconsistent with the spirit and genius of the Gospel, and banished from their communion all persons whose disordered brains, or licentious manners, might expose them to reproach.[a] The Taborites, thus new-modelled, were the same with those Bohemian Brethren (or Picards, i. e. *Beghards*, as their adversaries alled them) who joined Luther and his successors at the reformation, and of whom there are at this day many of the descendants and followers in Poland and other countries.

VIII. Among the greatest part of the interpreters of Scripture that lived in this century, we find nothing worthy of applause, if we except their zeal and their good intentions. Such of them as aimed at something higher than the character of mere compilers, and ventured to draw their explications from their own sense of things, did little more than amuse, or rather delude, their readers, with mystical and allegorical fancies. At the head of this class we may place Alphonsus Tostatus, bishop of Avila, whose voluminous commentaries upon the sacred writings exhibit nothing remarkable but their enormous bulk. Laurentius Valla is entitled to a more favourable judgment; and his small collection of Critical and Grammatical Annotations upon the New Testament is far from being destitute of merit, since it pointed out to succeeding authors the true method of removing the difficulties that sometimes present themselves to such as study with attention the divine oracles. It is proper to observe here, that these sacred books were, in almost all the kingdoms and states of Europe, translated into the language of each nation, particularly in Germany, Italy, France, and Britain. This circumstance naturally excited the expectations of a considerable change in the state of religion, and made the thinking few hope, that the doctrine of the church would be soon reformed by the light that could not but arise from consulting the genuine sources of divine truth.

IX. The schools of divinity made a miserable figure in this century. They were filled with teachers, who loaded their memory, and that of their disciples, with unintelligible distinctions and unmeaning sounds, that they might thus dispute and discourse, with an appearance of method, upon matters which they did not understand. There were now few remaining, of those who proved and illustrated the doctrines of religion by the positive declarations of the holy scriptures, and the sentiments of the ancient fathers, and who, with all their defects, were much superior to the vain and obscure pedants of whom we have been speaking. The senseless jargon of the latter did not escape the just and heavy censure of some learned and judicious persons, who considered their methods of teaching as highly detrimental to the interests of true religion, and to the advancement of genuine and solid piety. Accordingly, various plans were formed by different individuals, some of which had for their object the abolition of this method, others its reformation, while, in the mean time, the enemies of the schoolmen increased from day to day. The Mystics, of whom we shall have occasion to speak more largely hereafter, were ardently bent upon banishing entirely this scholastic theology out of the Christian church. Others, who seemed disposed to act with greater moderation, did not insist upon its total suppression, but were of opinion, that it was necessary to reform it, by abolishing all vain and useless subjects of debate, by restraining the rage of disputing that had infected the seminaries of theology, and by seasoning the subtlety of the schoolmen with a happy temperature of mystic sensibility and simplicity. This opinion was adopted by the famous Gerson, who laboured with the utmost zeal and assiduity in correcting and reforming the disorders and abuses which the scholastic divines had introduced into the seminaries,[b] as also by Savanarola, Petrus de Alliaco, and Nicolas Cusanus, whose treatise concerning Learned Ignorance is still extant.

X. The litigious herd of schoolmen found a new class of enemies equally keen, in the restorers of eloquence and letters, who were not all, however, of the same opinion with respect to the manner of treating these solemn quibblers. Some of them covered the scholastic doctrine with ridicule, loaded it with invectives, and demanded its suppression, as a most trifling and absurd system, that was highly detrimental to the culture and improvement of the mind, and could only prevent the growth of genius and true science. Others looked upon this system as supportable, and only proposed illustrating and polishing it by the powers of eloquence, thus to render it more intelligible and elegant. Of this class was Paulus Cortesius, who wrote, with this view, a commentary on the Book of Proverbs, in which, as we learn from himself, he forms a happy union between eloquence and theology, and clothes the principal intricacies of scholastic divinity with the graces of an agreeable and perspicuous style.[c] After all, the scholastic theology, supported by the extraordinary credit and authority of the Dominicans and Franciscans, maintained its ground against its various opposers; nor could these two religious orders, who excelled in that

[a] See Adriani Regenvolscii Historia Eccles. provinciar. Sclavonicar. lib. ii. cap. viii. p. 165.—Joach. Camerarii Historica Narratio de Fratrum Ecclesiis in Bohemia, Moravia, et Polonia.—Jo. Lasitii Historia Fratrum Bohemicorum, which I possess in manuscript, and of which the eighth book was published at Amsterdam, in 1649.

[b] Rich. Simon. Lettres Choisies, tom. ii. p. 269, and Critique de la Bibliotheque Ecclesiastique de M. Du-Pin, tom i. p. 491.—Thomasii Origines Histor. Philos. p. 56, and principally Gersonis Methodus Theologiam studendi, in Launoii Historia Gymnas. Navarreni, tom. iv. op. part i. p. 330.

[c] This work was published at Rome in 1512, and at Basil in 1513.

litigious kind of learning, bear the thought of losing the glory they had acquired by quibbling and disputing in the pompous jargon of the schools.

XI. This vain philosophy, however, grew daily more contemptible in the esteem of the judicious and the wise; while the Mystics gathered strength, and saw their friends and advocates multiply on all sides. Among these there were some men of distinguished merit, who are chargeable with few of the errors and extravagances that were mingled with the discipline and doctrine of that famous sect, such as Thomas à Kempis, (the author of the Germanic theology, so highly commended by Luther,) Laurentius Justinianus, Savanarola, and others. There are, on the other hand, some writers of this sect, such as Vincentius Ferrerius, Henricus Harphius, and Bernard of Sienna, in whose productions we must carefully separate certain notions which were the effects of a warm and irregular fancy, as also the visions of Dionysius, whom the Mystics consider as their chief, from the noble precepts of divine wisdom with which they are mingled. The Mystics were defended against their adversaries, the Dialecticians, partly by the Platonists, who were in general highly esteemed, and partly by some, even of the most eminent scholastic doctors. The former considered Dionysius as a person whose sentiments had been formed and nourished by the study of Platonism, and wrote commentaries upon his writings; of which we have an eminent example in Marcilius Ficinus, whose name adds a lustre to the Platonic school. The latter attempted a certain sort of association between the scholastic theology and that of the Mystics; and in this class were John Gerson, Nicolas Cusanus, Dionysius the Carthusian, and others.

XII. The controversy with the enemies of Christianity was carried on with much more vigour in this than in the preceding ages; and several learned and eminent men seemed now to exert themselves with peculiar industry and zeal in demonstrating the truth of that divine religion, and defending it against the various objections of its adversaries. This appears from the learned book of Marcilius Ficinus concerning the Truth of Christianity, Savanarola's Triumph of the Cross, the Natural Theology of Raymond de Sabunde, and other productions of a like nature. The Jews were refuted by Perezius and Jerome de St. Foi, the Saracens by Johannes de Turrecremata; and both these classes of unbelievers were opposed by Alphonso de Spina, in the Fortress of Faith. Nor were these pious labours in the defence of the Gospel at all unseasonable or superfluous: on the contrary, the state of things at this time rendered them necessary. For, on the one hand, the Aristotelian philosophers in Italy seemed, in their public instructions, to strike at the foundations of all religion; and, on the other hand, the senseless subtleties and quarrels of the schoolmen, who modelled religion according to their extravagant fancies, tended to bring it into contempt. Add to all this, that the Jews and Saracens lived in many places promiscuously with the Christians, who were therefore obliged, by the proximity of the enemy, to defend themselves with the utmost assiduity and zeal.

XIII. We have already taken notice of the fruitless attempts which were made to heal the unhappy divisions of the Greek and Latin churches. After the council of Florence, and the violation of the treaty of pacification by the Greeks, Nicolas V. exhorted and entreated them again to turn their thoughts towards the restoration of peace and concord. But his exhortations were without effect; and in about the space of three years after the writing of this last letter, Constantinople was besieged and taken by the Turks. And from that fatal period to the present time, the Roman pontiffs, in all their attempts to bring about a reconciliation, have always found the Grecian patriarchs more obstinate and intractable than they were when their empire was in a flourishing state. Nor is this circumstance so difficult to be accounted for, when all things are properly considered. This obstinacy was the effect of a rooted aversion to the Latins and their pontiffs, that acquired, from day to day, new degrees of strength and bitterness in the hearts of the Greeks; an aversion, produced and nourished by a persuasion, that the calamities which they suffered under the Turkish yoke might have been easily removed, if the western princes and the Roman pontiffs had not refused to succour them against their haughty tyrants. And accordingly, when the Greek writers deplore the calamities that fell upon their devoted country, their complaints are always mingled with heavy accusations against the Latins, whose cruel insensibility to their unhappy situation they paint in the strongest and most odious colours.

XIV. We pass over in silence many trifling controversies among the Latins, which have no claim to the attention of our readers. But we must not omit mentioning the revival of that famous dispute concerning the kind of worship that was to be paid to the blood of Christ, which was first kindled at Barcelona, in 1351, between the Franciscans and Dominicans, and had been left undecided by Clement VI.[a] This controversy was renewed at Brixen, in 1462, by James à Marchia, a celebrated Franciscan, who maintained publicly, in one of his sermons, that the blood which Christ shed upon the cross, did not belong to the divine nature, and of consequence was not to be considered as an object of divine and immediate worship. The Dominicans rejected this doctrine, and adopted with such zeal the opposite side of the question, that James of Brixen, who performed the office of inquisitor, called the Franciscan before his tribunal, and accused him of heresy. Pope Pius II., having made several ineffectual attempts to suppress this controversy, was at last persuaded to submit the affair to the examination and judgment of a select number of able divines. But many obstacles arose to prevent a final decision, among which we may reckon, as the principal, the influence and authority of the contending orders, each of which had embarked with zeal in the cause of their respective champions. Hence, after much altercation and chicane, the pontiff thought proper to impose silence on both the parties in this miserable dispute, in 1464; declaring, at the same time, that "both sides of the question might be lawfully maintained until Christ's vicar upon earth should find leisure and opportunity for examining the matter, and determining on which side the truth lay." This *leisure* and *opportunity* have not yet been offered to the pontiffs.[b]

[a] Luc. Wadding, Annal. Minor. tom. viii. p. 58.—Jac. Echardi Scriptor. Prædicator. tom. i. p. 650.

[b] Wadding, Anal. Minor. tom. xiii. p. 206.—Nat. Alexander, Hist. Eccles. Sæc. XV.

CHAPTER IV.

Concerning the Rites and Ceremonies that were used in the Church during this Century.

I. THE state of religious ceremonies among the Greeks may be learned from the book of Simeon of Thessalonica, concerning Rites and Heresies,[a] from which it appears, that the substance of religion was lost among that people; that a splendid shadow of pomp and vanity was substituted in its place by the rulers of the church; and that all the branches of divine worship were ordered in such a manner as to strike the imaginations, and captivate the senses of the multitude. They pretended, indeed, to allege several reasons for multiplying, as they did, the external rites and institutions of religion, and throwing over the whole of divine worship such a pompous garb of worldly splendour. But in these reasons, and in all their explications of this gaudy ritual, subtlety and invention are more apparent than truth or good sense. The origin of these multiplied rites, that cast a cloud over the native beauty and lustre of religion, is often obscure, and frequently dishonourable; and such as, by force of ill-applied genius and invention, have endeavoured to derive honour to these ceremonies from the circumstances that gave occasion to them, have failed egregiously in this desperate attempt. The deceit is too palpable to seduce any mind that is void of prejudice, and capable of attention.

II. Though the more rational and judicious of the Roman pontiffs complained of the multiplicity of ceremonies, festivals, temples, and the like, and did not seem unwilling to have this enormous mass diminished, they nevertheless distinguished, every one his own pontificate, by some new institution, and thought it their duty to perpetuate their fame by some new edict of this nature. Thus Calixtus III., to immortalize the remembrance of the deliverance of Belgrade from the powerful arms of Mohammed II., who had been obliged to raise the siege of that city, ordered, in 1456, the festival in honour of the transfiguration of Christ (which had been celebrated in some places by private authority before this period) to be religiously observed throughout the western world. And Sixtus IV., in 1476, granted indulgences, by a particular edict, to all those who should devoutly celebrate an annual festival in honour of the immaculate conception of the blessed Virgin, with respect to which none of the Roman pontiffs before him had thought proper to make any express declaration, or any positive appointment.[b] The other additions that were made to the Roman ritual, relating to the worship of the Virgin Mary, public and private prayers, the traffic of indulgences, and other things of that nature, are of too little importance to deserve an exact and circumstantial enumeration. We need not such a particular detail to convince us, that in this century religion was reduced to mere show, to a show composed of pompous absurdities and splendid trifles.

CHAPTER V.

Concerning the Heresies, Sects, and Divisions, that troubled the Church during this Century.

I. NEITHER the severe edicts of pontiffs and emperors, nor the barbarity and vigilance of unrelenting inquisitors, could extirpate the remains of the ancient heresies, or prevent the rise of new sects. We have already seen the Franciscan order at open war with the church of Rome. In Bosnia, and the adjacent countries, the Manichæans or Paulicians, who were the same with the sect named Catharists in Italy, propagated their doctrines with confidence, and held their religious assemblies with impunity. It is true, indeed, that the great protector of the Manichæans, Stephen Thomascus, king of Bosnia, abjured their errors, received baptism by the ministry of John Carvaial, a Roman cardinal, and, in consequence thereof, expelled those heretics from his dominions. But it is also certain, that he afterwards changed his mind; and it is well known, that, toward the conclusion of this century, the Manichæans inhabited Bosnia, Servia, and the neighbouring provinces. The Waldenses also still subsisted in several European provinces, more especially in Pomerania, Brandenburg, the district of Magdeburgh, and Thuringia, where they had a considerable number of friends and followers. It appears, however, from authentic records not yet published, that a great part of the adherents of this unfortunate sect, in the countries now mentioned, were discovered by the inquisitors, and delivered over by them to the civil magistrates, who committed them to the flames.

II. The Brethren and Sisters of the free spirit (who were called in Germany *Beghards* or *Schwestriones*, and in France *Turlupins*, and whose distinctive character was a species of mysticism that bordered upon phrensy) wandered about in a secret and disguised manner in various parts of France, Germany, and Flanders, and particularly in Suabia and Switzerland, where they spread the contagion of their enthusiasm, and caught the unwary in their snares. The search, however, that was made after them, was so strict and well conducted, that few of the teachers and chiefs of this fanatical sect escaped the hands of the inquisitors.[c] When the war between the Hussites and the votaries of Rome broke out in Bohemia, in 1418, a troop of these fanatics, headed by a person whose name was John, repaired thither and held secret assemblies, first at Prague, and afterwards in different places, whence they at length retired to a certain island, where they were less exposed to the notice of their enemies. It was, as we have already had occasion to observe, one of the leading principles of this sect, that the tender instincts of nature, with that bashfulness and modesty which generally accompany them, were evident marks of inherent corruption, and showed, that the mind was not sufficiently purified or rendered conformable to the divine nature, whence it derived its origin. And they alone were deemed perfect by these fanatics, and supposed to be united to the Supreme Being, who could behold without any emotion, the naked bodies of the sex to which they did not belong, and who, in imitation of what was practised before the fall by our first parents, went entirely naked, and conversed familiarly in this manner with males and females, without feeling any of the tender propensities of nature. Hence it was that the *Beghards* (whom the Bohemians, by a change in the pronunciation of that word, called *Picards*,) when they came into their religious assemblies, and were present at the celebration of divine worship, appeared without any veil or covering whatever. They had also constantly in their mouths a maxim,

[a] J. A. Fabricius has given an account of the contents of this book in his Biblioth. Græca, vol. xiv.

[b] See Volaterrani Comment. Urbani, lib. viii. p. 289.—Æneas Sylvius de Statu Europæ sub Frederico III. cap. x. in Freheri Scriptor. Rerum Germanicar. tom. ii. p. 104.

[c] Felix Malleolus (whose German name is *Hammerlein*) in his

which, indeed, was very suitable to the genius of the religion they professed; namely, 'that they were not free (*i. e.* sufficiently extricated from the shackles of the body) who made use of garments, particularly such garments as covered the thighs and the parts adjacent.' These tenets could not but cast a deserved reproach upon this absurd sect; and though in their religious assemblies nothing passed that was contrary to the rules of virtue, yet they were universally suspected of the most scandalous incontinence, and of the most lascivious practices. Ziska, the austere general of the Hussites, gave credit to these suspicions, and to the rumours they occasioned; and, falling upon this miserable sect in 1421, he put some to the sword, and condemned the rest to the flames, which dreadful punishment they sustained with the most cheerful fortitude, and also with a contempt of death that was peculiar to their sect, and which they possessed in a degree that seems to surpass credibility.[a] Among the various titles by which these extravagant enthusiasts were distinguished, that of *Adamite* was one; and it was given them on account of their being so studious to imitate the state of innocence in which the first man was created. The ignominious term of Beghards, or Picards, at first peculiar to the small sect of which we now treat, was afterwards applied to the *Hussites*, and to all the Bohemians who opposed the tyranny of the Romish church. All these were called by their enemies, and indeed by the multitude in general, *Picard friars*.

III. A new sect, which made a great noise, and infected the multitude with the contagion of its enthusiasm, arose about the beginning of this century. A priest whose name is not known, descended from the Alps,[b] arrayed in a white garment, and accompanied with a prodigious number of persons of both sexes, who after the example of their chief, were also clothed in white linen, whence they were distinguished by the name of *Fratres Albati*, i. e. *White Brethren*. This enthusiastic multitude went in a kind of procession through several provinces, following a cross, which their leader held erected like a standard, and, by the striking appearance of their sanctity and devotion, captivated to such a degree the minds of the people wherever they went, that persons of all ranks and orders flocked in crowds to augment their number. The new chief exhorted his followers to appease the anger of an incensed Deity, emaciated his body by voluntary acts of mortification and penance, endeavoured to persuade the Christian nations to renew the war against the infidels in Palestine, and pretended, that he was favoured with divine visions, which instructed him in the will and in the secrets of Heaven. Boniface IX. apprehending that this enthusiast or impostor concealed insidious and ambitious views,[c] ordered him to be seized and committed to the flames; upon which his followers were dispersed, and his sect entirely extinguished. Whether a punishment so severe was inflicted with reason and justice, is a point that has been debated, and yet remains uncertain; for several writers of great credit and authority maintain the innocence of the sectary, while others assert that he was convicted of the most enormous crimes.[d]

IV. In the year 1411, a sect was discovered in the Netherlands, and more especially at Brussels, which owed its origin to an illiterate man, whose name was Ægidius Cantor, and to William of Hildenissen, a Carmelite monk; and whose members were distinguished by the title of *Men of Understanding*. There were many things reprehensible in the doctrine of this sect, which seemed to be chiefly derived from the theology of the Mystics. For they pretended to be honoured with celestial visions; denied that any could arrive at a perfect knowledge of the Holy Scriptures, without the extraordinary succours of a divine illumination; declared the approach of a new revelation from heaven, more complete and perfect than the Gospel of Christ; maintained, that the resurrection was already accomplished in the person of Jesus, and that no other resurrection was to be expected; affirmed, that the inward man was not defiled by the outward actions, whatever they were; that the pains of hell were to have an end, and that not only all mankind, but even the devils themselves, were to return to God, and be made partakers of eternal felicity. This sect seems to have been a branch of that of the Brethren and Sisters of the free spirit; since they declared, that a new dispensation of grace and of spiritual liberty was to be promulgated to mortals by the Holy Ghost. It must however be acknowledged, on the other hand, that their absurdities were mingled with several opinions, which showed, that they were not totally void of understanding; for they maintained, among other things, "1st, That

account of the Lollards, subjoined to his book *contra validos Mendicantes*, i. e. *against the sturdy Beggars*, has given us a list, though a very imperfect one, of the Beghards who were committed to the flames in Switzerland and the adjacent countries, during this century. This author, in his books against the Beghards and Lollards, has (either through design, or by a mistake founded on the ambiguity of the terms) confounded three different classes of persons, who were usually known by the appellations of Beghards and Lollards; as, 1st, the Tertiaries, or third order of the more austere Franciscans; 2dly, the Brethren of the free spirit; and, 3dly, the Cellite or Alexian friars. Many writers have fallen into the same error.

[a] See the *Historia Fratrum Bohemorum*. MS. lib. ii. sect. lxxvi. by Lasitius, who proves, in a satisfactory and circumstantial manner, that the Hussites and the Bohemian Brethren were entirely distinct from these Picards, and had nothing in common with them. The other authors who have written upon this subject are honourably mentioned by Isaac le Beausobre in his Dissertation sur les Adamites de Boheme, subjoined to L'Enfant's *Histoire de la Guerre des Hussites*. This learned author has taken great pains to justify the Picards, or Bohemian Adamites, whom he supposes to have been the same with the Waldenses, and a set of men eminent for their piety, whom their enemies loaded with the most groundless accusations. But this is manifestly endeavouring to wash the Æthiopian white; for it may be demonstrated, by the most unexceptionable and authentic records, that the account I have given of the matter is true. The researches I have made, and the knowledge they have procured me of the civil and religious history of these times, entitle me perhaps to more credit in such a point as this, than the laborious author from whom I differ, who was not profoundly acquainted with the history of the middle ages, and was by no means exempt from prejudice and partiality.

[b] Theodoric de Niem tells us, that the sect came from Scotland, and that its leader gave himself out for the prophet Elias. Sigonius and Platina inform us, that this enthusiast came from France; that he had white apparel, carried in his aspect the greatest modesty, and seduced prodigious numbers of people of both sexes, and of all ages; that his followers, (called *penitents*,) among whom were several cardinals and priests, were clothed in white linen down to their heels, with caps, which covered their whole faces, except their eyes; that they went in troops of ten, twenty, and forty thousand persons, from one city to another, calling out for mercy, and singing hymns; that wherever they came they were received with great hospitality, and made innumerable proselytes; that they fasted, or lived upon bread and water, during the time of their pilgrimage, which continued generally nine or ten days. See Annal. Mediol. ap. Muratori.—Niem, lib. ii. cap. xvi.

[c] What Dr. Mosheim hints but obscurely here, is explained by Sigonius and Platina, who tell us, that the pilgrims, mentioned in the preceding note, stopped at Viterbo, and that Boniface, fearing that the priest who headed them might endeavour by their assistance to seize the pontificate, sent a body of troops thither, who apprehended the false prophet, and carried him to Rome, where he was burned.

[d] See L'Enfant, Hist. du Concile de Pise, tom. i. p. 102.—Poggi, His. Florentina, lib. iii. p. 122.—Marc. Anton. Sabellicus in Enneadibus Rhapsodiæ His. Ennead. ix. lib. ix. t. ii. op. p. 839, pub. at Basil in 1560.

Christ alone had merited eternal life and felicity for the human race, and that therefore men could not acquire this inestimable privilege by their own actions alone; 2dly, That the priests, to whom the people confessed their transgressions, had not the power of absolving them, but that it was Christ alone in whom this authority was vested; and 3dly, That voluntary penance and mortification were not necessary to salvation." These propositions, however, and some others, were declared heretical by Peter d'Ailly, bishop of Cambray, who obliged William of Hildenissen to abjure them,[a] and opposed with the greatest vehemence and success the progress of this sect.

V. The sect of the Flagellantes, or Whippers, continued to excite commotions in Germany, more especially in Thuringia and the Lower Saxony; but these fanatics were very different from the ancient heretics of the same name, who ran wildly in troops through various provinces. The new Whippers rejected not only the sacraments, but also every branch of external worship, and placed their only hopes of salvation in faith and flagellation; to which they added some strange doctrines concerning the evil spirit, and other matters, which are not explained in history with sufficient perspicuity. The person that appeared at the head of this sect in Thuringia was Conrad Schmidt; and he was committed to the flames, with many of his followers,[b] in 1414, by Schonefeld, who was, at that time, inquisitor in Germany, and rendered his name famous by his industry and zeal in the extirpation of heresy. Nicolas Schaden suffered at Quedlinburgh for his attachment to this sect; and, though Berthold Schade, who was seized at Halberstadt in 1481, escaped death, as appears most probable, by abjuring their doctrine,[c] we find in the records of these unhappy times a numerous list of the Flagellantes, whom the German inquisitors devoted to the flames.

[a] See the records of this transaction in Steph. Baluz. Miscellan. tom. ii. p. 277.

[b] Excerpta Monachi Pernensis, in Jo. Burch. Menkenii Scriptor. Rerum Germanicar. tom. ii. p. 1521.—Chron. Monaster. in Anton. Matthæi Analect. vet. Ævi, tom. v. p. 71.—Chron. Magdeb. in Meibomii Scriptor. Rerum German. tom. ii. p. 362.—From sixteen articles of faith adopted by this sect, which were committed to writing by a certain inquisitor of Brandenburg in the year 1411, and which Conrad Schmidt is said to have taken from the papers of Walkenried, we may derive a tolerable idea of their doctrine, of which the substance is as follows:—"That the opinions adopted by the Roman church, with respect to the efficacy of the sacraments, the flames of purgatory, praying for the dead, and several other points, are entirely false and groundless; and that the person who believes what is contained in the Apostles' Creed, repeats frequently the Lord's prayer and the Ave Maria, and at certain times lashes his body severely, as a voluntary punishment for the transgressions he has committed, shall obtain eternal salvation."

[c] See the account of this matter, which is given by the learned Jo. Ernest Kappius, in his Relat. de rebus Theologicis Antiquis et Novis, an. 1747, p. 475.

AN

ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY:

BOOK THE FOURTH,

CONTAINING THE

HISTORY OF THE CHURCH

FROM

THE BEGINNING OF THE REFORMATION BY LUTHER

TO

THE PRESENT TIMES.

INTRODUCTION.

I. The order and method, that have been followed in the former part of this work, cannot be continued, without the greatest inconvenience, in this fourth book, which relates to the modern history of the church. From the commencement of the sixteenth century, the face of religion was remarkably changed; the divisions, that had formerly perplexed the church, increased considerably; and the Christian societies, that relinquished the established forms of divine worship, and erected themselves into separate assemblies, upon principles different from those of the Roman hierarchy, rapidly multiplied. This circumstance renders it impossible to present in one connected series, or, as it were, in one continued tablature, the events, vicissitudes, and revolutions, which happened in the church, divided its members, and enfeebled the dominion of its tyrants. From the period on which we now enter, the bond of union among Christians, that had been formed by a blind obedience to the Roman pontiff, was in almost every country, either dissolved, or at least relaxed; and consequently this period of our history must be divided into a multitude of branches, into as many parts, as there were famous sects that arose in this century.

II. It is however proper to observe here, that many of the events, which distinguished this century, had a manifest relation to the church in general, and not to any Christian society in particular; and, as these events deserve to be mentioned separately, on account of their remarkable tendency to throw a light upon the state of Christianity in general, as well as upon the history of each Christian society, we shall divide this fourth book into two main and principal parts, of which the one will contain the *General* and the other the *Particular History of the Christian Religion.*

III. To the *General History* belong all those events which relate to the state of Christianity, considered in itself and in its utmost extent, to the Christian church viewed in the general, and abstracted from the miserable and multiplied divisions into which it was rent by the passions of men. Under this head we shall take notice of the advancement and progress of Christianity in general, without any regard to the particular sects that were thus instrumental in promoting its interests: nor shall we omit the consideration of certain doctrines, rites, and institutions, which appeared worthy of admission to all, or at least to the greatest part of the Christian sects, and which consequently produced, in various countries, improvements or changes of greater or less importance.

IV. In the *Particular History* of this century, we propose reviewing, in their proper order, the various sects into which the church was divided. This part of our work, for the sake of method and precision, we shall subdivide into two. In the first we shall comprehend what relates to the more ancient Christian sects, both in the eastern and western hemispheres; while the second will be confined to the history of those more modern societies, the date of whose origin is posterior to the Reformation in Germany. In the accounts that are here to be given of the circumstances, fate, and doctrines of each sect, the method laid down in the introduction to this work shall be rigorously observed, as far as is possible, since it seems best calculated to lead us to an accurate knowledge of the nature, progress, and tenets of every Christian society, that arose in those times of discord.

V. The most momentous event that distinguished the church after the fifteenth century, and we may add, the most glorious of all the revolutions that happened in the state of Christianity since the time of its divine and im-

mortal Founder, was that happy change introduced into religion, which is known by the title of the *Blessed Reformation*. This grand revolution, which arose in Saxony from small beginnings, not only spread itself with the utmost rapidity through all the European provinces, but also extended its efficacy to the most distant parts of the globe, and may be justly considered as the main spring which has moved the nations from that illustrious period, and occasioned the greatest part both of those civil and religious revolutions that fill the annals of history down to our times. The face of Europe was, in a more especial manner, changed by this great event. The present age feels yet, in a sensible manner, and ages to come will continue to perceive, the inestimable advantages produced by it, and the inconveniences of which it has been the innocent occasion. The history, therefore, of such an important revolution, from which so many others have derived their origin, and whose relations and connexions are so extensive and so general, demands a peculiar degree of attention, and has an unquestionable right to a distinguished place in such a work as this. We now proceed to give a compendious view of the modern history of the Christian church, according to the intimated plan and method.

THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY.

SECTION I.

THE HISTORY OF THE REFORMATION.

I. The History of the Reformation is too ample and extensive to be comprehended, without some degree of confusion, in the uninterrupted narrative of one Section: we shall therefore divide it into Four Parts.

The first will contain an account of the state of Christianity before the commencement of the Reformation;

The second will give the history of the Reformation from its beginning until the date of the Confession of Augsburg;

The third will exhibit a view of the same history, from this latter period to the commencement of the war of Smalcald; and

The fourth will carry it down to the peace that was concluded with the advocates of the Reformation in the year 1555.[a] This division is natural; it arises spontaneously from the events themselves.

CHAPTER I.

Concerning the State of the Christian Church before the Reformation.

I. About the commencement of this century, the Roman pontiffs lived in the utmost tranquillity; nor had they, as things seemed to be situated, the least reason to apprehend any opposition to their pretensions, or rebellion against their authority; since those dreadful commotions, which had been excited in the preceding ages by the Waldenses, Albigenses, and Beghards, and more recently by the Bohemians, were entirely suppressed, and had yielded to the united powers of counsel and the sword. Such of the Waldenses as yet remained, lived contented under the difficulties of extreme poverty in the valleys of Piedmont, and proposed to themselves no higher earthly felicity, than that of leaving to their descendants that wretched and obscure corner of Europe, which separates the Alps from the Pyrenean mountains; while the handful of Bohemians, that survived the ruin of their faction, and still persevered in their opposition to the Roman yoke, had neither strength nor knowledge adequate to any new attempt, and therefore, instead of inspiring terror, became objects of contempt.

II. We must not, however, conclude from this apparent tranquillity and security of the pontiffs and their adherents, that their measures were applauded, or that their chains were worn without reluctance; for not only private persons, but also the most powerful princes and sovereign states, exclaimed loudly against the despotic dominion of the pontiffs, the fraud, violence, avarice, and injustice that prevailed in their counsels, the arrogance, tyranny, and extortion of their legates, the unbridled licentiousness and enormous crimes of the clergy and monks of all denominations, the inordinate severity and partiality of the Roman laws; and demanded publicly, as their ancestors had done before them, a *reformation* of the church, in its head and in its members, and a general council to accomplish that necessary and happy purpose.[b] But these complaints and demands were not carried so far as to produce any good effect, since they came from persons who did not entertain the least doubt about the supreme authority of the pope in religious matters, and who, of consequence, instead of attempting, themselves, to bring about that reformation which was so ardently desired, remained entirely inactive, and looked for redress to the court of Rome, or to a general council. As long as the authority of the pontiff was deemed sacred, and his jurisdiction supreme, there could be no reason to expect any considerable reformation either of the corruptions of the church or of the manners of the clergy.

III. If any thing seemed proper to destroy the gloomy empire of superstition, and to alarm the security of the lordly pontiffs, it was the restoration of learning in Europe, and the number of men of genius that suddenly arose, under the benign influence of that auspicious revolution. But even this new scene was insufficient to terrify the lords of the church, or to make them apprehend the decline of their power. It is true, that this happy revolution in the republic of letters dispelled the gloom of ignorance, and kindled in the minds of many the love of truth and of sacred liberty. It is also certain that many of these great men, such as Erasmus and others, pointed the delicacy of their wit, or levelled the fury of their indignation, at the superstitions of the times, the corruptions of the priesthood, the abuses that reigned in the court of Rome, and the brutish manners of the monastic orders. But this was not sufficient, since none had the courage to strike at the root of the evil, to attack the papal jurisdiction and statutes, which were absurdly, yet artfully, sanctified by the title of *canon-law*, or to

[a] The writers of the history of the Reformation, of every rank and order, are enumerated by the very learned Philip Fred. Hane (who himself deserves a most eminent rank in this class,) in his Historia Sacrorum a Luthero emendatorum, part i. and by Jo. Alb. Fabricius, in his Centifolium Lutheranum, part ii. cap. clxxxvii. The greatest part, or at least the most eminent, of this list of authors must be consulted by such as desire a farther confirmation or illustration of the matters which I propose to relate briefly in the course of this history. The illustrious names of Sleidan and Seckendorff, and others, who have distinguished themselves in this kind of erudition, are too well known to render it necessary to recommend their works to the perusal of the curious reader.

[b] These complaints and accusations have been largely enumerated by several writers. See, among many others, Val. Ern. Loescherus, in Actis et Documentis Reformationis, tom. i. cap. v. ix. et Ern. Salom. Cyprian. Præfat. ad Wilk. Ern. Tenzelii Historiam Reformat. published at Leipsic in 1717.—The grievances complained of by the Germans in particular, are amply mentioned by J. F. Georgius in his Gravamina Imperator. et Nationis German. adversus Sedem Romanam, cap. vii. Nor do the wiser and more learned among the modern Ro-

call in question the ancient and most pernicious opinion, that Christ had established a vicegerent at Rome, clothed with his supreme and unlimited authority. Entrenched within these strong holds, the pontiffs looked upon their own authority and the peace of the church as beyond the reach of danger, and treated with indifference the threats and invectives of their enemies. Armed with power to punish, and abundantly furnished with the means of rewarding in the most alluring manner, they were ready, on every commotion, to crush the obstinate, and to gain over the mercenary to their cause; and this indeed could not but contribute considerably to the stability of their dominion.

IV. Hence it was, that the bishops of Rome lived in the utmost security and ease, and, being free from apprehensions and cares of every kind, followed without reluctance, and gratified without any limitation or restraint, the various demands of their lusts and passions. Alexander VI., whom humanity disowns, and who is rather to be considered as a monster than as a man, whose deeds excite horror, and whose enormities place him on a level with the most execrable tyrants of ancient times, stained the commencement of this century by the most atrocious crimes. The world was delivered from this papal fiend in the year 1503, by the poisonous draught which he had prepared for others, as is generally believed, though there are historians who attribute his death to sickness and old age.[a] He was succeeded in the pontificate by Pius III., who, in less than a month, was deprived by death of that high dignity. The vacant chair was obtained, by fraud and bribery, by Julian de la Rovere, who assumed the denomination of Julius II.

V. To the odious list of vices with which Julius II. dishonoured the pontificate, we may add the most savage ferocity, the most audacious arrogance, the most despotic vehemence of temper, and the most extravagant and phrenetic passion for war and bloodshed. He began his military enterprises by entering into a war with the Venetians, after having strengthened his cause by an alliance with the emperor and the king of France.[b] He afterwards laid siege to Ferrara, and at length turned his arms against his former ally, the French monarch, in conjunction with the Venetians, Spaniards, and Swiss, whom he had drawn into this war, and engaged in his cause by an offensive league. His whole pontificate, in short, was one continued scene of military tumult; nor did he suffer Europe to enjoy a moment's tranquillity as long as he lived. We may easily imagine the miserable condition of the church under a *vicar* of Christ, who lived in camps, amidst the din of arms, and who was ambitious of no other fame than that which arose from battles won and cities desolated. Under such a pontiff all things must have gone to ruin; the laws must have been subverted, the discipline of the church destroyed, and the genuine lustre of true religion entirely effaced.

VI. Nevertheless, from this dreadful cloud that hung over Europe, some rays of light seemed to break forth, that promised a better state of things, and gave some reason to expect that reformation in the church which was so generally and so ardently desired. Louis XII., king of France, provoked by the insults he had received from this arrogant pontiff, meditated revenge, and even caused a medal to be stricken with a menacing inscription, expressing his resolution to overturn the power of Rome, which was represented on this coin by the title of Babylon.[c] Several cardinals also, encouraged by the protection of this monarch and the emperor Maximilian I., assembled, in 1511, a council at Pisa, with an intention to set bounds to the tyranny of this furious pontiff, and to correct and reform the errors and corruptions of a superstitious church. Julius, on the other hand, relying on his own strength, and on the power of his allies, beheld these threatening appearances without the least concern, and even treated them with mockery and laughter. He did not, however, neglect the methods of rendering ineffectual the efforts of his enemies, that prudence dictated, and therefore gave orders for a council to meet in the Lateran palace in 1512,[d] in which the decrees of the council of Pisa were condemned and annulled in the most injurious and insulting terms. This condemnation would, undoubtedly, have been followed by the most dire and formidable anathemas against Louis and other princes, had not death carried off this audacious pontiff in 1512, in the midst of his ambitious and vindictive projects.

VII. He was succeeded, in 1513, by Leo X., of the family of Medicis, who, though of a milder disposition than his predecessor, was equally indifferent about the interests of religion and the advancement of true piety. He was a protector of men of learning, and was himself learned, as far as the darkness of the age would admit. His time was divided between conversation with men of letters and pleasure, though it must be observed, that the greatest part of it was consecrated to the latter. He had an invincible aversion to whatever was accompanied with solicitude and care, and discovered the greatest impatience under events of that nature. He was remarkable for his prodigality, luxury, and imprudence, and has even been charged with impiety, if not atheism He did not, however, lose sight of the grand object which the generality of his predecessors had so much at heart,—that of promoting and advancing the opulence and grandeur of the Roman see; for he took the utmost care that nothing should be transacted in the Lateran council, (which Julius had assembled and left sitting,) that had the least tendency to favour the reformation of the church; and, in a conference which he had with Francis I., king of France, at Bologna, he engaged that monarch to abrogate the Pragmatic Sanction,[e] which had been so long odious to the popes, and to substitute in its place

manists pretend to deny that the church and clergy, before the time of Luther, were corrupt in a very high degree.

[a] See Cent. XV. part ii. chap. ii. sect. xviii. note [a].

[b] See Du Bos, Histoire de la Ligue de Cambray.

[c] See B. Christ. Sigismund. Liebii Commentatio de Nummis Ludovici XII., Epigraphe, 'Perdam Babylonis nomen,' insignibus, Leipsic, 1717.—See also Thes. Epis. Crozianus, tom. i.—Colonia, His. Liter. de la Ville de Lyon, tom. ii.—The authenticity and occasion of this medal have been much disputed, and, as is well known, have afforded matter of keen debate.

[d] Harduini Concil. t. ix. p. 1559.

[e] We have mentioned this Pragmatic Sanction, Cent. XV. part ii. chap. ii. sect. xvi. note [c], and given there some account of its nature and design. This important edict is published at large in the eighth volume of the Concilia Harduini, as is the Concordat in the ninth volume, and in Leibnitz' Mantissa Codicis Diplomat. part i. ii. The history of these two pieces is given in an ample and accurate manner by Bishop Burnet, in his History of the Reformation, vol. iii.—See also, on the same subject, Boulay's Hist. Acad. Paris, tom. vi.—Du Clos Histoire de Louis XI.—Histoire du Droit Ecclesiastique François, tom i. Diss ix.—Menagiana, tom. iii.

another body of laws, more advantageous to the papacy; which he accordingly imposed upon his subjects under the title of the *Concordat*, but not without their utmost indignation and reluctance.[a]

VIII. The raging thirst of dominion that inflamed these pontiffs, and their arrogant endeavours to crush and oppress all who came within the reach of their power, were accompanied with the most insatiable avarice. All the provinces of Europe were, in a manner, drained to enrich these spiritual tyrants, who were perpetually gaping after new accessions of wealth, in order to augment the number of their friends and the stability of their dominion. And, indeed, according to the notions commonly entertained, the rulers of the church seemed, from the nature of their character, to have a fair pretence for demanding a sort of tribute from their flock; for none can deny to the supreme governors of any state (and such was the character assumed by the popes) the privilege of levying tribute from those over whom they bear rule. But, as the name of *tribute* obviously tended to alarm the jealousy and excite the indignation of the civil magistrate, the pontiffs were too cunning to employ it, and had recourse to various stratagems and contrivances to rob the subject without shocking the sovereign, and to levy taxes under the specious mask of religion. Among these contrivances, the distribution of *indulgences*, which enabled the wealthy to purchase impunity for their crimes by certain sums applied to religious uses, held an eminent rank. This traffic was renewed whenever the coffers of the church were exhausted. On these occasions, indulgences were warmly recommended to the ignorant multitude under some new and specious, yet fallacious pretext, and were greedily sought, to the great detriment both of individuals and of the community.

IX. Notwithstanding the veneration and homage that were paid to the Roman pontiffs, they were far from being universally reputed infallible in their decisions, or unlimited in their authority. The wiser part of the German, French, Flemish, and British nations, considered them as liable to error, and bounded by law. The councils of Constance and Basil had contributed extremely to rectify the notions of the people in that respect; and from that period all Christians, except the superstitious monks and parasites of Rome, were persuaded that the pope was subordinate to a general council, that his decrees were not infallible, and that the council had a right to depose him, whenever he was convicted of gross errors or enormous crimes. Thus were the people, in some measure, prepared for the reformation of the church; and hence arose that ardent desire, that earnest expectation of a general council, which filled the minds of the wisest and best Christians in this century. Hence also the frequent appeals which were made to this approaching council, when the court of Rome issued any new edict, or made any new attempt repugnant to the dictates of piety and justice.

X. The licentious examples of the pontiffs were zealously imitated in the lives and manners of the subordinate rulers and ministers of the church. The greatest part of the bishops and canons passed their days in dissolute mirth and luxury, and squandered away, in the gratification of their lusts and passions, the wealth that had been set apart for religious and charitable purposes. Nor were they less tyrannical than voluptuous; for the most despotic princes never treated their vassals with more rigour and severity, than these spiritual rulers employed toward all who were under their jurisdiction. The decline of virtue among the clergy was attended with the loss of the public esteem; and the most considerable part of that once respected body became, by their sloth and avarice, their voluptuousness and impurity, their ignorance and levity, contemptible and infamous, not only in the eyes of the wise and good, but also in the general judgment of the multitude.[b] Nor could the case be otherwise as matters were now constituted; for, as all the offices and dignities of the church had become *venal*, the way of preferment was inaccessible to merit, and the wicked and licentious were rendered capable of rising to the highest ecclesiastical honours.

XI. The prodigious swarms of monks that overspread Europe were justly considered as burthens to society, and occasioned frequent murmurs and complaints. Nevertheless, such was the genius of the age, of an age that was emerging from the thickest gloom of ignorance, and was suspended, as it were, in a dubious situation between darkness and light, that these monastic drones would have remained undisturbed, had they taken the least pains to preserve any remains even of the external air of decency and religion, that used to distinguish them in former times. But the Benedictine and other monkish fraternities, who were invested with the privilege of possessing certain lands and revenues, broke through all restraint, made the worst possible use of their opulence, and, forgetful of the gravity

[a] The king went in person to the parliament to offer the Concordat to be registered; and letters patent were made out, requiring all the judges and courts of justice to observe this act, and see it executed. The parliament, after deliberating a month upon this important matter, concluded not to register the Concordat, but to observe still the Pragmatic Sanction, unless the new edict should be received and established in as great an assembly as that was, which published the other in the reign of Charles VII.; and when by violence and force they were obliged to publish the Concordat, they joined to this publication a solemn protest, and an appeal from the pope to the next general council; into both which measures the university and the clergy entered with the greatest alacrity and zeal. But royal and papal despotism at length prevailed.

The chancellor Du-Prat, who was principally concerned in promoting the Concordat, has been generally regarded as an enemy to the liberties of the Gallican church. The illustrious and learned president Henault has not, however, hesitated to defend his memory against this accusation, and to justify the Concordat as an equitable contract and as a measure attended with less inconvenience than the Pragmatic Sanction. He observes, that by the king's being invested, by the Concordat, with the privilege of nominating to the bishoprics and vacant benefices of the first class, many corruptions and abuses were prevented, which arose from the simoniacal practices that prevailed almost every where, while, according to the Pragmatic Sanction, every church chose its bishop, and every monastery its abbot. He observes, moreover, that this nomination was the natural right of the crown, as the most considerable part of the great benefices had been created by the kings of France; and he insists particularly on this consideration, that the right which Christian communities have to choose their leaders, cannot be exercised by such large bodies without much confusion and many inconveniences; and that the subjects, by entrusting their sovereign with the government of the state, invest him, *ipso facto*, with an authority over the church, which is a part of the state, and its noblest branch. See Henault's Abregé Chronologique de l'Histoire de France, in the particular remarks that are placed at the end of the reign of Louis XIV.

The most specious objection that was made to the Concordat was this: that, in return for the nomination to the vacant benefices, the king granted to the popes the *annates*, or first-fruits, which had so long been complained of as an intolerable grievance. There is, however, no mention of this equivalent in the Concordat: and it was by a papal bull that succeeded this compact, that the pontiffs claimed the payment of the first-fruits, of which they had put themselves in possession in 1316, and which had been suspended by the Pragmatic Sanction.

[b] See Cornelii Aurelii Gaudani Apocalypsis, seu Visio Mirabilis super miserabili Statu Matris Ecclesiæ, in Casp. Burmanni Analect Hist. de Hadriano VI. p. 245, printed at Utrecht in 1727.

of their character and of the laws of their order, rushed headlong into the shameless practice of vice in all its various kinds and degrees. On the other hand, the Mendicant orders, and especially those who followed the rules of St. Dominic and St. Francis, though they were not carried away with the torrent of licentiousness that was overwhelming the church, lost their credit in a different way; for their rustic impudence, their ridiculous superstitions, their ignorance, cruelty, and brutish manners, tended to alienate from them the minds of the people, and gradually diminished their reputation. They had the most barbarous aversion to the arts and sciences, and expressed a like abhorrence of certain eminent and learned men, who, being eagerly desirous of opening the paths of science to the pursuit of the studious youth, recommended the culture of the mind, and attacked the barbarism of the age in their writings and in their discourse. This is sufficiently evident from what happened to Reuchlinus, Erasmus, and other learned men.

XII. Among all the monastic orders, none enjoyed a higher degree of power and authority than the Dominican friars, whose credit was great, and whose influence was very widely extended. This will not appear surprising, when we consider that they filled very eminent stations in the church, presided every where over the terrible tribunal of the inquisition, and had the care of souls, with the function of confessors, in all the courts of Europe; a circumstance which, in those times of ignorance and superstition, manifestly tended to put most of the European princes in their power. But, notwithstanding all this credit and authority, the Dominicans had their enemies; and about this time their influence began to decline. Several marks of perfidy, that appeared in the measures they employed to extend their authority, justly exposed them to the public indignation. Nothing could be more infamous than the frauds they practised to accomplish their purposes, as may be seen, among other examples, by the tragedy which they acted at Bern in 1509.[a] They were perpetually em-

☞ [a] This most impious fraud is recorded at length by Ruchat, at the end of the sixth volume of his Histoire de la Reformation en Suisse; and also by Hottinger, in his Histor. Eccles. Helvet. tom. i. There is also a compendious, but distinct, narration of this infernal stratagem, in bishop Burnet's Travels through France, Italy, Germany, and Switzerland. The stratagem in question was the consequence of a rivalry between the Franciscans and Dominicans, and more especially of their controversy concerning the immaculate conception of the Virgin Mary. The former maintained that she was born without the blemish of original sin; the latter asserted the contrary. The doctrine of the Franciscans, in an age of darkness and superstition, could not but be popular; and hence the Dominicans lost ground from day to day. To support the credit of their order, they resolved, at a chapter holden at Wimpfen in 1504, to have recourse to fictitious visions and dreams, in which the people at that time had an easy faith; and they determined to make Bern the scene of their operations. A person named Jetzer, who was extremely simple, and much inclined to austerities, and who had taken their habit as a lay-brother, was chosen as the instrument of the delusions they were contriving. One of the four Dominicans, who had undertaken the management of this plot, conveyed himself secretly into Jetzer's cell, and about midnight appeared to him in a horrid figure, surrounded with howling dogs, and seeming to blow fire from his nostrils, by the means of a box of combustibles which he held near his mouth. In this frightful form he approached Jetzer's bed, told him that he was the ghost of a Dominican, who had been killed at Paris, as a judgment of Heaven for laying aside his monastic habit; that he was condemned to purgatory for this crime; adding, at the same time, that, by his means, he might be rescued from his misery, which was beyond expression. This story, accompanied with horrible cries and howlings, terribly alarmed poor Jetzer, and engaged him to promise to do all that was in his power to deliver the Dominican from his torment. Upon this the impostor told him, that nothing but the most extraordinary mortifications, such as the discipline of the whip, performed during eight days by the whole monastery, and Jetzer's lying prostrate in the form of one crucified in the chapel during mass, could contribute to his deliverance. He added, that the performance of these mortifications would draw down upon Jetzer the peculiar protection of the Blessed Virgin; and concluded by saying, that he would appear to him again, accompanied with two other spirits. Morning was no sooner come, than Jetzer gave an account of this apparition to the rest of the convent, who unanimously advised him to undergo the discipline that was enjoined him; and every one consented to bear his share of the task imposed. The deluded simpleton obeyed, and was admired as a saint by the multitudes that crowded about the convent, while the four friars who managed the imposture, magnified, in the most pompous manner, the miracle of this apparition, in their sermons and in their conversation. The night after, the apparition was renewed with the addition of two friars, dressed like devils; and Jetzer's faith was augmented by hearing from the spectre all the secrets of his life and thoughts, which the impostors had learned from his confessor. In this and some subsequent scenes, the impostor talked much of the Dominican order, which he said was peculiarly dear to the blessed Virgin; he added, that the Virgin knew herself to be conceived in original sin; that the doctors who taught the contrary were in purgatory; that the blessed Virgin abhorred the Franciscans for making her equal with her son; and that the town of Bern would be destroyed for harbouring such plagues within its walls. In one of these apparitions, Jetzer imagined that the voice of the spectre resembled that of the prior of the convent, and this was not a mistake; but, not suspecting a fraud, he gave little attention to this. The prior appeared in various forms, sometimes in that of St. Barbara, at others in that of St. Bernard; at length he assumed that of the Virgin Mary, and, for that purpose, clothed himself in the habits that were employed to adorn her statue on the great festivals; the little images, that on these days are set on the altars, were used for angels, which, being tied to a cord that passed through a pulley over Jetzer's head, rose up and down, and danced about the pretended virgin to increase the delusion. The Virgin, thus equipped, addressed a long discourse to Jetzer, in which, among other things, she told him that she was conceived in original sin, though she had remained but a short time under that blemish. She gave him, as a miraculous proof of her presence, a *host*, or consecrated wafer, which turned from white to red in a moment; and after various visits, in which the greatest enormities were transacted, the *Virgin-prior* told Jetzer, that she would give him the most affecting and undoubted marks of her Son's love, by imprinting on him the five wounds that pierced Jesus on the cross, as she had done before to St. Lucia and St. Catharine. Accordingly, she took his hand by force, and struck a large nail through it, which threw the poor dupe into the greatest torment. The next night this masculine virgin brought, as she pretended, some of the linen, in which Christ had been buried, to soften the wound, and gave Jetzer a soporific draught, which had in it the blood of an unbaptized child, some grains of incense and of consecrated salt, some quicksilver, the hairs of the eye-brows of a child, all which, with some stupifying and poisonous ingredients, were mingled by the prior with magic ceremonies, and a solemn dedication of himself to the devil in hope of his succour. This draught threw the poor wretch into a sort of lethargy, during which the monks imprinted on his body the other four wounds of Christ in such a manner that he felt no pain. When he awoke, he found, to his unspeakable joy, these impressions on his body, and came at last to fancy himself a representative of Christ in the various parts of his passion. He was, in this state, exposed to the admiring multitude on the principal altar of the convent, to the great mortification of the Franciscans. The Dominicans gave him some other draughts, that threw him into convulsions, which were followed by a voice conveyed through a pipe into the mouths of two images, one of Mary, the other of the child Jesus; the former of which had tears painted upon its cheeks in a lively manner. The little Jesus asked his mother, by means of this voice, (which was that of the prior,) why she wept; and she answered, that her tears were occasioned by the impious manner in which the Franciscans attributed to *her* the honour that was due to *him*, in saying that she was conceived and born without sin.

The apparitions, false prodigies, and abominable stratagems of these Dominicans, were repeated every night; and the matter was at length so grossly over-acted, that, simple as Jetzer was, he at last discovered it, and had almost killed the prior, who appeared to him one night in the form of the Virgin with a crown on her head. The Dominicans, fearing, by this discovery, to lose the fruits of their imposture, thought the best method would be to own the whole matter to Jetzer, and to engage him, by the most seducing promises of opulence and glory, to carry on the delusion. He was persuaded, or at least appeared to be so. But the Dominicans, suspecting that he was not entirely gained over, resolved to poison him. His constitution was so vigorous, that though they gave him poison five times, he was not destroyed by it. One day they sent him a loaf prepared with some spices, which growing green in a day or two, he threw a piece of it to a wolf's whelps that were in the monastery, and it killed them immediately. At another time they poisoned the host; but as he vomited it soon after he had taken it, he escaped once more. In short, there were no means of securing him, which the most detestable impiety and barbarity could invent, that they did not put in practice, till, finding at last an opportunity of getting out of the convent, he threw himself into the hands of the magistrates, to whom

ployed in stigmatizing, with the opprobious mark of heresy, numbers of learned and pious men, in encroaching upon the rights and property of others to augment their possessions, and in contriving the most iniquitous snares and stratagems for the destruction of their adversaries;[a] and they were the principal counsellors by whose instigation and advice Leo X. was determined to that most rash and imprudent measure, even the public condemnation of Luther.

XIII. The principal places in the public schools of learning were filled very frequently by monks of the mendicant orders. This unhappy circumstance prevented their emerging from that ignorance and darkness which had so long enveloped them; and it also rendered them inaccessible to that auspicious light of improved science, whose salutary beams had already been felt in several of the European countries. The instructors of youth, dignified with the *venerable* titles of *artists*, *grammarians*, *philosophers*, and *dialecticians*, loaded the memories of their laborious pupils with a certain quantity of barbarous terms, arid and senseless distinctions, and scholastic precepts, delivered in the most inelegant style; and all such as could repeat this jargon with readiness and rapidity, were considered as men of uncommon eloquence and erudition. The whole body of the philosophers extolled Aristotle beyond measure, while scarcely any studied him, and none understood him; for what was now exhibited, as the philosophy of that celebrated sage, was really nothing more than a confused and motley heap of obscure notions, sentences, and divisions, which even the public doctors and heads of schools were unable to comprehend; and if, among these thorns of scholastic wisdom, there was any thing that had the appearance of fruit, it was crushed and blasted by the furious wranglings and disputes of the Scotists and Thomists, the Realists and Nominalists, whose clamours and contentions were unhappily heard in all the European colleges.

XIV. The wretched and senseless manner of teaching theology in this century, may be learned from many books yet extant, which were written by the divines of that period, and which, in reality, have no other merit than their enormous bulk. There were very few expositors of the Scriptures during this century; and scarcely any of the Christian doctors had a critical acquaintance with the sacred oracles. This kind of knowledge was so rare, that, when Luther arose, there could not be found, even in the university of Paris, which was regarded as the first and most famous of all the public schools of learning, a single person qualified to dispute with him, or oppose his doctrine upon a scriptural foundation. Any commentators, that were at this time to be found, were such as, laying aside all attention to the true meaning and force of the words of Scripture, which their profound ignorance of the original languages and of the rules of criticism rendered them incapable of investigating, gave a loose to their vain and irregular fancies, in the pursuit of mysterious significations. The greatest part of the public teachers belonged to the classes of divines, already mentioned under the titles of *Positivi* and *Sententiarii*, who were extremely fond, the former of loading their accounts, both of the truths and precepts of religion, with multiplied quotations and authorities from the writings of the ancient doctors; the latter of explaining the doctrines of the Gospel by the rules of a subtile and intricate philosophy.

XV. It must at the same time be observed, that the divines of this century disputed with great freedom upon religious subjects, even upon those which were looked upon as most essential to salvation. There were several points of doctrine, which had not yet been determined by the authority of the church; nor did the pontiffs, without some very urgent reason, restrain the right of private judgment, or force the consciences of men, except in those cases where doctrines were adopted that seemed detrimental to the supremacy of the apostolic see, or to the temporal interests of the sacerdotal and monastic orders. Hence it is, that we could mention many Christian doctors before Luther, who inculcated not only with impunity, but even with applause, the very same tenets that afterwards drew upon him such heavy accusations and such bitter reproaches; and it is beyond all doubt, that this great reformer might have propagated these opinions without any danger of molestation, had he not pointed his warm remonstrances against the opulence of Rome, the overgrown fortunes of the bishops, the majesty of the pontiffs, and the towering ambition of the Dominicans.

XVI. The public worship of the Deity was now no more than a pompous round of external ceremonies, the greatest part of which were insignificant and senseless, and much more adapted to dazzle the eyes than to touch the heart. Of those who were at all qualified to administer public instruction to the people, the number was not very considerable; and their discourses, which contained little beside fictitious reports of miracles and prodigies, insipid fables, wretched quibbles, and illiterate jargon, deceived instead of instructing the multitude. Several of these sermons are yet extant, which it is impossible to read without the highest indignation and contempt. Those who, on account of their gravity of manners, or their supposed superiority in point of wisdom and knowledge, held the most distinguished rank among these vain declaimers, had a common-place set of subjects allotted to them, on which they were constantly exercising the force of their lungs and the power of their eloquence. These subjects were, the authority of the holy mother church, and the obligation of obedience to her decisions; the virtues and merits of the saints, and their credit in the court of heaven; the dignity, glory, and love of the blessed Virgin; the efficacy of relics; the duty of adorning churches, and endowing monasteries; the necessity of good works (as that phrase was then understood) to salvation; the intolerable burnings of purgatory, and the utility of indulgences. Such were the topics that employed the zeal and labours of the most eminent doctors of this century; and they were, indeed, the only subjects that could tend to fill

he made a full discovery of this infernal plot. This intelligence being sent to Rome, commissaries were ordered to examine the affair; and the whole imposture being fully proved, the four friars were solemnly degraded from their priesthood, and were burned alive on the last day of May, 1509. Jetzer died some time after at Constance, having poisoned himself, as was believed by some. Had his life been taken away before he had found an opportunity of making the discovery already mentioned, this execrable and horrid plot, which, in many of its circumstances, was conducted with art, would have been handed down to posterity as a stupendous miracle. This is a very brief account of the matter; such as are desirous of a more circumstantial relation of this famous imposture, may consult the authors mentioned in the beginning of this note.

[a] See Bilib. Pirkheimeri Epistola ad Hadrianum Pontif. Maxim. de Dominicanorum flagitiis, in operibus ejus, p. 372. This letter is also to be found in Gerdesii Intr. ad Hist. Renov. Evangel. t. i. p. 170. Append.

the coffers of the *good old mother church*, and advance her temporal interests. Ministers who would have taken it into their heads to inculcate the doctrines and precepts of the Gospel, to exhibit the example of its divine author, and the efficacy of his mediation, as the most powerful motives to righteousness and virtue, and to represent the love of God and mankind as the great duties of the Christian life, would have been very unprofitable servants to the church and to the papacy, however they might have promoted the cause of virtue and the salvation of souls.

XVII. From this state of affairs we may draw conclusions respecting the true causes of that incredible ignorance in religious matters, which reigned in all countries, and among all ranks and orders of men; an ignorance accompanied with the vilest forms of superstition, and the greatest corruption of manners. The clergy were far from showing the least disposition to enlighten the ignorance, or to check the superstition of the times; which, indeed, they even nourished and promoted, as conducive to their safety, and favourable to their interests. Nor was there more zeal shown in stemming the torrent of immorality and licentiousness, than in dispelling the clouds of superstition and ignorance; for the prudence of the church had easily foreseen, that the traffic of indulgences could not but suffer from a diminution of the crimes and vices of mankind, and that, in proportion as virtue gained an ascendency upon the manners of the multitude, the profits arising from expiations, satisfactions, and the like ecclesiastical contrivances, would necessarily decrease.

XVIII. Such was the dismal condition of the church. Its corruption was complete, and the abuses which its rulers permitted had reached the greatest height of enormity. Proportioned to the greatness of this corruption was the impatient ardour with which all, who were endowed with any tolerable portion of solid learning, genuine piety, or even good sense, desired to see the church reformed and purged from these shocking abuses; and the number of those who were affected in this manner was very considerable in all parts of the western world. The greatest part of them, indeed, were perhaps over-moderate in their demands. They did not extend their views to a change in the form of ecclesiastical government, a suppression of those doctrines, which, however absurd, had acquired a high degree of credit by their antiquity, or even to an abrogation of those rites and ceremonies, which had been multiplied in such an extravagant manner, to the great detriment of true religion and rational piety. All they aimed at was, to set limits to the overgrown power of the pontiffs, reform the corrupt manners of the clergy, and prevent the frauds that were too commonly practised by that order of men; to dispel the ignorance and correct the errors of the blinded multitude, and to deliver them from the heavy and insupportable burthens which were imposed upon them under religious pretexts. But as it was impossible to obtain any of these salutary purposes without the suppression of various absurd and impious opinions, from which the grievances complained of sprang, or, indeed, without a general reformation of the religion that was publicly professed, this was supposed to be ardently, though silently wished for, by all those who openly demanded the 'reformation of the church in its head and in its members.'

XIX. If any sparks of real piety subsisted under this despotic empire of superstition, they were only to be found among the Mystics; for this sect, renouncing the subtlety of the schools, the vain contentions of the learned, and all the acts and ceremonies of external worship, exhorted their followers to aim at nothing but internal sanctity of heart, and communion with God, the centre and source of holiness and perfection. Hence they were loved and respected by many persons, who had a serious sense of religion and a devotional frame of mind. Yet, as they were not entirely free from the reigning superstitions, but associated many vulgar errors with their practical precepts and directions;—and as their excessive passion for contemplation led them into chimerical notions, and sometimes into a degree of fanaticism that approached to madness—more effectual succours than theirs were necessary to combat the inveterate errors of the times, and to bring about the reformation that was expected with such impatience.

CHAPTER II.

The History of the Reformation, from its Commencement to the Confession of Augsburg.

I. WHILE the Roman pontiff slumbered in security at the head of the church, and saw nothing throughout the vast extent of his dominion but tranquillity and submission; and while the worthy and pious professors of genuine Christianity almost despaired of seeing that reformation on which their most ardent desires and expectations were bent; an obscure and inconsiderable person suddenly offered himself to public view in the year 1517, and laid the foundation of this long-expected change, by opposing, with undaunted resolution, his single force to the torrent of papal ambition and despotism. This extraordinary man was Martin Luther, a native of Eisleben in Saxony, a monk of the Augustinian *Eremites*, (one of the Mendicant orders,) and, at the same time, professor of divinity in the university which had been erected at Wittenberg, a few years before this period, by Frederic the Wise. The papal chair was, at that time, filled by Leo X.; Maximilian I., a prince of the house of Austria, was king of the Romans and emperor of Germany; and Frederic, already mentioned, was elector of Saxony. The bold efforts of this new adversary of the pontiffs were honoured with the applause of many; but few or none entertained confident hopes of his success. It seemed scarcely possible that this puny David could hurt a Goliah, whom so many heroes had opposed in vain.

II. The qualities or talents that distinguished Luther were not of a common or ordinary kind. His genius was truly great and unparalleled; his memory vast and tenacious; his patience in supporting trials, difficulties, and labour, incredible; his magnanimity invincible, and unshaken by the vicissitudes of human affairs; and his learning most extensive, considering the age in which he lived. All this will be acknowledged, even by his enemies, at least by such of them as are not totally blinded by a spirit of partiality and faction. He was deeply versed in the theology and philosophy that were in vogue in the schools during this century, and he taught them both with great reputation and success in the university of Wittenberg. As a philosopher, he embraced the doctrine of the Nominalists, which was the system adopted by his order; while, in divinity, he followed chiefly the sentiments of

Augustin; but in both he preferred the decisions of Scripture, and the dictates of right reason, to the authority and opinions of fallible men. It would be equally rash and absurd to represent this great man as exempt from error, and free from infirmities and defects; yet, if we except the contagious effects of the age in which he lived, and of the religion in which he had been brought up, we shall perhaps find few points of his character that render him liable to reproach. [a]

III. The first opportunity that this great man had of unfolding, to the view of a blinded and deluded age, the truth which struck his astonished sight, was offered by a Dominican, whose name was John Tetzel. [b] This bold and enterprising monk had been chosen on account of his uncommon impudence, by Albert, archbishop of Mentz and Magdeburg, to preach and proclaim, in Germany, those famous *indulgences* of Leo X., which administered the remission of all sins, past, present, and to come, however enormous their nature, to those who were rich enough to purchase them. The frontless monk executed this iniquitous commission not only with matchless insolence, indecency,[c] and fraud, but even carried his impiety so far as to derogate from the all-sufficient power and influence of the merits of Christ. At this, Luther, unable to repress his just indignation, raised his warning voice, and in ninety-five propositions, (maintained publicly at Wittenberg, on the 30th of September, 1517,) censured the extravagant extortion of these quæstors, and plainly pointed out the pontiff as a partaker of their guilt, since he suffered the people to be seduced, by such delusions, from placing their principal confidence in Christ, the only proper object of their trust. This was the commencement and foundation of that memorable rupture and revolution in the church, which humbled the grandeur of the lordly pontiffs, and eclipsed so great a part of their glory. [d]

IV. This debate between Luther and Tetzel was, at

---

[a] The writers who have given a circumstantial account of Luther and his transactions, are accurately enumerated by Jo. Alb. Fabricius, in his Centifolium Lutheranum.

[b] The historians who have particularly mentioned Tetzel, and his odious methods of deluding the multitude, are enumerated in the work quoted in the preceding note, part i. p. 47; part ii. p. 530.—What is said of this vile deceiver by Echard and Quetif, (Scriptores Ordin. Prædicator. tom. ii.) discovers the blindest zeal and the meanest partiality.

☞ [c] In describing the efficacy of these indulgences, Tetzel said, among other enormities, that "even had any one ravished the mother of God, he (Tetzel) had wherewithal to efface his guilt." He also boasted that "he had saved more souls from hell by these indulgences, than St. Peter had converted to Christianity by his preaching."

☞ [d] Dr. Mosheim has taken no notice of the calumnies invented and propagated by some late authors, in order to make Luther's zealous opposition to the publication of indulgences appear to be the effect of selfish and ignoble motives. It may not, therefore, be improper to set that point in a true light; not that the cause of the reformation (which must stand by its own intrinsic dignity, and is in no way affected by the views or characters of its instruments) can derive any strength from this inquiry; but as it may tend to vindicate the personal character of a man, who has done eminent service to the cause of religion.

Mr. Hume, in his history of the reign of Henry VIII., has thought proper to repeat what the enemies of the reformation, and some of its dubious or ill-informed friends, have advanced, with respect to the motives that engaged Luther to oppose the doctrine of indulgences. This elegant historian affirms, that the "Augustin friars had *usually* been employed in Saxony to preach indulgences, and from this trust had derived both profit and consideration; that Arcemboldi gave this occupation to the Dominicans; that Martin Luther, an Augustin friar, professor in the university of Wittenberg, *resenting the affront put upon his order*, began to preach against the abuses that were committed in the sale of indulgences, and being provoked by opposition, proceeded even to decry indulgences themselves." It is to be wished, that Mr. Hume's candour had engaged him to examine this accusation better, before he had ventured to repeat it. In the first place, it is not true, that the Augustin friars had been usually employed in Saxony to preach indulgences. It is well known, that the commission had been offered alternately, and sometimes jointly, to all the Mendicants, whether Augustin friars, Dominicans, Franciscans, or Carmelites. From the year 1229, that lucrative commission was principally entrusted to the Dominicans; * and in the records which relate to indulgences, we rarely meet with the name of an Augustin friar, and not a single act by which it appears, that the Roman pontiff ever named the friars of that order to the office under consideration. More particularly it is remarkable, that for half a century before Luther, (i. e. from 1450 to 1517,) during which period indulgences were sold with the most scandalous marks of avaricious extortion and impudence, we scarcely find an Augustin friar mentioned as being employed in that service; if we except a monk named Baluzius, who was no more than an underling of the papal quæstor Raymond Peraldus; so far is it from being true, that the Augustin monks were exclusively, or even usually, engaged in that service. † Mr. Hume has built his assertion upon the sole authority of a single expression of Paul Sarpi, which has been abundantly refuted by De Priero, Pallavicini, and Graweson, the mortal enemies of Luther.—But it may be alleged, that, even supposing it was not usual to employ the Augustin friars alone in the propagation of indulgences, yet Luther might be offended at seeing such an important commission given to the Dominicans exclusively, and that, consequently, this was his motive in opposing the propagation of indulgences. To show the injustice of this allegation, I observe, secondly, that, in the time of Luther, the preaching of indulgences had become very odious and unpopular; and it is therefore far from being probable, that Luther would have been solicitous about obtaining such a commission, either for himself or for his order. The princes of Europe, with many bishops, and multitudes of learned and pious men, had opened their eyes upon the turpitude of this infamous traffick; and even the Franciscans and Dominicans, toward the conclusion of the fifteenth century, opposed it publicly, both in their discourses and in their writings. ‡ The very commission, which is supposed to have excited the envy of Luther, was offered by Leo to the general of the Franciscans, and was refused both by him and his order, § who gave it over entirely to Albert, bishop of Mentz and Magdeburg. Is it then to be imagined, that either Luther, or the other Augustin friars, aspired after a commission of which the Franciscans were ashamed? Besides, it is a mistake to affirm, that this office was given to the Dominicans in general; for it was given to Tetzel alone, an individual member of that order, who had been notorious for his extortion, profligacy, and barbarity.

But that neither resentment nor envy were the motives that led Luther to oppose the doctrine and publication of indulgences, will appear with the utmost evidence, if we consider, in the third place, that he was never accused of any such motives, either in the edicts of the pontiffs of his time, or amidst the other reproaches of the contemporary writers, who defended the cause of Rome, and who were generally very prodigal of their invectives and calumnies. All the contemporary adversaries of Luther are absolutely silent on this head. From the year 1517 to 1546, when the dispute about indulgences was carried on with the greatest warmth and animosity, not one writer ever ventured to reproach Luther with these ignoble motives of opposition now under consideration. I speak not of Erasmus, Sleidan, De Thou, Guicciardini, and others, whose testimony might be perhaps suspected of partiality in his favour; but I speak of Caietan, Hoogstrat, De Priero, Emser, and even the infamous John Tetzel, whom Luther opposed with such vehemence and bitterness. Even Cochlæus was silent on this head during the life of Luther, though, after the death of that great reformer, he broached the calumny I am here refuting. But such was the scandalous character of this man, who was notorious for fraud, calumny, lying, and their sister vices, || that Pallavicini, Bossuet, and other enemies of Luther, were ashamed to make use either of his name or testimony. Now may it not be fairly presumed, that the contemporaries of Luther were better judges of his character, and of the principles from which he acted, than those who lived in after-times? Can it be imagined, that motives to action, which escaped their prying eyes, should have discovered themselves to us who live at such a distance of time from the scene of action, to M. Bossuet, to Mr. Hume, and to other abettors of this ill-contrived and foolish story. Either there are no rules of moral evidence, or Mr. Hume's assertion is entirely groundless.

I might add many other considerations to show the unreasonableness of supposing that Luther exposed himself to the rage of the pontiff, to the persecutions of an exasperated clergy, to the severity of such a potent and despotic prince as Charles V., and to the risk of death itself, from a principle of avarice and ambition. But I have said enough to satisfy every candid mind.

* See Weismanni Memorabilia Historiæ Sacræ N. T. p. 1051, 1115.

† See Harpii Dissertat. de Nonnullis Indulgentiarum (Sæc. XIV. et XV.) Quæstoribus, p. 384, 387.

‡ See Walch. op. Lutheri, tom. xv. p. 114, 283, 312, 349.—Seckendorf. Hist. Lutheranismi, lib. i. sect. vi. p. 13.

§ See Walch. loc. cit. p. 371.

|| Sleidan de Statu Rel. et Reip. in Dedic. Epist. ad August. Electorem.

first, a matter of no great moment, and might have been determined with the utmost facility, had Leo been disposed to follow the healing method which common prudence must have naturally pointed out on such an occasion; for, after all, this was no more than the private dispute of two monks, concerning the extent of the pope's power with respect to the remission of sin. Luther confessed that the Roman pontiff was invested with the power of remitting the *human* punishments denounced against transgressors, i. e. the punishments ordained by the church, and its visible head, the bishop of Rome; but he strenuously denied that his power extended to the remission of the *divine* punishments allotted to offenders, either in the present or in a future state; affirming, on the contrary, that these punishments could only be removed by the merits of Christ, or by voluntary acts of mortification and penance, undertaken and performed by the transgressor. The doctrine of Tetzel was directly opposite to the sentiments of Luther; for that senseless and designing monk asserted, that all punishments, present and future, human and divine, were submitted to the authority of the pope, and came within the reach of his absolving power. This matter had often been debated before the present period; but the popes had always been prudent enough to leave it undecided. These debates, however, being sometimes treated with neglect, and at others carried on without wisdom, the seeds of discord imperceptibly gained new accessions of strength and vigour, and from small beginnings produced, at length, events of the most momentous nature.

V. The sentiments of Luther were received with applause by the greatest part of Germany, which had long groaned under the avarice of the pontiffs, and the extortions of their tax-gatherers, and had murmured grievously against the various stratagems that were daily put in practice, with the most shameless impudence, to fleece the rich, and to grind the faces of the poor. But the votaries of Rome were filled with horror, when they were informed of the opinions propagated by the Saxon reformer; more especially the Dominicans, who looked upon their order as insulted and attacked in the person of Tetzel. The alarm of controversy was therefore sounded, and Tetzel himself appeared immediately in the field against Luther, whose sentiments he pretended to refute in two academical discourses, which he pronounced on occasion of his promotion to the degree of doctor in divinity. In the year following (1511) two famous Dominicans, Sylvester de Priero and Hoogstrat, the former a native of Italy, and the latter a German, rose up also against the adventurous reformer, and attacked him at Cologne with the utmost vehemence and ardour. Their example was soon followed by another formidable champion, named Eckius, a celebrated professor of divinity at Ingolstadt, and one of the most zealous supporters of the Dominican order. Luther stood firm against these united adversaries, and was neither vanquished by their arguments, nor daunted by their talents and reputation; but answered their objections, and refuted their reasonings with the greatest strength of evidence, and a becoming spirit of resolution and perseverance. At the same time, he addressed letters, in the most submissive and respectful terms, to the pope, and to several of the bishops, showing them the uprightness of his intentions, as well as the justice of his cause, and declaring his readiness to change his sentiments, as soon as he should see them fairly proved to be erroneous.

VI. At first, Leo beheld this controversy with indifference and contempt; but, being informed by the emperor Maximilian not only of its importance, but also of the fatal divisions it was likely to produce in Germany, he summoned Luther to appear before him at Rome, and there to plead the cause which he had undertaken to maintain. This papal citation was superseded by Frederic the Wise, elector of Saxony, who pretended, that the cause of Luther belonged to the jurisdiction of a German tribunal, and that it was to be decided by the ecclesiastical laws of the empire. The pontiff yielded to the remonstrances of this prudent and magnanimous prince, and ordered Luther to justify his intentions and doctrines before cardinal Caietan, who was at this time legate at the diet of Augsburg. In this first step the court of Rome gave a specimen of that temerity and imprudence with which all its negotiations, in this weighty affair, were afterwards conducted; for, instead of reconciling, nothing could tend more to inflame the dispute than the choice of Caietan, a Dominican, and, consequently, the declared enemy of Luther and friend of Tetzel, as judge and arbitrator in this nice and perilous controversy.

VII. Luther, however, repaired to Augsburg in October, 1518, and conferred, at three meetings, with Caietan himself,[a] concerning the points in debate. But had he even been disposed to yield to the court of Rome, this imperious legate was, of all others, the most unfit person to be employed in procuring from him any act or mark of submission. The high spirit of Luther was not to be tamed by the arrogant dictates of mere authority; such, however, were the only methods of persuasion adopted by the haughty cardinal. He, in an overbearing tone, desired Luther to renounce his opinions, without even attempting to prove them erroneous, and insisted, with importunity, on his confessing humbly his fault, and submitting respectfully to the judgment of the Roman pontiff.[b] The Saxon reformer could not think of yielding to terms so unreasonable in themselves, and so despotically proposed; so that the conferences were absolutely without effect. Luther, finding his adversary and judge inaccessible to reason and argument, suddenly left Augsburg, after having appealed from the pope's present decision to that which he should pronounce when better informed; and, in this step, he seemed yet to respect the dignity and authority of the bishop of Rome.[c] Leo, on the other hand, let loose the reins to ambition and despotism, and carried things to extremities; for he published an edict, *commanding* his spiritual subjects to acknowledge his power of delivering from all the punishments

[a] There is an ample account of this cardinal given by Quetif and Echard, Scriptor. Ordin. Prædicator. tom. ii.

[b] The imperious and imprudent manner in which Caietan behaved toward Luther was highly disapproved, even at the court of Rome, as appears, among other testimonies, from Paolo Sarpi's History of the Council of Trent, book i. p. 22. The conduct of Caietan is defended by Echard, but with little prudence and less argument. The truth is, that the court of Rome, and its unthinking sovereign, were not less culpable than Caietan in the whole of this transaction, since they might easily foresee, that a Dominican legate was of all others the most unlikely to treat Luther with moderation and impartiality, and consequently the most improper to reconcile matters.

[c] See B. Ch. Fr. Börner. Diss. de Coll. Luth. cum Caietano, Leips. 1722. Val. Ern. Losch. Act. et Doc. Ref. t. ii. c. xi. p. 435, op. Luth. t. xxiv. p. 409

due to sin and transgression. As soon as Luther received information of this inconsiderate and violent measure, he perceived, plainly, that it would be impossible for him to bring the court of Rome to any reasonable terms; he therefore repaired to Wittenberg, and appealed from the pontiff to a general council.

VIII. In the mean time the pope became sensible of his imprudence in entrusting Caietan with such a commission, and therefore resolved to employ a man of more candour and impartiality, and better acquainted with business, in order to suppress the rebellion of Luther, and to engage that reformer to submission and obedience. This new legate was Charles Miltitz, a Saxon knight, who belonged to the court of Leo, and whose laic character exposed him less to the prejudices which arise from a spirit of party, than if he had been clothed with the splendid purple, or the monastic frock. He was also a person of great prudence, penetration, and dexterity, and every way qualified for the execution of such a nice and critical commission as this was. Leo sent him into Saxony to present to Frederic the golden consecrated rose, (which the pontiffs are accustomed to bestow, as a peculiar mark of distinction, on those princes for whom they have, or think proper to profess, an uncommon friendship and esteem,) and to treat with Luther, not only about finishing his controversy with Tetzel, but also with regard to the methods of bringing about a reconciliation between him and the court of Rome. Nor, indeed, were the negotiations of this prudent minister entirely unsuccessful; for, in his first conference with Luther, at Altenburg, in 1519, he carried matters so far as to persuade him to write a submissive letter to Leo, promising to observe a profound silence upon the points in debate, provided that the same obligation should be imposed upon his adversaries. This same year, in the month of October, Miltitz had a second conference with Luther in the castle of Liebenwerd, and a third, the year following, at Lichtenberg.[a] These meetings, which were reciprocally conducted with moderation and decency, gave great hopes of an approaching reconciliation; nor were these hopes altogether ill-founded.[b] But the violent proceedings of the enemies of Luther, and the arrogant spirit, as well as unaccountable imprudence, of the court of Rome, blasted these fair expectations, and rekindled the flames of discord.

IX.[c] It is sufficient barely to mention the measures taken by Caietan to draw Luther anew under the papal yoke, because these were, indeed, nothing more than the wild suggestions of superstition and tyranny, maintained and avowed with the most shameless impudence. A man who began by commanding the reformer to renounce his errors, and to believe, upon the dictates of mere authority, that "one drop of Christ's blood being sufficient to redeem the whole human race, the remaining quantity, which was shed in the garden and on the cross, was left as a legacy to the church, to be a treasure whence indulgences were to be drawn and administered by the Roman pontiffs;"[d] such a man was not to be reasoned with. But Miltitz proceeded in quite another manner, and his conferences with the Saxon reformer are worthy of attention. He was ordered, indeed, to demand of the elector, that he would either oblige Luther to renounce the doctrines he had hitherto maintained, or that he would withdraw from him his protection and favour. But, perceiving that he was received by the elector with a degree of coldness that bordered upon contempt, and that Luther's credit and cause were too far advanced to be destroyed by the efforts of mere authority, he had recourse to gentler methods. He loaded Tetzel with the bitterest reproaches, on account of the irregular and superstitious means he had employed for promoting the sale of indulgences, and attributed to this miserable wretch all the abuses that Luther had complained of. Tetzel, on the other hand, burthened with the iniquities of Rome, tormented with a consciousness of his own injustice and extortions, stung with the opprobrious censures of the new legate, and seeing himself equally despised and abhorred by both parties, died of grief and despair.[e] This incendiary being sacrificed as a victim to cover the Roman pontiff from reproach, Miltitz entered into a particular conversation with Luther at Altenburg, and, without pretending to justify the scandalous traffick in question, required only, that he would acknowledge the four following points: "1st, That the people had been seduced by false notions of indulgences: 2dly, That he (Luther) had been the cause of that seduction, by representing indulgences as much more heinous than they really were: 3dly, That the odious conduct of Tetzel alone had given occasion to these representations: and, 4thly, That, though the avarice of Albert, archbishop of Mentz, had set on Tetzel, this rapacious tax-gatherer had far exceeded the bounds of his commission." These proposals were accompanied with many soothing words, with pompous encomiums on Luther's character, capacity, and talents, and with the softest and most pathetic expostulations in favour of union and concord in an afflicted and divided church; all which Miltitz combined with the greatest dexterity and address, in order to touch and disarm the reformer. Nor were his mild and insinuating methods of negotiating without effect; and it was upon this occasion that Luther made submissions which showed that his views were not, as yet, very extensive, his former prejudices entirely expelled, or his reforming principles steadily fixed; for he not only offered to observe a profound silence for the future with respect to indulgences, provided that the same condition should be imposed on his adversaries; he went much farther; he proposed writing an humble and submissive letter to the pope, acknowledging that he had carried his zeal and animosity too far; and such a letter he wrote soon after the conference at Altenburg.[f] He even consent-

[a] See Börneri Dissert. The records relating to the embassy of Miltitz, were first published by Cyprianus, in Addit. ad Tenzelii Histor. Reformat. tom. i. ii.,—as also by Löscherus, in his Acta Reformat. tom. ii. c. xvi. and tom. iii. cap. ii.

[b] In 1519, Leo wrote to Luther in the softest and most pacific terms. From this remarkable letter, (which was published in 1742, by Löscherus, in a German work entitled Unschuld Nachricht,) it appears that at the court of Rome, they looked upon a reconciliation between Luther and the pontiff as certain and near at hand.

☞ [c] This whole ninth section is added to Dr. Mosheim's work by the translator, who thought that this part of Luther's history deserved to be related in a more circumstantial manner, than it is in the original.

☞ [d] Such, among others still more absurd, were the expressions of Caietan, which he borrowed from one of the Decretals of Clement VI. called (and that justly for more than one reason) *Extravagant's*.

☞ [e] Luther was so affected by the agonies of despair under which Tetzel laboured, that he wrote to him a pathetic letter of consolation, which, however, produced no effect. His infamy was perpetuated by a picture placed in the church of Pirna, in which he is represented sitting on an ass and selling indulgences.

☞ [f] This letter was dated the 13th of March, 1519, about two months after that conference.

ed to publish a circular letter, exhorting all his disciples and followers to reverence and obey the dictates of the holy Roman church. He declared that his only intention, in the writings he had composed, was to brand with infamy those emissaries who abused his authority, and employed its protection as a mask to cover their abominable and impious frauds. It is true, indeed, that amidst those weak submissions which the impartial demands of historical truth oblige us to relate, there was, properly speaking, no retraction of his former tenets, nor the smallest degree of respect shown to the infamous traffick of indulgences. Nevertheless, the pretended majesty of the Roman church, and the authority of the Roman pontiff, were treated by Luther in this transaction, and in his letter to Leo, in a manner that could not naturally have been expected from a man who had already appealed from the pope to a general council.

Had the pope been so prudent as to accept the submission of Luther, he would have almost nipped in the bud the cause of the reformation, or would, at least, have considerably retarded its growth and progress. When he had gained over the head, the members would, with greater facility, have been reduced to obedience. But the flaming and excessive zeal of some inconsiderate bigots renewed (happily for the truth) the divisions, which were so near being healed, and, by animating both Luther and his followers to inspect more closely the enormities that prevailed in the papal hierarchy, promoted the principles, and augmented the spirit, which ultimately produced the blessed[a] reformation.

X. One of the circumstances that contributed principally, at least by its consequences, to render the embassy of Miltitz ineffectual for the restoration of peace, was a famous controversy of an incidental nature that was carried on at Leipsic, for some weeks successively, in 1519.[b] Eckius, the celebrated theologian, happened to differ widely from Carlostadt, the colleague and companion of Luther, in his sentiments concerning free will. The result of this variety in opinion was easy to be foreseen. The military genius of our ancestors had so far infected the schools of learning, that differences in points of religion and literature, when they grew to a certain degree of warmth and animosity, were decided, like the quarrels of valiant knights, by a single combat. Some famous university was pitched upon as the field of battle, while the rector and professors beheld the contest, and proclaimed the victory. Eckius, therefore, in compliance with the spirit of this fighting age, challenged Carlostadt, and even Luther himself, against whom he had already drawn his pen, to try the force of his theological arms. The challenge was accepted, the day appointed, and the three champions, appeared in the field. The first conflict was between Carlostadt and Eckius, respecting the powers and freedom of the human will;[c] it was carried on in the castle of Pleissenburg, before a numerous and splendid auditory, and was followed by a dispute between Luther and Eckius concerning the authority and supremacy of the Roman pontiff. This latter controversy, which the present situation of affairs rendered singularly nice and critical, was left undecided. Hoffman, at that time rector of the university of Leipsic, and who had been also appointed judge of the arguments alleged on both sides, refused to declare to whom the victory belonged, so that the decision of the case was referred to the universities of Paris and Erfurt.[d] In the mean time, one of the immediate effects of this dispute was a visible increase of the bitterness and enmity which Eckius had conceived against Luther; for from this very period he breathed nothing but fury against the reformer,[e] whom he marked out as a victim to his vengeance, without considering, that the measures he took for the destruction of Luther, must have a most pernicious influence upon the cause of the pontiff, by fomenting the present divisions, and thus contributing to the progress of the reformation, as was really the case.[f]

XI. Among the spectators of this ecclesiastical combat, was Philip Melancthon, at that time professor of Greek at Wittenberg, who had not yet been involved in these divisions, (for the mildness of his temper, and his elegant taste for polite literature, rendered him averse from disputes of this nature,) though he was the intimate friend of Luther, and approved his design of delivering the pure and primitive science of theology from the darkness and subtlety of scholastic jargon.[g] As this eminent man was one of those whom the dispute with Eckius convinced of the excellence of Luther's cause; as he was, moreover,

---

☞ [a] See, for an ample account of Luther's conferences with Miltitz, the incomparable work of Seckendorff, entitled Commentar. Histor. Apologet. de Lutheranismo, sive de Reformatione Religionis, &c. in which the facts relating to Luther and the Reformation are deduced from the most valuable and authentic manuscripts and records, contained in the library of Saxe-Gotha, and in other learned and princely collections: and in which the frauds and falsehoods of Maimbourg's History of Lutheranism are fully detected and refuted.—As to Miltitz, his fate was unhappy. His moderation (which nothing but the blind zeal of some furious monks could have prevented from being eminently serviceable to the cause of Rome) was represented by Eckius, as something worse than indifference about the success of his commission; and, after several marks of neglect received from the pontiff, he had the misfortune to lose his life in passing the Rhine, at Mentz.

[b] These disputes commenced on the 27th of June, and ended on the 15th of July.

☞ [c] This controversy turned upon *liberty*, considered not in a philosophical, but in a theological sense. It was rather a dispute concerning *power* than concerning *liberty*. Carlostadt maintained, that, since the fall of man, our natural liberty is not strong enough to conduct us to what is good, without the intervention of divine grace. Eckius asserted, on the contrary, that our natural liberty co-operates with divine grace, and that it is in the power of man to consent to the divine impulse, or to resist it. The former attributed all to God; the latter divided the merit of virtue betweer God and the creature. The modern Lutherans have almost universally abandoned the sentiments of Carlostadt.

[d] There is an ample account of this dispute at Leipsic, given by Löscherus, in his Acta et Documenta Reformationis.

☞ [e] This was one proof that the issue of the controversy was not in his favour. The victor, in any combat, is generally too full of satisfaction and self-complacency, to feel the emotions of fury and vengeance, which seldom arise but from disappointment and defeat. There is even an insolent kind of clemency that arises from an eminent and palpable superiority. This indeed Eckius had no opportunity of exercising.—Luther demonstrated, in this conference, that the church of Rome, in the earlier ages, had never been acknowledged as superior to other churches; and he combated the pretensions of that church and its bishop, from the testimony of Scripture, the authority of the fathers, and the best ecclesiastical historians, and even from the decrees of the council of Nice; while all the arguments of Eckius were derived from the spurious and insipid Decretals, which were scarcely of 400 years' standing. See Seckendorff's History of Lutheranism.

☞ [f] It may be observed here, that, before Luther's attack upon the store-house of indulgences, Eckius was his intimate friend. The latter must certainly have been uncommonly unworthy, since even the mild and gentle Melancthon represents him as an inhuman persecutor, a sophist, and a knave, who maintained doctrines contrary to his belief, and against his conscience. See the learned Dr. Jortin's Life of Erasmus, vol. ii. p. 713; also Vitus' account of the death of Eckius in Seckendorff, lib. iii. p. 468.

[g] See Melancthon's letter concerning the conference at Leipsic, in Löscherus' Acta et Documenta Reformationis, tom. iii

one of the illustrious and respectable instruments of the Reformation; it may not be improper to give some account of the talents and virtues that rendered his name immortal. His greatest enemies have borne testimony to his merit. They have been forced to acknowledge, that the annals of antiquity exhibit very few worthies that may be compared with him, whether we consider the extent of his knowledge in things human and divine, the fertility and elegance of his genius, the facility and quickness of his comprehension, or the uninterrupted industry that attended his learned and theological labours. He rendered to philosophy and the liberal arts the same eminent service that Luther had done to religion, by purging them from the dross with which they had been corrupted, and by recommending them, in a powerful and persuasive manner, to the study of the Germans. He had the rare talent of discerning truth in its most intricate connexions and combinations, of comprehending at once the most abstract notions, and expressing them with the utmost ease and perspicuity. And he applied this happy talent in religious disquisitions with such unparalleled success, that it may safely be affirmed, that the cause of true Christianity derived from the learning and genius of Melancthon more signal advantages, and a more effectual support, than it received from any of the other doctors of the age. His love of peace and concord, which partly arose from the sweetness of his natural temper, made him desire with ardour that a reformation might be effected without producing a schism in the church, and that the external communion of the contending parties might be preserved uninterrupted and entire. This spirit of mildness and charity, carried perhaps too far, led him sometimes to make concessions that were neither consistent with prudence, nor advantageous to the cause in which he was engaged. It is however certain, that he gave no quarter to those more dangerous and momentous errors that reigned in the church of Rome, but maintained on the contrary that their extirpation was essentially necessary, in order to the restoration of true religion. In the natural complexion of this great man there was something soft, timid, and yielding. Hence originated a certain diffidence of himself, that not only made him examine things with the greatest attention and care, before he resolved upon any measure, but also filled him with uneasy apprehensions where there was no danger, and made him fear even things that, in reality, could never happen. And yet, on the other hand, when the hour of real danger approached, when things bore a formidable aspect, and the cause of religion was in imminent peril, then this timorous man was at once converted into an intrepid hero, looked danger in the face with unshaken constancy, and opposed his adversaries with invincible fortitude. All this shows, that the force of truth and the power of principle had diminished the weaknesses and defects of Melancthon's natural character, without entirely removing them. Had his fortitude been more uniform and steady, his desire of reconciling all interests and pleasing all parties less vehement and excessive, his triumph over the superstitions imbibed in his infancy more complete,[a] he must deservedly have been considered as one of the greatest among men.[b]

XII. While the credit and authority of the pontiff were thus upon the decline in Germany, they received a mortal wound in Switzerland from Ulric Zuingle, a canon of Zurich, whose extensive learning and uncommon sagacity were accompanied with the most heroic intrepidity and resolution.[c] It must even be acknowledged,[d] that this eminent man had perceived some rays of the truth before Luther came to an open rupture with the church of Rome. He was, however, afterwards still farther animated by the example, and instructed by the writings of the Saxon reformer; and thus his zeal for the good cause acquired new strength and vigour; for he not only explained the sacred writings in his public discourses to the people,[e] but also gave, in 1519, a signal proof of his courage, by opposing, with the greatest resolution and success, the ministry of a certain Italian monk, named Bernardine Samson, who was carrying on, in Switzerland, the impious traffick of indulgences with the same impudence that Tetzel had done in Germany.[f] This was the first remarkable event that prepared the way for the reformation among the Helvetic cantons. In process of time, Zuingle pursued with steadiness and resolution the design that he had begun with such courage and success; and some other learned men, educated in Germany, acting with zeal as his colleagues, succeeded so far in removing the credulity of a deluded people, that the pope's supremacy was rejected and denied in the greatest part of Switzerland. It is indeed to be observed, that he did not always use the same methods of conversion that were employed by Luther; nor, upon particular occasions, did he discountenance the use of violent measures against such as adhered with obstinacy to the superstitions of their an-

☞ [a] By this, no doubt, Dr. Mosheim means the credulity this great man discovered with respect to prodigies and dreams, and his having been somewhat addicted to the pretended science of astrology. See Schelhornii Amœnit. Hist. Eccles. et Lit. vol. ii. p. 609.

[b] We have a life of Melancthon, written by Joachim Camerarius; but a more accurate account of this illustrious reformer, composed by a prudent, impartial, and well-informed biographer, as also a complete collection of his works, would be an inestimable present to the republic of letters.

☞ [c] The translator has added, to the portrait of Zuingle, the quality of *heroic intrepidity*, because it was a predominant and remarkable part of the character of this illustrious reformer, whose learning and fortitude, tempered by the greatest moderation, rendered him, perhaps beyond comparison, the brightest ornament of the protestant cause.

☞ [d] Our learned historian does not seem to acknowledge this with pleasure, as the Germans and Swiss contend for the honour of having given the first overtures toward the reformation. If, however, truth has obliged him to make this acknowledgment, he has accompanied it with some modifications which are more artful than accurate. He says, that Zuingle "had perceived some rays of the truth before Luther came to an open rupture," &c. to make us imagine that Luther might have seen the truth long before that rupture happened, and consequently as soon as Zuingle. But it is well known, that the latter, from his early years, had been shocked at several of the superstitious practices of the church of Rome; that, so early as the year 1516,* he had begun to explain the Scriptures to the people, and to censure, though with great prudence and moderation, the errors of a corrupt church; and that he had very noble and extensive ideas of a general reformation, at the very time that Luther retained almost the whole system of popery, indulgences excepted. Luther proceeded very slowly to exempt himself from those prejudices of education, which Zuingle, by the force of an adventurous genius, and an uncommon degree of knowledge and penetration, easily shook off.

☞ [e] This again is inaccurate. It appears from the preceding note, and from the most authentic records, that Zuingle had explained the Scriptures to the people, and called in question the authority and supremacy of the pope, before the name of Luther was known in Switzerland. Besides, instead of receiving instruction from the German reformer, he was much his superior in learning, capacity, and judgment, and was much fitter to be his master than his disciple, as the four volumes in folio which we have of his works abundantly testify.

[f] See Jo. Henr. Hottingeri Hist. Eccles. Helvet. tom. ii. lib. vi.—Ruchart, Histoire de la Reformation en Suisse, tom. i. liv. i.—Gerdes, Histor. Renovati Evangelii, tom. ii.

* Ruchart, Hist. de la Reformation en Suisse, Zuinglii op. tom. i. p. 7. Nouveau Diction. vol. iv. p. 866. Durand, Hist. du xvi. Siecle, tom. ii. p. 8, &c. Jurieu, Apologie pour les Reformateurs, &c. partie i. p. 119.

cestors. He is also said to have attributed, to the civil magistrate, such an extensive power in ecclesiastical affairs, as is quite inconsistent with the essence and genius of religion. But, upon the whole, even envy itself must acknowledge, that his intentions were upright, and his designs worthy of high approbation.

XIII. In the mean time, the religious dissensions in Germany increased, instead of diminishing; for, while Miltitz was treating with Luther in such a mild and prudent manner as offered the fairest prospect of an approaching accommodation, Eckius, inflamed with resentment and fury on account of his defeat, repaired with the utmost precipitation to Rome, to accomplish, as he imagined, the ruin of the bold reformer. There, entering into a league with the Dominicans, who were still in high credit at the papal court, and more especially with their two zealous patrons, De Priero and Caietan, he earnestly entreated Leo to level the thunder of his *anathemas* at the head of the delinquent, and to exclude him from the communion of the church. The Dominicans, desirous of revenging the affront which, in their opinion, their whole order had received by Luther's treatment of their brother Tetzel and their patron Caietan, seconded the furious efforts of Eckius; and the pontiff, overcome by the importunity of these pernicious counsellors, imprudently issued[a] a bull on the 15th of June, 1520, in which forty-one pretended heresies, extracted from the writings of Luther, were solemnly condemned, his works ordered to be publicly burned, and in which he was again summoned, on pain of excommunication, to confess and retract his pretended errors within the space of sixty days, and to throw himself upon the clemency of the pontiff.

XIV. As soon as the account of this rash sentence was communicated to Luther, he thought it was high time to consult both his present defence and his future security; and the first step he took for this purpose, was the renewal of his appeal from the sentence of the pontiff, to the more respectable decision of a general council. But as he foresaw that this appeal would be treated with contempt, and that, when the time prescribed for his recantation should have elapsed, the thunder of excommunication would be levelled at his devoted head, he judged it prudent to withdraw himself voluntarily from the communion of the church of Rome, before he was obliged to leave it by force; and thus to render this new bull of ejection a blow in the air, an exercise of authority without any object to act upon. At the same time, he resolved to execute this wise determination in a public manner, that his voluntary retreat from the communion of a corrupt and superstitious church might be universally known, before the lordly pontiff had prepared his ghostly thunder. With this view, on the 10th of December, 1520, he had a pile of wood erected without the walls of the city;[b] and there, in presence of a prodigious multitude of people of all ranks and orders, he committed to the flames both the bull that had been published against him, and the decretals and canons relating to the pope's supreme jurisdiction. By this he declared to the world, that he was no longer a subject of the pontiff, and that, consequently, the sentence of excommunication against him, which was daily expected from Rome, was entirely superfluous and insignificant; for the man who publicly commits to the flames the code that contains the laws of his sovereign, shows thereby that he has no longer any respect for his government, nor any intention of submitting to his authority; and the man who voluntarily withdraws himself from a society, cannot, with any appearance of reason or common sense, be afterwards forcibly and authoritatively excluded from it. It is not improbable, that Luther was directed, in this critical measure, by persons well skilled in the law, who are generally dexterous in furnishing a perplexed client with nice distinctions and plausible evasions. Be that as it may, he separated himself only from the church of Rome, which considers the pope as infallible, and not from the church considered in a more extensive sense; for he submitted to the decision of the universal church, when that decision should be given in a general council lawfully assembled. When this judicious distinction is considered, it will not appear at all surprising, that many, even of the Roman Catholics, who weighed matters with a certain degree of impartiality and wisdom, and were zealous for the maintenance of the liberties of Germany, justified this bold resolution of Luther.[c] In less than a month after he had taken this noble and important step, a second bull was issued against him, on the 6th of January, 1521, by which he was expelled from the communion of the church, for having insulted the majesty and disowned the supremacy of the pope.[d]

XV. Such iniquitous laws, enacted against the person and doctrine of Luther, produced an effect different from what was expected by the imperious pontiff. Instead of intimidating this bold reformer, they led him to form the project of founding a church upon principles opposite to those of Rome, and to establish, in it, a system of doctrine and ecclesiastical discipline agreeable to the spirit and precepts of the Gospel of truth. This, indeed, was the only resource left to him; for, to submit to the orders of a cruel and insolent enemy, would have been the greatest degree of imprudence imaginable; and to embrace, anew, errors which he had rejected with a just indignation, and exposed with the clearest evidence, would have discovered a want of integrity and principle, worthy only of the most abandoned profligate. From this time, therefore, he applied himself to the pursuit of the truth with increased assiduity and fervour; nor did he only review with attention, and confirm by new arguments, what he had hitherto taught, but went far beyond it, and made vigorous attacks

[a] The wisest and best part of the Roman catholics acknowledge, that Leo was chargeable with the most culpable imprudence in this rash and violent method of proceeding. See a Dissertation of the learned John Frederic Mayer, de Pontificis Leonis X. processum adversus Lutherum improbantibus, which is part of a work published at Hamburg, in 1698, under this singular title: Ecclesia Romana Reformationis Lutheranæ patrona et cliens. There were several wise and thinking persons at this time about the pontiff, who declared openly, without the least ceremony, their disapprobation of the violent counsels of Eckius and the Dominicans, and gave it as their opinion, that it was both prudent and just to wait for the issue of the conferences of Miltitz with Luther, before such forcible measures should be employed.

[b] Of Wittenberg.

[c] This judicious distinction has not been sufficiently attended to: and the Romanists, some through artifice, others through ignorance, have confounded the *papacy* with the *catholic church*, though they are, in reality, two different things. The papacy, indeed, by the ambitious dexterity of the Roman pontiffs, incorporated itself by degrees into the church; but it was a preposterous supplement, and was really as foreign to its genuine constitution, as a new *citadel, erected* by a successful usurper, would be to an *ancient city*. Luther set out and acted upon this distinction; he went out of the citadel, but he intended to remain in the city, and, like a good patriot, hoped to reform its corrupted government.

[d] Both these bulls are to be found in the Bullarium Romanum, and also in the learned Pfaff's Histor. Theol. Literar.

upon the principal fortress of popery, the power and jurisdiction of the Roman pontiff, which he overturned from its very foundation. In this noble undertaking he was seconded by many learned and pious men, in various parts of Europe; by those professors of the university of Wittenberg, who had adopted his principles; and in a more especial manner by the celebrated Melancthon; and, as the fame of Luther's wisdom and Melancthon's learning had filled that academy with an incredible number of students, who flocked to it from all parts, this happy circumstance propagated the principles of the Reformation with an amazing rapidity through all the countries of Europe.[a]

XVI. Not long after the commencement of these divisions, Maximilian I. had resigned his breath; and his grandson, Charles I. of Spain and V. of Austria, had succeeded him in the empire in 1519. Leo seized this new occasion of venting and executing his vengeance, by putting the new emperor in mind of his character as 'advocate and defender of the church,' and demanding the exemplary punishment of Luther, who had rebelled against its sacred laws and institutions. On the other hand, Frederic the Wise employed his credit with Charles to prevent the publication of any unjust edict against this reformer, and to have his cause tried by the canons of the Germanic church, and the laws of the empire. This request was so much the more likely to be granted, as Charles was under much greater obligations to Frederic than to any other of the German princes; for it was chiefly by his zealous and important services that he had been raised to the empire, in opposition to the pretensions of such a formidable rival as Francis I. king of France. The emperor was sensible of his obligations to the worthy elector, and was disposed to satisfy his demands. That, however, he might do this without displeasing the Roman pontiff, he resolved that Luther should be called before the council which was to be assembled at Worms in 1521, and that his cause should be there publicly heard, before any definitive sentence should be pronounced against him. It may perhaps appear strange, and even inconsistent with the laws of the church, that a cause of a religious nature should be examined and decided in the public diet. But it must be considered that these diets, in which the archbishops, bishops, and even some abbots, had their places, as well as the princes of the empire, were not only political assemblies, but also provincial councils for Germany, to whose jurisdiction, by the ancient canon law, such causes as that of Luther properly belonged.

XVII. Luther, therefore, appeared at Worms, secured against the violence of his enemies by a safe-conduct from the emperor, and, on the 17th of April, pleaded his cause before that grand assembly with the utmost resolution and presence of mind. Menaces and entreaties were alternately employed to conquer the firmness of his purpose, to engage him to renounce the propositions he had hitherto maintained, and to bend him to a submission to the Roman pontiff. But he opposed all these attempts with a noble obstinacy, and peremptorily declared that he would never abandon his opinions, or change his conduct, unless he should be convinced by the word of God, or the dictates of right reason, that his opinions were erroneous, and his conduct unlawful. When therefore neither promises nor threats could shake the constancy of this magnanimous reformer, he obtained, indeed, from the emperor, the liberty of returning unmolested to his home: but, after his departure from the diet, he was condemned by the unanimous suffrages both of the emperor and the princes, and was declared an enemy to the holy Roman empire.[b] Frederic, who saw the storm rising against Luther, used the best precautions to secure him from its violence. For this purpose he sent three or four persons in whom he could confide, to meet him on his return from the diet, in order to conduct him to a place of safety. These emissaries, disguised by masks, executed their commission with the utmost secrecy and success. Meeting with Luther near Eisenach, they seized him, and carried him into the castle of Wartenberg; nor, as some have imagined upon probable grounds, was this done without the knowledge of his imperial majesty. In this retreat, which he called his Patmos, the reformer lay concealed for ten months, and employed this involuntary leisure in compositions that were afterwards very useful to the world.[c]

XVIII. His active spirit could not, however, long bear this confinement; he therefore left his Patmos in March, 1522, without the consent or even the knowledge of his patron and protector Frederic, and repaired to Wittenberg. One of the principal motives that engaged him to take this

[a] There is a particular account of the rapid progress of the reformation in Germany, given by the learned Daniel Gerdes, professor at Groningen, in his Historia renovati Evangelii.

☞ [b] This sentence, which was dated the 8th of May, 1521, was excessively severe; and Charles, whether through sincere zeal or political cunning, showed himself in this affair an ardent abettor of the papal authority; for in this edict the pope is declared the only true judge of the controversy, in which he was evidently a party concerned; Luther is declared a member cut off from the church, a schismatic, a notorious and obstinate heretic;' 'the severest punishments are denounced against those who shall receive, entertain, maintain, or countenance him, either by acts of hospitality, by conversation or writing; and all his disciples, adherents, and followers, are involved in the same condemnation. This edict was, however, received with the highest disapprobation by all wise and thinking persons, 1st, because Luther had been condemned without being heard, at Rome, by the college of cardinals, and afterwards at Worms, where, without any discussion or refutation of his doctrine, he was only despotically ordered to abandon and renounce it; 2dly, because Charles V., as emperor, had not a right to give an authoritative sentence against the doctrine of Luther, or to take for granted the infallibility of the Roman pontiff, before these matters were discussed and decided by a general council; and, 3dly, because a considerable number of the German princes, who were immediately interested in this affair, such as the electors of Cologne, Saxony, and the Palatinate, and other sovereign princes, had neither been present at the diet, nor examined and approved the edict; and, therefore, at best, it could only have force in the territories belonging to the house of Austria, and to such of the princes as had given their consent to its publication. But, after all, this edict produced scarcely any effect, not only for the reasons now mentioned, but also because Charles, whose presence, authority, and zeal, were necessary to render it respectable, was involved in other affairs of a civil nature which he had more at heart. Obliged to pass successively into Flanders, England, and Spain, to quell the seditions of his subjects, and to form new alliances against his great enemy and rival Francis, he lost sight of the edict, while it was treated with the highest indignation or the utmost contempt by all who had any regard for the liberties of the empire and the rights of the Germanic church.

☞ [c] This precaution of the humane and excellent elector being put in execution, on the 3d of May, five days before the solemn publication of the edict of Worms, the pope missed his blow; and the adversaries of Luther became doubly odious to the people in Germany, who, unacquainted with the scheme of Frederic, and not knowing what was become of their favourite reformer, imagined that he was imprisoned, or perhaps destroyed, by the emissaries of Rome. In the mean time, Luther lived in peace and quiet in the castle of Wartenberg, where he translated a great part of the New Testament into the German language, and wrote frequent letters to his trusty friends and intimates to comfort them under his absence. Nor was his confinement here inconsistent with amusement and relaxation; for he frequently enjoyed the pleasure of hunting in company with his keepers, passing for a country gentleman, under the appellation of *Younker George*.

bold step, was the information he had received of the inconsiderate conduct of Carlostadt, and some other friends of the Reformation, who had already excited tumults in Saxony, and were acting in a manner equally prejudicial to the tranquillity of the state, and the true interests of the church. Carlostadt, professor at Wittenberg, was a man of considerable learning, who had pierced the veil, with which papal artifice and superstition had covered the truth, and, at the instigation of Eckius, had been excluded with Luther from the communion of the church. His zeal, however, was intemperate; his plans were laid with temerity, and executed without moderation. During Luther's absence, he threw down and broke the images of the saints that were placed in the churches, and instead of restraining the vehemence of a fanatical multitude, who had already begun in some places to abuse the precious liberty that was dawning upon them, he encouraged their ill-timed violence, and led them on to sedition and mutiny. Luther opposed the impetuosity of this imprudent reformer with the utmost fortitude and dignity, and wisely exhorted him and his adherents to eradicate error from the minds of the people, before they made war upon its external ensigns in the churches and public places; since, the former being once removed, the latter must fall of course,[a] and since the destruction of the latter alone could be attended with no lasting fruits. To these prudent admonitions this excellent reformer added the influence of example, by applying himself, with redoubled industry and zeal, to his German translation of the Holy Scriptures, which he carried on with expedition and success,[b] with the assistance of some learned and pious men whom he consulted in this important undertaking. The event abundantly showed the wisdom of Luther's advice; for the different parts of this translation, being successively and gradually spread abroad among the people, produced sudden and almost incredible effects, and extirpated, root and branch, the erroneous principles and superstitious doctrines of the church of Rome from the minds of a prodigious number of persons.

XIX. During these transactions, Leo died, and was succeeded in the pontificate by Adrian VI., a native of Utrecht. This pope, who had formerly been preceptor to Charles V., and who owed his new dignity to the good offices of that prince, was a man of probity and candour, who acknowledged ingenuously that the church laboured under the most fatal disorders, and declared his willingness to apply the remedies that should be judged the most adapted to heal them.[c] He began his pontificate by sending a legate to the diet, which was assembled at Nuremberg in 1522. Francis Cheregato, the person who was intrusted with this commission, had positive orders to demand the speedy and vigorous execution of the sentence that had been pronounced against Luther and his followers at the diet of Worms; but, at the same time, he was authorised to declare that the pontiff was ready to remove the abuses and grievances that had armed such a formidable enemy against the see of Rome. The princes of the empire, encouraged by this declaration, and also by the absence of the emperor, who at this time resided in Spain, seized this opportunity of proposing the convocation of a general council in Germany, in order to deliberate upon the proper methods of bringing about a universal reformation of the church. They exhibited, at the same time, a hundred articles, containing the heaviest complaints of the injurious treatment which the Germans had hitherto received from the court of Rome, and, by a public law, prohibited all innovation in religious matters, until a general council should decide what ought to be done in an affair of such high importance.[d] As long as the German princes were unacquainted with, or inattentive to, the measures that were taken in Saxony for founding a new church in direct opposition to that of Rome, they were zealously unanimous in their endeavours to set bounds to the papal authority and jurisdiction, which they all looked upon as overgrown and enormous; nor were they at all offended at Luther's contest with the pontiff, which they considered as a dispute of a private and personal nature.

XX. The good pope Adrian did not long enjoy the pleasure of sitting at the head of the church. He died in 1523, and was succeeded by Clement VII., a man of a

☞ If we cast an eye upon the conduct of Luther, in this first scene of his trials, we shall find a true spirit of rational zeal, generous probity, and Christian fortitude, animating this reformer. In his behaviour, before and at the diet of Worms, we observe these qualities shining with a peculiar lustre, and tempered, notwithstanding the warmth of his complexion, with an unexpected degree of moderation and decent respect both for his civil and ecclesiastical superiors. When some of his friends, informed of the violent designs of the Roman court, and alarmed by the bull that had been published against him by the rash pontiff, advised him not to expose his person at the diet, notwithstanding the imperial safe-conduct, (which, in a similar case, had not been sufficient to protect John Huss and Jerome of Prague from the perfidy and cruelty of their enemies,) he answered with his usual intrepidity, that "were he obliged to encounter at Worms as many devils as there were tiles upon the houses of that city, this would not deter him from his fixed purpose of appearing there; that fear, in his case, could be only a suggestion of Satan, who apprehended the approaching ruin of his kingdom, and who was willing to avoid a public defeat before such a grand assembly." The fire and obstinacy that appeared in this answer seemed to prognosticate much warmth and vehemence in his conduct at the assembly. But it was quite otherwise. He exposed with decency and dignity the superstitious doctrines and practices of the church of Rome, and the grievances that arose from the over-grown power of its pontiff, and the abuse that was made of it. He acknowledged the writings with which he was charged, and offered, both with moderation and humility, to defend their contents. He desired the pope's legates and their adherents to hear him, to inform him, to reason with him; and solemnly offered, in presence of the assembled princes and bishops, to renounce his doctrines, if they were shown to be erroneous. But to all these expostulations he received no other answer, than the despotic dictates of mere authority, attended with injurious and provoking language

☞ [a] Dr. Mosheim's account of this matter is perhaps more advantageous to Luther than the rigorous demands of historical impartiality will admit: at least the defects of the great reformer are here shaded with art. It is evident from several passages in the writings of Luther, that he was by no means averse to the use of images, but that, on the contrary, he looked upon them as adapted to excite and animate the devotion of the people. But, perhaps, the true reason of his displeasure at the proceedings of Carlostadt, was, that he could not bear to see another crowned with the glory of executing a plan which he had formed and that he was ambitious of appearing the principal, if not the only, conductor of this great work. This is not a mere conjecture. Luther himself has not taken the least pains to conceal this instance of his ambition: and it appears evidently in several of his letters. On the other hand, it must be owned, that Carlostadt was rash, violent, and prone to enthusiasm, as appears by the connexions he formed afterwards with the fanatical anabaptists, headed by Munzer. His contest with Luther about the eucharist, in which he manifestly maintained the truth, shall be mentioned in its proper place.

[b] Of this German translation of the Bible, which contributed more than all other causes, taken together, to strengthen the foundations of the Lutheran church, we have an interesting history composed by Jo Fred. Mayer, and published at Hamburg in 1701. A more ample one was expected from the labours of the learned J. Melchior Kraft; but his death disappointed the hopes of the learned. See Jo. Alb. Fabricii Centifolium Lutheranum, part. i. p. 147, and part. ii. p. 617.

[c] See Caspar. Burmanni Adrianus VI. sive Analecta Historica de Adriano VI. Papa Romano, published at Utrecht in 1727.

[d] See Jac. Fred. Georgii Gravamina Germanorum adversus Sedem Romanam, lib. ii. p. 327.

reserved character, and prone to artifice.[a] This pontiff sent to the imperial diet at Nuremberg, in 1524, a cardinal legate, named Campeggio, whose orders, with respect to the affairs of Luther, breathed nothing but severity and violence, and who inveighed against the lenity of the German princes in delaying the execution of the decree of Worms, while he carefully avoided the smallest mention of Adrian's promise of reforming the corruptions of a superstitious church. The emperor seconded the demands of Campeggio, by the orders he sent to his minister to insist upon the execution of the decree. The princes of the empire, tired out by these importunities and remonstrances, changed in appearance the law they had passed, but confirmed it in reality; for, while they promised to observe the edict, as far as it was possible, they renewed their demand of a general council, and left all other disputed points to be examined and decided at the diet that was soon to be assembled at Spire. The pope's legate, on the other hand, perceiving by these proceedings, that the German princes in general were no enemies to the Reformation, retired to Ratisbon, with the bishops and those princes who adhered to the cause of Rome, and there drew from them a new declaration, by which they engaged themselves to execute the edict with rigour in their respective dominions.

XXI. While the efforts of Luther toward the reformation of the church were so far successful, and almost all the nations seemed disposed to open their eyes upon the light, two unhappy occurrences, one of a foreign, and the other of a domestic nature, contributed greatly to retard the progress of this salutary and glorious work. The domestic, or internal incident, was a controversy concerning the *manner* in which the body and blood of Christ were present in the eucharist, that arose among those whom the pope had publicly excluded from the communion of the church, and unhappily produced among the friends of the good cause the most deplorable animosities and divisions. Luther and his followers, though they had rejected the monstrous doctrine of the church of Rome with respect to transubstantiation, or the change of the bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ, were nevertheless of opinion, that the partakers of the Lord's supper received, with the bread and wine, the real body and blood of Christ. This, in their judgment, was a mystery, which they did not pretend to explain.[b] Carlostadt, who was Luther's colleague, understood the matter otherwise; and his doctrine, which was afterwards more fully illustrated and confirmed by Zuingle, amounted to this: "That the body and blood of Christ were not *really* present in the eucharist; and that the bread and wine were no more than external *signs*, or *symbols*, designed to excite in the minds of Christians the remembrance of the sufferings and death of the divine Saviour, and of the benefits which arise from it."[c] This opinion was embraced by all the friends of the Reformation in Switzerland, and by a considerable number of its votaries in Germany. On the other hand, Luther maintained his doctrine, in relation to this point, with the utmost obstinacy; and hence arose, in 1524, a tedious and vehement controversy, which, notwithstanding the zealous endeavours that were used to reconcile the contending parties, terminated, at length, in a mischievous division between those who had embarked together in the sacred cause of religion and liberty.

XXII. To these intestine divisions were added the horrors of a civil war, which was the fatal effect of oppression on the one hand, and of enthusiasm on the other, and, by its unhappy consequences, proved prejudicial to the cause and progress of the Reformation. In 1525, a prodigious multitude of seditious fanatics suddenly arose, like a whirlwind, in different parts of Germany, took arms, united their forces, waged war against the laws, the magistrates, and the empire in general, ravaged the country with fire and sword, and exhibited daily the most horrid spectacles of unrelenting barbarity. The greatest part of this furious and formidable mob was composed of peasants and vassals, who groaned under heavy burthens, and declared they were no longer able to bear the despotic severity of their chiefs; and hence this sedition was called the *Rustic war*, or the war of the peasants.[d] But it is also certain, that this motley crowd was intermixed with numbers, who joined in this sedition from different motives, some being impelled by the suggestions of enthusiasm, and others by the profligate and odious views of rapine and plunder, of repairing fortunes ruined by extravagant and dissolute living. At the first breaking out of this war, it seemed to have been kindled only by civil and political views; and agreeable to this is the general tenour of the Declarations and Manifestoes that were published by these rioters. The claims they made in these papers related to nothing farther than the diminution of the tasks imposed upon the peasants, and to their obtaining a greater measure of liberty than they had hitherto enjoyed. Religion seemed to be out of the question; at least, it was not the object of deliberation or debate. But no sooner had the enthusiast Munzer[e] put himself at the head of this outrageous rabble, than the face of things changed entirely; and, by the instigation of this man, who had deceived numbers before this time by his pretended visions and inspirations, the civil commotions in Saxony and Thuringia were soon directed toward a new object, and were turned into a religious war. The sentiments, however, of this seditious and dissolute multitude were greatly divided, and their demands were very different. One part of their

[a] See Jac. Zeigleri Historia Clementis VII. in Jo. Georgii Schelhornii Amœnit. Histor. Eccles. tom. ii. p. 210.

☞ [b] Luther was not so modest as Dr. Mosheim here represents him. He pretended to explain his doctrine of the real presence, absurd and contradictory as it was, and uttered much senseless jargon on this subject. As in a red-hot iron, said he, two distinct substances, namely, iron and fire, are united, so is the body of Christ joined with the bread in the eucharist. I mention this miserable comparison to show into what absurdities the towering pride of system will often betray men of deep sense and true genius.

[c] See Val. Ern. Löscheri Historia Motuum inter Lutheranos et Reformatos, part i. lib. ii. cap. i.—See, on the other side of the question, Scultet's Annales Evangelii, published by Vonder Hardt in his Historia Liter. Reformat.; also Rud. Hospinianus, and other reformed writers, who have treated of the origin and progress of this dispute.——☞ It appears from this representation (which is a just one) of the sentiments of Zuingle concerning the holy sacrament of the Lord's supper, that they were the same with those maintained by bishop Hoadly, in his Plain Account of the Nature and Design of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper.

[d] These kinds of wars or commotions, arising from the impatience of the peasants, under the heavy burthens that were imposed on them, were very common long before the time of Luther. Hence the author of the Danish Chronicle (published by the learned Ludewig in his Reliq. MStorum) calls these insurrections a *common evil*. This will not appear surprising to such as consider, that, in most places, the condition of the peasants was much more intolerable and grievous before the Reformation, than it is in our times; and that the tyranny and cruelty of the nobility, before that happy period, were excessive and insupportable.

[e] Or Munster, as some call him.

number pleaded for an exemption from all laws, a licentious immunity from every sort of government; another, less outrageous and extravagant, confined their demands to a diminution of the taxes they were forced to pay, and of burthens under which they groaned;[a] another insisted upon a new form of religious doctrine, government, and worship, upon the establishment of a pure and unspotted church, and to add weight to this requisition, pretended, that it was suggested by the Holy Ghost, with which they were divinely and miraculously inspired; while a very considerable proportion of this furious rabble were without any distinct view or fixed purpose, and, being infected with the contagious spirit of sedition, and exasperated by the severity of their magistrates and rulers, went on headlong without reflection or foresight into every act of violence and cruelty which rebellion and enthusiasm could suggest: so that, if it cannot be denied that many of these rioters perversely misunderstood the doctrine of Luther concerning Christian liberty, and thence took occasion to commit the disorders that rendered them so justly odious, yet it would be a most absurd instance of partiality and injustice to charge that doctrine with the blame of those extravagant outrages which arose only from the manifest abuse of it. Luther himself, indeed, sufficiently defended both his principles and his cause against any such imputations, by the books he wrote against the riotous sect, and the advice he addressed to the princes of the empire to take arms against them. Accordingly, in 1525, the turbulent malcontents were defeated in a pitched battle fought at Mulhausen; and Munzer, their ringleader, was put to death.[b]

XXIII. While this fanatical insurrection raged in Germany, Frederic the Wise, elector of Saxony, departed this life. This excellent prince, whose character was distinguished by an uncommon degree of prudence and moderation, had, during his life, been a sort of mediator between the Roman pontiff and the reformer of Wittenberg, and had always entertained the pleasing hope of restoring peace in the church, and of so reconciling the contending parties as to prevent a separation either in point of ecclesiastical jurisdiction or religious communion. Hence it was, that while he made no opposition to Luther's design of reforming a corrupt and superstitious church, but rather encouraged him in the execution of this pious purpose, yet he was at no pains to introduce any change into the churches which were established in his own dominions, or to subject them to his jurisdiction. The elector John, his brother and successor, acted in a very different manner. Convinced of the truth of Luther's doctrine, and persuaded, that it must lose ground and be soon suppressed if the despotic authority of the Roman pontiff remained undisputed and entire, he, without hesitation or delay, assumed to himself that supremacy in ecclesiastical matters which every lawful sovereign may claim as his natural right, and founded and established a church in his dominions, very different from the church of Rome, in doctrine, discipline, and government. To bring this new and happy establishment to as great a degree of perfection as was possible, this resolute and active prince ordered a body of laws, relating to the form of ecclesiastical government, the method of public worship, the rank, offices, and revenues of the priesthood, and other matters of that nature, to be drawn up by Luther and Melancthon, and promulgated by heralds throughout his dominions in 1527. He also took care that all the churches should be supplied with pious and learned ministers, and that such of the clergy as dishonoured religion by their bad morals, or were incapable, from their want of talents, of promoting its influence, should be removed from the sacred function. The illustrious example of this elector was followed by all the princes and states of Germany that were unfriendly to the papal supremacy and jurisdiction; and similar forms of worship, discipline, and government, were thus introduced into all the churches which dissented from that of Rome. Thus may the elector John be considered as the second parent and founder of the Lutheran church, which he alone rendered a complete and independent body, distinct from the superstitious church of Rome, and fenced about with salutary laws, with a wise and well-balanced constitution. But as the best blessings may, through the influence of human corruption, become the innocent occasions of great inconveniences, such particularly was the fate of those wise and vigorous measures which this elector took for the reformation of the church; for, from that time the religious differences between the German princes, which had been hitherto kept within the bounds of moderation, broke out into a violent and lasting flame. The prudence, or rather timidity, of Frederic the Wise, who avoided every resolute measure that might tend to kindle the fire of discord, had preserved a sort of external union and concord among these princes, notwithstanding their differences in opinion. But as soon as his successor by the open and undisguised steps he took, made it glaringly evident, that he designed to withdraw the churches in his dominions from the jurisdiction of Rome, and to reform the doctrine, discipline, and worship that had been hitherto established, then indeed the scene changed. The union, which was more specious than solid, and which was far from being well cemented, was suddenly dissolved: the spirits were heated and divided, and an open rupture ensued among the German princes, of whom one party embraced the Reformation, while the other adhered to the superstitions of their forefathers.

XXIV. Affairs being reduced to this violent and troubled state, the patrons of popery gave intimations that were far from being ambiguous, of their intention to make *war* upon the Lutheran party, and to suppress by *force* the doctrines which they were incapable of overturning by *argument;* and this design would certainly have been put in execution, had not the troubles of Europe disconcerted their measures. The Lutherans, informed of these hostile intentions, began to deliberate upon the most effectual methods of defending themselves against superstition armed with violence, and formed the plan of a confederacy that might answer this prudent purpose. In the mean time the diet, assembled at Spire in 1526, at which Ferdinand, the emperor's brother, presided, ended in a manner more favourable to the friends of the Reformation, than they could naturally expect. The emperor's ambassadors at this diet were ordered to use their most earnest

[a] These burthens were the duties of vassalage or feudal services, which, in many respects, were truly grievous.

[b] "Petri Gnodalii Historia de Seditione repentinâ Vulgi, præcipue Rusticorum, anno 1525, tempore verno per universam fere Germaniam exortâ, *Basil*, 1570."—See also B. Tenzelii Histor. Reform. tom. ii. p 331, and the observations of Ernest Cyprian upon that work.

endeavours for the suppression of all farther disputes concerning religion, and to insist upon the rigorous execution of the edict of Worms. The greatest part of the German princes strongly opposed this motion, declaring, that they could not execute that sentence, nor come to any determination with respect to the doctrines by which it had been occasioned, before the whole matter should be submitted to the cognizance of a general council lawfully assembled; alleging farther, that the decision of controversies of this nature belonged properly to such a council, and to it alone. This opinion, after long and warm debates, was adopted by a great majority, and, at length, consented to by the whole assembly; for it was unanimously agreed to present a solemn address to the emperor, beseeching him to assemble, without delay, a free and general council: and it was also agreed, that, in the mean time, the princes and states of the empire should, in their respective dominions, be at liberty to manage ecclesiastical matters in the manner which they might deem the most expedient, yet so as to be able to give to God and to the emperor an account of their administration, when it should be demanded of them.

XXV. Nothing could be more favourable to those who had the cause of pure and genuine Christianity at heart, than a resolution of this nature. For the emperor was, at this time, so entirely taken up in regulating the troubled state of his dominions in France, Spain, and Italy, which exhibited, from day to day, new scenes of perplexity, that, for some years, it was not in his power to turn his attention to the affairs of Germany in general, and still less to the state of religion in particular, which was beset with difficulties that, to a reflecting politician like Charles, must have appeared peculiarly critical and dangerous. Besides, had he really possessed leisure to form, or power to execute, a plan that might terminate, in favour of the Roman pontiff, the religious disputes which prevailed in Germany, it is evident that the inclination was wanting, and that Clement VII., who now sat in the papal chair, had nothing to expect from the good offices of Charles; for this pontiff, after the defeat of Francis at the battle of Pavia, filled with uneasy apprehensions of the growing power of the emperor in Italy, entered into a confederacy with the French and the Venetians against that prince. This measure inflamed the resentment and indignation of Charles to such a degree, that he abolished the papal authority in his Spanish dominions, made war upon the pope, laid siege to Rome in 1527, blocked up Clement in the castle of St. Angelo, and exposed him to the most severe and contumelious treatment. These critical events, together with the liberty granted by the diet of Spire, were prudently and industriously improved, by the friends of the Reformation, to the advantage of their cause, and to the augmentation of their number. Several princes, whom the fear of persecution and punishment had hitherto prevented from lending a hand to the good work, being delivered now from their restraint, publicly renounced the superstition of Rome, and introduced among their subjects the same forms of religious worship, and the same system of doctrine, that had been received in Saxony. Others, though placed in such circumstances as discouraged them from acting in an open manner against the interests of the pope, were far from manifesting any intention of opposing those who withdrew the people from his despotic yoke; nor did they molest the private assemblies of those who had separated themselves from the church of Rome. And all the Germans who, before the resolutions of the diet of Spire, had rejected the papal discipline and doctrine, were now, in consequence of the liberty they enjoyed by these resolutions, wholly employed in bringing their schemes and plans to a certain degree of consistency, and in adding vigour and firmness to the glorious cause in which they were engaged. In the mean time, Luther and his fellow-labourers, particularly those who were with him at Wittenberg, by their writings, their instructions, their admonitions and counsels, inspired the timorous with fortitude, dispelled the doubts of the ignorant, fixed the principles and resolution of the floating and inconstant, and animated all the friends of genuine Christianity with a spirit suitable to the grandeur of their undertaking.

XXVI. But the tranquillity and liberty they enjoyed, in consequence of the resolutions taken in the first diet of Spire, were not of long duration. They were interrupted by a new diet assembled, in 1529, in the same place, by the emperor, after he had appeased the commotions and troubles which had employed his attention in several parts of Europe, and concluded a treaty of peace with Clement. This prince, having now, in a great measure, shaken off the burthen that had for some time overwhelmed him, had leisure to direct the affairs of the church; and this the reformers soon felt by a disagreeable experience. For the power, which had been granted by the former diet to every prince, of managing ecclesiastical matters as he thought proper, until the meeting of a general council, was now revoked by a majority of votes, and not only so, but every change was declared unlawful that should be introduced into the doctrine, discipline, or worship of the established religion, before the determination of the approaching council was known.[a] This decree was justly considered as iniquitous and intolerable by the elector of Saxony, the landgrave of Hesse, and such other members of the diet, as were persuaded of the necessity of a reformation in the church. Nor was any one so simple, or so little acquainted with the politics of Rome, as to look upon the promise of assembling speedily a general council, in any other light, than as an artifice to quiet the minds of the people; since it was easy to perceive, that a lawful council, free from the despotic influence of Rome, was the very last thing that a pope would grant in such a critical state of affairs. Therefore, when the princes and members now mentioned found that all their arguments and remonstrances against this unjust decree made no impression upon Ferdinand,[b] or upon the abettors of the ancient superstitions, (whom the pope's legate animated by his presence and exhortations,) they entered a solemn *protest* against this decree, on the 19th of April, and appealed to the emperor and to a future council.[c] Hence

☞ [a] The resolution of the first diet of Spire, which had been taken unanimously, was revoked in the second, and another substituted in its place by a plurality of voices, which, as several of the princes then present observed, could not give to any decree the force of a law throughout the empire.

☞ [b] As the emperor was at Barcelona, while this diet was held at Spire, his brother Ferdinand was president in his place.

☞ [c] The princes of the empire, who entered this protest, and are consequently to be considered as the first protestant princes, were John, elector of Saxony, George, elector of Brandenburg, for Franconia,

arose the denomination of *Protestants*, given from this period to those who renounce the superstitious communion of the church of Rome.

XXVII. The dissenting princes, who were the protectors and heads of the reformed churches, had no sooner entered their protest, than they sent proper persons to the emperor, who was then upon his passage from Spain to Italy, to acquaint him with their proceedings in this affair. The ministers employed in this commission, executed the orders they had received with the greatest resolution and presence of mind, and behaved with the spirit and firmness of the princes, whose sentiments and conduct they were sent to justify and explain. The emperor, whose pride was wounded by this fortitude in persons that dared to oppose his designs, ordered the ambassadors to be apprehended, and detained for several days. Intelligence of this violent step was soon brought to the protestant princes, and made them conclude that their personal safety, and the success of their cause, depended entirely upon their courage and concord, the one animated, and the other cemented by a solemn confederacy. They, therefore, held several meetings at Nuremberg, Smalcald, and other places, in order to deliberate upon the means of forming such a powerful league as might enable them to repel the violence of their enemies.[a] But so different were their opinions and views of things, that they could come to no satisfactory conclusion.

XXVIII. Among the incidents that promoted animosity and discord between the friends of the Reformation, and prevented that union which was so much to be desired among persons embarked in the same good cause, the principal one was the dispute that had arisen between the divines of Saxony and Switzerland, concerning the manner of Christ's presence in the *eucharist*. To terminate this controversy, Philip, landgrave of Hesse, invited, in 1529, to a conference at Marpurg, Luther and Zuingle, with some of the most eminent doctors who adhered to the respective parties of these contending chiefs. This expedient, which was designed by that truly magnanimous prince, not so much to end the matter by keen debate, as to accommodate differences by the conciliatory spirit of charity and prudence, was not attended with the salutary fruits that were expected from it. The divines that were assembled for this pacific purpose disputed, during four days, in presence of the landgrave. The principal champions in these debates were Luther, who attacked Œcolampadius, and Melancthon, who disputed against Zuingle; and the controversy turned upon several points of theology, in relation to which the Swiss doctors were supposed to entertain erroneous sentiments. For Zuingle was accused of heresy, not only on account of his explication of the nature and design of the Lord's Supper, but also in consequence of the false notions which he was supposed to have adopted, relating to the divinity of Christ, the efficacy of the divine word, original sin, and some other parts of the Christian doctrine. This illustrious reformer cleared himself, however, from the greatest part of these accusations, with the most triumphant evidence, and in such a manner as appeared entirely satisfactory, even to Luther himself. The dissension concerning the manner of Christ's presence in the eucharist still remained; nor could either of the contending parties be persuaded to abandon, or even to modify, their opinion of that matter.[b] The only advantage, therefore, that resulted from this conference, was, that the jarring doctors formed a sort of truce, by agreeing to a mutual toleration of their respective sentiments, and leaving the cure of their divisions to the disposal of Providence, and the effect of time, which sometimes cools the rage of party.

XXIX. The ministers of the churches which had embraced the sentiments of Luther, were preparing a new embassy to the emperor, when an account was received of the intention of that prince to come into Germany, with a view of terminating, in the approaching diet at Augsburg, the religious disputes which had produced such animosities and divisions in the empire. Charles, though long absent from Germany, and engaged in affairs that left him little leisure for theological disquisitions, was nevertheless attentive to these disputes, and foresaw their consequences. He had also, to his own deliberate reflections upon these disputes, added the counsels of men of wisdom, sagacity, and experience, and was thus, at certain seasons, rendered more cool in his proceedings, and more moderate and impartial in his opinion both of the contending parties and of the merits of the cause. He therefore, in an interview with the pope at Bologna, insisted, in the most serious and urgent manner, upon the necessity of assembling a general council. His remonstrances and expostulations could not, however, move Clement, who maintained with zeal the papal prerogatives, imputed to the emperor an ill-judged clemency, and alleged that it was the duty of that prince to support the church, and to execute speedy vengeance upon the obstinate *heretical* faction, who dared to call in question the authority of Rome and its pontiff. The imperial potentate was as little affected by this haughty discourse, as the pope had been by his wise remonstrances, and looked upon it as a most iniquitous thing, a measure also in direct opposition to the laws of the empire, to condemn, unheard, and to destroy, without any evidence of their demerit, a set of men, who had always approved themselves good citizens, and had in various respects deserved well of their country. Hitherto, indeed, it was not easy for Charles to form a clear idea of the matters in debate, since no regular system had yet been composed of the doctrines embraced by Luther and his followers, by which their real opinions, and the true causes of their opposition to the Roman pontiff, might be known with certainty. As, therefore, it was impossible, without some declaration of this nature, to examine with accuracy, or decide with equity, a matter of such high importance as that which gave rise to the divisions between the votaries of Rome and the friends of the Reformation, the elector of Saxony ordered Luther, and other eminent divines, to commit to writing,

Ernest and Francis, dukes of Lunenburg, the landgrave of Hesse, and the prince of Anhalt. These princes were supported by thirteen imperial towns, viz. Strasburg, Ulm, Nuremberg, Constance, Rottingen, Windsheim, Memmingen, Nordlingen, Lindaw, Kempten, Heilbron, Weissenburg, and St. Gall.

[a] See the history of the confession of Augsburg, written in German by the learned Christ. Aug. Salig, tom. i. book ii. ch. i. p. 128, and more especially an important work by Dr. Joachim Muller, entitled Historie von der Evangelischen Stande Protestation gegen den Speyerschen Reichs-Abscheid von 1529, Appellation, &c. published at Jena in 1705.

[b] Val. Ern. Löscheri Historia Motuum inter Lutheranos et Reformatos, tom. i. lib. i. cap. vi. p. 143.—Henr. Bullingeri Historia Colloquii Marpurgensis, in Jo. Conr. Fuesslin's Beytragen zur Schweizer Reformat. Geschichte, tom. iii.—Abr. Sculteti Annal. Reformat. ad annum 1529.—Rudolphi Hospiniani Histor. Sacramentor. part. ii.

the chief articles of their religious system, and the principal points in which they differed from the church of Rome. Luther, in compliance with this order, delivered to the elector, at Torgaw, the seventeen articles which had been drawn up and voted in the conference at Sultzbach in 1529; and hence they were called the *articles of Torgaw*.[a] Though these articles were deemed by Luther a sufficient declaration of the sentiments of the reformers, yet it was judged proper to enlarge them; and, by a judicious detail, to give perspicuity to the arguments, and thereby strength to the cause. It was this consideration that engaged the protestant princes, assembled at Coburg and Augsburg, to employ Melancthon in extending these articles, in which important work he showed a due regard to the counsels of Luther, and expressed his sentiments and doctrine with the greatest elegance and perspicuity. And thus came forth to public view the famous *confession of Augsburg*, which did such honour to the acute judgment and the eloquent pen of Melancthon.

XXX. During these transactions in Germany, the dawn of truth arose upon other nations. The light of the reformation spread itself far and wide; and almost all the European states welcomed its salutary beams, and exulted in the prospect of an approaching deliverance from the yoke of superstition and spiritual despotism. Some of the most considerable provinces of Europe had already broken their chains, and openly withdrawn themselves from the discipline of Rome and the jurisdiction of its pontiff. And thus it appears that Clement was not impelled by a false alarm to demand of the emperor the speedy extirpation of the reformers, since he had the strongest reasons to apprehend the destruction of his spiritual empire. The reformed religion was propagated in Sweden, soon after Luther's rupture with Rome, by one of his disciples, whose name was Olaus Petri, and who was the first herald of religious liberty in that kingdom. The zealous efforts of this missionary were powerfully seconded by that valiant and public-spirited prince, Gustavus Vasa Ericson, whom the Swedes had raised to the throne in the place of Christiern, king of Denmark, whose horrid barbarity lost him the sceptre that he had perfidiously usurped. This generous and patriotic hero had been in exile and in prison, while the brutal usurper, now mentioned, was involving his country in desolation and misery; but, having escaped from his confinement, and taken refuge at Lubeck, he was there instructed in the principles of the Reformation, and looked upon the doctrine of Luther, not only as agreeable to the genius and spirit of the Gospel, but also as favourable to the temporal state and political constitution of the Swedish dominions. The prudence, however, of this excellent prince was equal to his zeal, and always accompanied it: and, as the religious opinions of the Swedes were in a fluctuating state, and their minds divided between their ancient superstitions, recommended by custom, and the doctrine of Luther, which attracted their assent by the power of conviction and truth, Gustavus wisely avoided all vehemence and precipitation in spreading the new doctrine, and proceeded in this important undertaking with circumspection, and by degrees, in a manner suitable to the principles of the reformation, which are diametrically opposite to compulsion and violence.[b] Accordingly, the first object of his attention was the instruction of his people in the sacred doctrines of the Scriptures, for which purpose he invited into his dominions several learned Germans, and spread abroad through the kingdom Petri's Swedish translation of the Bible.[c] Some time after this, in 1526, he appointed a conference, at Upsal, between this eminent reformer and Peter Gallius, a zealous defender of the ancient superstition, in which these two champions were to plead publicly in behalf of their respective opinions, that it might thus be seen on which side the truth lay. The dispute, in which Olaus obtained a signal victory, contributed much to confirm Gustavus in his persuasion of the truth of Luther's doctrine, and to promote its progress in Sweden. In the following year, another event gave the finishing stroke to its propagation and success; and this was the assembly of the states at Westeraas, where the king recommended the doctrine of the reformers with such zeal, wisdom, and piety, that, after warm debates fomented by the clergy in general, and much opposition on the part of the bishops in particular, it was voted that the plan of reformation proposed by Luther should have free admittance among the Swedes.[d] This resolution was principally owing to the firmness and magnanimity of Gustavus, who declared publicly, that he would lay down his sceptre, and retire from his kingdom, rather than rule a people enslaved to the orders and authority of the pope, and more controlled by the tyranny of their bishops, than by the laws of their monarch.[e] Thus the papal em-

[a] See Chr. Aug. Heumanni Diss. de Lenitate Augustanæ Confess. in Sylloge Dissert. Theologicar. tom. i. p. 14.—Jo. Joach. Muller's Historia Protestationis; and the other writers who have treated, either of the Reformation in general, or of the confession of Augsburg in particular.

[b] This incomparable model of princes gave many proofs of his wisdom and moderation. Once, while he was absent from Stockholm, a great number of German anabaptists, probably the riotous disciples of Munzer, arrived in that city, carried their fanaticism to extremities, and pulled down with fury the images and other ornaments of the churches, while the Lutherans dissembled their sentiments of this riot in expectation that the storm would turn to their advantage. But Gustavus no sooner returned to Stockholm, than he ordered the leaders of these fanatics to be seized and punished, and assailed the Lutherans with bitter reproaches for not having opposed them in time.

[c] It is very remarkable, and shows the equity and candour of Gustavus in the most striking point of light, that while he ordered Olaus Petri to publish his literal translation of the sacred writings, he gave permission at the same time to the archbishop of Upsal, to prepare another version suited to the doctrine of the church of Rome; that, by a careful comparison of both translations with the original, an easier access might be opened to the truth. The bishops at first opposed this order, but were at length obliged to submit.

[d] It was no wonder, indeed, that the bishops opposed warmly the proposal of Gustavus, since there was no country in Europe where that order and the clergy in general drew greater temporal advantages from the superstition of the times than in Sweden and Denmark. Most of the bishops had revenues superior to those of the sovereign; they possessed castles and fortresses that rendered them independent of the crown, enabled them to excite commotions in the kingdom, and gave them a degree of power that was dangerous to the state. They lived in the most dissolute luxury and overgrown opulence, while many of the nobles were in misery and want. The resolution formed by the states assembled at Westeraas, did not so much tend to regulate points of doctrine, as to reform the discipline of the church, to reduce the opulence and authority of the bishops within proper bounds, to restore to the impoverished nobility the lands and possessions which their superstitious ancestors had given to an all-devouring clergy, to exclude the prelates from the senate, to take from them their castles, and things of that nature. It was however resolved, at the same time, that the church should be provided with able pastors, who should explain the pure word of God to the people in their native tongue; and that no ecclesiastical preferments should be granted without the king's permission. This was a tacit and gentle method of promoting the Reformation.

[e] Bazii Inventarium Eccles. Sueco-Gothor. published at Lincoping in 1642. Scultetı Annales Evangelii Renovati, in Von-der-Hardt's Histor. Liter. Reformat. part v. p. 83, and 110. Raynal, Anecdotes Hist. Politiques et Militaires, tom. i. part ii.

pire in Sweden was overturned, and the king acted thenceforward as head of the church.

XXXI. The light of the reformation was also received in Denmark, in consequence of the ardent desire discovered by Christian or Christiern II. of having his subjects instructed in the principles and doctrines of Luther. This monarch, whose savage and infernal cruelty (either the effect of natural temper, or of bad counsels) rendered his name odious and his memory execrable, was nevertheless desirous of delivering his dominions from the superstition and tyranny of Rome. For this purpose, in 1520, he sent for Martin Reinard, one of the disciples of Carlostadt, out of Saxony, and appointed him professor of divinity at Copenhagen; and after his death, which happened in the following year, he invited Carlostadt himself to fill that important place, which he accepted indeed, but, after a short residence in Denmark, returned into Germany. These disappointments did not abate the reforming spirit of the Danish monarch, who used his utmost endeavours, though in vain, to engage Luther to visit his dominions, and took several steps that tended to the diminution, and, indeed, to the suppression of the jurisdiction, exercised over his subjects by the Roman pontiff.

It is, however, proper to observe, that in all these proceedings, Christiern was animated by no other motive than that of ambition. It was the prospect of extending his authority, and not a zeal for the advancement of true religion, that gave life and vigour to his reformative projects.

His very actions, independently of what may be concluded from his known character, evidently show, that he protected the religion of Luther with no other view than to rise by it to supremacy, both in church and state, and to find a pretext for depriving the bishops of that overgrown authority, and those ample possessions which they had gradually usurped,[a] and which he wished to appropriate to himself. A revolution produced by his avarice, tyranny, and cruelty, prevented the execution of this bold enterprise. The states of the kingdom, being exasperated, some by his schemes for destroying the liberty of Denmark, others by his attempts to abolish the superstition of their ancestors,[b] and all by his savage and barbarous treatment of those who dared to oppose his avarice or ambition, formed a conspiracy against him in 1523, by which he was deposed and banished from his dominions, and his uncle Frederic, duke of Holstein, placed on the Danish throne.

XXXII. This prince conducted matters with much more equity, prudence, and moderation, than his predecessor had done. He permitted the protestant doctors to preach publicly the opinions of Luther,[c] but did not venture so far as to change the established government and discipline of the church. He contributed, however, greatly to the progress of the reformation, by his successful attempts in favour of religious liberty, in the assembly of the states holden at Odensee in 1527; for it was here that he procured the publication of that famous edict, which declared every subject of Denmark free, either to adhere to the tenets of the church of Rome, or to embrace the doctrine of Luther.[d] Encouraged by this resolution, the protestant divines exercised the functions of their ministry with such zeal and success, that the greatest part of the Danes opened their eyes upon the auspicious beams of sacred liberty, and abandoned gradually both the doctrines and jurisdiction of the church of Rome. But the honour of finishing this glorious work, of destroying entirely the reign of superstition, and breaking asunder the bonds of papal tyranny, was reserved for Christiern III., a prince equally distinguished by his piety and prudence. He began by suppressing the despotic authority of the bishops, and by restoring to their lawful owners a great part of the wealth and possessions which the church had acquired by the artful stratagems of the crafty and designing clergy This step was followed by a wise and well-judged settlement of religious doctrine, discipline, and worship, throughout the kingdom, according to a plan laid down by Bugenhagius, whom the king had invited from Wittenberg to perform that arduous task, for which his eminent piety, learning, and moderation, rendered him peculiarly proper. The assembly of the states at Odensee, in 1539, gave a solemn sanction to all these transactions; and thus the work of the reformation was brought to perfection in Denmark.[e]

XXXIII. It is however to be observed, that, in the history of the reformation of Sweden and Denmark, we must carefully distinguish between the reformation of religious opinions, and that of the episcopal order; for, though these two things may appear to be closely connected, yet, in reality, they are so far distinct, that one might have been completely transacted without the other. A reform of doctrine might have been effected, without diminishing the authority of the bishops, or suppressing their order; and, on the other hand, the opulence and power of the bishops might have been reduced within proper bounds, without introducing any change into the system of doctrine that had been so long established, and which was generally received.[f] In the measures taken in these northern kingdoms, for the reformation of a cor-

---

[a] See Jo. Gramii Diss. de Reformatione Daniæ à Christierno tentatâ, in the third volume of the Scriptor. Societ. Scientiarum Hafniens, p. 1—90.

[b] See, for a confirmation of this part of the accusation, a curious piece, containing the reasons that induced the states of Denmark to renounce their allegiance to Christiern. This piece is to be found in the fifth volume of Ludewig's compilatior entitled, Reliquiæ Manuscriptorum, in which the states of Denmark express their displeasure at the royal favour shown to the Lutherans, in the following terms: "Lutheranæ hæresis pullulatores, contra jus pietatemque, in regnum nostrum catholicum introduxit; doctorem Carolostadium, fortissimum Lutheri athletam, enutrivit."

[c] See Jo. Molleri Cimbria Literata, tom. ii. p. 886.—Christ. Olivarii Vita Pauli Eliæ, p. 108.—Erici Pontoppidani Annales Ecclesiæ Danicæ, tom. iii. p. 139.

☞ [d] It was farther provided by this edict, that no person should be molested on account of his religion; that a royal protection should be granted to the Lutherans to defend them from the insults and malignity of their enemies; and that ecclesiastics, of whatever rank or order, should be permitted to enter into the married state, and to fix their residence wherever they thought proper, without any regard to monasteries, or other religious societies.

[e] See a German work of the learned Eric Pontoppidan, entitled, A Compendious View of the History of the Reformation in Denmark; as also the Annales Ecclesiæ Danicæ, of the same author, tom. ii. iii.—See also the work of Henry Muhl, de Reformat. Religionis in vicinis Daniæ Regionibus et potissimum in Cimbria, in ejus Dissertationibus Historico-Theologicis.

☞ [f] This observation is not worthy of Dr. Mosheim's sagacity The strong connexion between superstitious ignorance among the people, and influence and power in their spiritual rulers, is too evident to stand in need of any proof. A good clergy will, or ought to have an influence, in consequence of a respectable office, adorned with learning, piety, and morals; but the power of a licentious and despotic clergy can be only supported by the blind and superstitious credulity of their flock.

rupt doctrine and a superstitious discipline, there was nothing that deserved the smallest censure: neither fraud nor violence were employed for this purpose; on the contrary, all things were conducted with wisdom and moderation, in a manner suitable to the dictates of equity and the spirit of Christianity. The same judgment cannot easily be pronounced with respect to the methods of proceeding in the reformation of the clergy, and more especially of the episcopal order. For here, certainly, violence was used, and the bishops were deprived of their honours, privileges, and possessions, without their consent; indeed, notwithstanding the greatest struggles and the warmest opposition.[a] The truth is, that so far as the reformation in Sweden and Denmark regarded the privileges and possessions of the bishops, it was rather a matter of political expediency than of religious obligation; for a change here had become so necessary, that, had Luther and his doctrine never appeared in the world, it must have been nevertheless attempted by a wise legislator; for the bishops, by a variety of perfidious stratagems, had gotten into their hands such enormous treasures, such ample possessions, so many castles and fortified towns, and had assumed such an unlimited and despotic authority, that they were in a condition to give law to the sovereign himself, to rule the nation as they thought proper, and, in effect, they already abused their power so far as to appropriate to themselves a considerable part of the royal patrimony, and of the public revenues of the kingdom. Such, therefore, was the critical state of these northern kingdoms, in the time of Luther, that it became absolutely necessary, either to degrade the bishops from that rank which they dishonoured, and to deprive them of the greatest part of those possessions and prerogatives which they had so unjustly acquired and so licentiously abused, or to see, tamely, royalty rendered contemptible by its weakness, the sovereign deprived of the means of protecting and succouring his people, and the state exposed to rebellion, misery, and ruin.

XXXIV. The kingdom of France was not inaccessible to the light of the Reformation. Margaret queen of Navarre, sister to Francis I., the implacable enemy and perpetual rival of Charles V., was inclined to favour the new doctrine, which delivered pure and genuine Christianity from a great part of the superstitions under which it had so long lain disguised. The auspicious patronage of this illustrious princess encouraged several pious and learned men, whose religious sentiments were the same with her's, to propagate the principles of the Reformation in France, and even to erect several protestant churches in that kingdom. It is manifest from the most authentic records, that, so early as the year 1523, there were, in several of the provinces of that country, multitudes of persons, who had conceived the utmost disgust to the doctrine and tyranny of Rome; and among these were many persons of rank and dignity, and even some of the episcopal order. As their numbers increased from day to day, and troubles and commotions were excited in several places on account of religious differences, the authority of the monarch and the cruelty of his officers intervened, to support the doctrine of Rome, by the edge of the sword and the terrors of the gibbet; and on this occasion many persons, eminent for their piety and virtue, were put to death with the most unrelenting barbarity.[b] Although this cruelty, instead of retarding, accelerated the progress of the Reformation, yet, in the reign of Francis, the restorers of genuine Christianity were not always equally successful and happy. Their situation was extremely uncertain, and it was perpetually changing. Sometimes they seemed to enjoy the auspicious shade of royal protection; at others they groaned under the weight of persecution, and at certain seasons they were forgotten, which oblivion rendered their condition tolerable. Francis, who had either no religion at all, or, at best, no fixed and consistent system of religious principles, conducted himself toward the protestants in such a manner as answered his private and personal views, or as reasons of policy and the public interest seemed to require. When it became necessary to engage in his cause the German protestants, in order to foment sedition and rebellion against his mortal enemy Charles V., he treated the protestants in France with the utmost equity, humanity, and gentleness; but, so soon as he had gained his point, and had no more occasion for their services, he threw off the mask, and appeared to them in the aspect of an implacable and persecuting tyrant.[c]

About this time the famous Calvin, upon whose character, talents, and religious exploits, we shall have occasion to dwell more amply in the course of this history, began to draw the attention of the public, but more especially of the queen of Navarre. He was born at Noyon in Picardy, on the 10th of July, 1509, and was bred to the law,[d] in which, as well as in all the other branches of lite-

☞ [a] What does Dr. Mosheim mean here? Did ever an usurper give up his unjust possessions without reluctance? Does rapine constitute a right, when it is maintained by force? Is it unlawful to use violence against extortioners? The question here is, whether the bishops deserved the severe treatment they received from Christiern III.; and our author seems to answer this question in the affirmative, and to declare this treatment both just and necessary, in the following part of this section. Certain it is, that the bishops were treated with great severity, deposed from their sees, imprisoned on account of their resistance; all the church lands, towns, and fortresses, were annexed to the crown, and the temporal power of the clergy abolished. It is also certain, that Luther himself looked upon these measures as violent and excessive, and even wrote a letter to Christiern, exhorting him to use the clergy with more lenity. It is therefore proper to decide with moderation on this subject, and to grant, that, if the insolence and licentiousness of the clergy were enormous, the resentment of the Danish monarch may have been excessive. Nor indeed was his political prudence here so great as Dr. Mosheim seems to represent it; for the equipoise of government was hurt, by a total suppression of the power of the bishops. The nobility acquired by this a prodigious degree of influence, and the crown lost an order, which, under proper regulations, might have been rendered one of the strongest supports of its prerogative. But disquisitions of this nature are foreign to our purpose. It is only proper to observe, that, in the room of the bishops, Christiern created an order of men, with the denomination of *Superintendants*, who performed the spiritual part of the episcopal office without the least shadow of temporal authority.

[b] See Beza, Histoire des Eglises Reformeés de France, tom. i.—Benoit, Histoire de l'Edit de Nantes, liv. i.—Christ. Aug. Salig. Histor. August. Confessionis, vol. ii.

☞ [c] The inconsistency and contradiction that were visible in the conduct of Francis I. may be attributed to various causes. At one time, we see him resolved to invite Melancthon into France, probably with a view to please his sister the queen of Navarre, whom he loved tenderly, and who had strongly imbibed the principles of the protestants. At another time, we behold him exercising the most infernal cruelty toward the friends of the Reformation, and hear him making that mad declaration, that, "if he thought the blood in his arm was tainted with the Lutheran heresy, he would order it to be cut off; and that he would not spare even his own children, if they entertained sentiments contrary to those of the catholic church." See Flor. de Remond, Hist. de la Naissance et du Progrès de l'Heresie.

☞ [d] He was originally designed for the church, and had actually obtained a benefice; but the light that broke in upon his religious sen-

rature, then known, his studies were attended with the most rapid and amazing success. Having acquired the knowledge of religion, by a diligent perusal of the holy scriptures, he began early to perceive the necessity of reforming the established system of doctrine and worship. His zeal exposed him to various perils; and the connexions he had formed with the friends of the Reformation, whom Francis was frequently committing to the flames, placed him more than once in imminent danger, from which he was delivered by the good offices of the excellent queen of Navarre. To escape the impending storm, he retired to Basil, where he published his Christian Institutions; and prefixed to them that famous dedication to Francis, which has attracted the admiration of succeeding ages, and which was designed to soften the unrelenting fury of that prince against the protestants.[a]

XXXV. The instances of an opposition to the doctrine and discipline of Rome, in the other European states, were few in number, before the diet of Augsburg, and were too faint, imperfect, and ambiguous, to make much noise in the world. It, however, appears from the most authentic testimonies, that, even before that period, the doctrine of Luther had made a considerable, though perhaps a secret, progress in Spain, Hungary, Bohemia, Britain, Poland, and the Netherlands, and had, in all these countries, many friends, of whom several repaired to Wittenberg, to improve their knowledge and enlarge their views under such an eminent master. Some of these countries openly broke asunder the chains of superstition, and withdrew themselves, in a public and constitutional manner, from the jurisdiction of the Roman pontiff. In others, a prodigious number of families received the light of the blessed Reformation; rejected the doctrines and authority of Rome; and notwithstanding the calamities and persecutions they have suffered on account of their sentiments, under the sceptre of bigotry and superstition, continue still in the profession of the pure doctrines of Christianity; while in other, still more unhappy, lands, the most barbarous tortures, the most infernal spirit of cruelty, together with penal laws adapted to strike terror into the firmest minds, have extinguished, almost totally, the light of religious truth. It is, indeed, certain, and the Roman catholics themselves acknowledge it without hesitation, that the papal doctrines, jurisdiction, and authority, would have fallen into ruin in all parts of the world, had not the force of the secular arm been employed to support this tottering edifice, and fire and sword been let loose upon those who were assailing it only with reason and argument.

CHAPTER III.

The History of the Reformation, from the Time when the Confession of Augsburg was presented to Charles V., until the Commencement of the War which succeeded the League of Smalcald.

I. THE diet was opened at Augsburg on the 20th day of June, 1530; and, as it was unanimously agreed, that the affairs of religion should be discussed before the deliberations relating to the intended war with the Turks, the protestant members of this great assembly received from the emperor a formal permission to present to the diet an account of their religious principles and tenets. In consequence of this, Christian Bayer, chancellor of Saxony, read, in the German language, in presence of the emperor and the assembled princes, the famous confession which has been since distinguished by the denomination of the *Confession of Augsburg*. The princes heard it with the deepest attention and recollection of mind; it confirmed some in the principles they had embraced, surprised others; and many, who, before this time, had little or no idea of the religious sentiments of Luther, were now not only convinced of their innocence, but were, moreover, delighted with their purity and simplicity. The copies of this confession, which, after being read, were delivered to the emperor, were signed and subscribed by John, elector of Saxony, by four princes of the empire, namely, George, marquis of Brandenburg; Ernest, duke of Lunenburg; Philip, landgrave of Hesse; Wolfgang, prince of Anhalt; and by the imperial cities of Nuremberg and Reutlingen; who all thereby solemnly declared their assent to the doctrines contained in it.[b]

II. The tenor and contents of the confession of Augsburg are well known; at least, by all who have the smallest acquaintance with ecclesiastical history; since that confession was adopted by the whole body of the protestants as the rule of their faith. The style that reigns in it is plain, elegant, grave, and perspicuous, such as becomes the nature of the subject, and such as might be expected from the admirable pen of Melancthon. The *matter* was, undoubtedly, supplied by Luther, who, during the diet, resided at Coburg, a town in the neighbourhood of Augsburg; and even the form it received from the eloquent pen of his colleague, was authorized by his approbation and advice. This confession contains twenty-eight chapters, of which the greatest part[c] are employed in representing, with perspicuity and truth, the religious opinions of the protestants, and the rest in pointing out the errors and abuses that occasioned their separation from the church of Rome.[d]

timents, as well as the preference given by his father to the profession of the law, induced him to give up his ecclesiastic vocation, which he afterwards resumed in a purer church.

☞ [a] This paragraph relating to Calvin, is added to Dr. Mosheim's text by the translator, who was surprised to find, in a History of the Reformation, such late mention made of one of its most distinguished and remarkable instruments; a man whose extensive genius, flowing eloquence, immense learning, extraordinary penetration, indefatigable industry, and fervent piety, placed him at the head of the Reformers; all of whom he surpassed, at least, in learning and parts, as he also did the greater part of them in obstinacy, asperity, and turbulence.

[b] There is a very voluminous history of the diet, which was published in 1577, at Frankfort on the Oder, by the laborious George Celestine. The history of the Confession of Augsburg was composed in Latin by David Chytræus, and more recently in German, by Ern. Solom. Cyprian and Christopher Aug. Salig. The performance of the latter is rather, indeed, a history of the Reformation in general, than of the Confession of Augsburg in particular. That of Cyprian is more concise and elegant, and is confirmed by original pieces which are equally authentic and curious.

[c] Twenty-one chapters were so employed: the other seven contained a detail of the errors and superstitions of the Romish church.

☞ [d] It is proper to observe here, that, while the Lutherans presented their confession to the diet, another excellent remonstrance of the same nature was addressed to this august assembly by the cities of Strasburg, Constance, Memmingen, and Lindaw, which had rejected the errors and jurisdiction of Rome, but did not enter into the Lutheran league, because they had adopted the opinions of Zuingle in relation to the eucharist. The declaration of these four towns (called for that reason the *Tetrapolitan Confession*) was drawn up by the excellent Martin Bucer, and was considered as a master-piece of reasoning and eloquence, not only by the protestants, but even by several of the Roman catholics; and among others by M. Du-Pin. Zuingle also sent to this diet a private confession of his religious opinions. It is, however, re-

III. The creatures of the Roman pontiff, who were present at this diet, employed John Faber, afterwards bishop of Vienne in Dauphiné, together with Eckius, and another doctor named Cochlæus, to draw up a refutation of this famous confession. This pretended refutation having been read publicly in the assembly, the emperor required of the protestant members that they would acquiesce in it, and put an end to their religious debates by an unlimited submission to the doctrines and opinions contained in this answer. But this demand was far from being complied with. The protestants declared, on the contrary, that they were by no means satisfied with the reply of their adversaries, and earnestly desired a copy of it, that they might demonstrate more fully its extreme insufficiency and weakness. This reasonable request was refused by the emperor, who, on this occasion, as well as on several others, showed more regard to the importunity of the pope's legate and his party, than to the demands of equity, candour, and justice. He even interposed his supreme authority to suspend any farther proceeding in this matter, and solemnly prohibited the publication of any new writings or declarations that might contribute to lengthen out these religious debates. This, however, did not reduce the protestants to silence. The divines of that community, who had been present at the diet, endeavoured to recollect the arguments and objections employed by Faber, and again had recourse to the pen of Melancthon, who refuted them in an ample and satisfactory manner, in a learned piece that was presented to the emperor, but which that prince refused to receive. This answer was afterwards enlarged by Melancthon, when he had obtained a copy of Faber's reply, and was published in 1531, with the other pieces that related to the doctrine and discipline of the Lutheran church, under the title of 'A Defence of the Confession of Augsburg.'

IV. There were only three ways left of bringing to a conclusion these religious differences, which it was, in reality, most difficult to reconcile. The first and the most rational method was to grant, to those who refused to submit to the doctrine and jurisdiction of Rome, the liberty of following their private judgment in matters of a religious nature, and the privilege of serving God according to the dictates of their consciences, with a proviso that the public tranquillity should not be disturbed. The second, and, at the same time, the shortest and most iniquitous expedient, was to end these dissensions by military apostles, who, sword in hand, should force the protestants to return to the bosom of the church, and to court the papal yoke, which they had so magnanimously thrown off. Some thought of a middle way, which was equally remote from the difficulties that attended the two methods now mentioned, and proposed that a reconciliation should be made upon fair, candid, and equitable terms, by engaging each of the contending parties to temper their zeal with moderation, to abate reciprocally the rigour of their pretensions, and remit some of their respective claims. The first method, which seemed agreeable to the dictates of reason, charity, and justice, was highly approved by several wise and good men, on both sides; but it was ill-suited to the arrogant ambition of the pontiff, and the superstitious ignorance of the times, which beheld with horror whatever tended to introduce the sweets of religious liberty, or the exercise of private judgment. The second method, being violent and inhuman, was more agreeable to the spirit and sentiments of the age, and was peculiarly suited to the despotic genius and sanguinary zeal of the court of Rome: but the emperor had sufficient prudence and equity to induce him to reject it; and it appeared shocking to those who were not lost to all sentiments of justice or moderation. The third expedient was therefore most generally approved: it was peculiarly agreeable to all who were zealous for the interests and tranquillity of the empire; nor did the pope seem to look upon it either with aversion or contempt. Hence various conferences ensued between persons of eminence, piety, and learning, who were chosen for that purpose from both sides; and nothing was omitted that might have the least tendency to calm the animosity, heal the divisions, and unite the hearts of the contending parties;* but all endeavours proved fruitless, since the difference of opinion was too considerable and too important to admit a reconciliation. It was in these conferences that the spirit and character of Melancthon appeared in their true and genuine colours; and it was here that the votaries of Rome exhausted their efforts to gain over to their party this pillar of the Reformation, whose abilities and virtues added such a lustre to the protestant cause. This humane and gentle spirit was apt to sink into a kind of yielding softness under the influence of mild and generous treatment. And, accordingly, while his adversaries soothed him with fair words and flattering promises, he seemed to melt as they spoke, and, in some measure, to comply with their demands; but, when they so far forgot themselves as to make use of imperious language and menacing terms, then did he appear in a very different point of light; then a spirit of intrepidity, ardour, and independence, animated all his words and actions, and he looked down with contempt on the threats of power, the frowns of fortune, and the fear of death. The truth is, that, in this great and good man, a soft and yielding temper was joined with the most inviolable fidelity, and the most invincible attachment to the truth.

V. As this method of terminating the religious debates between the friends of liberty and the votaries of Rome, proved ineffectual, the latter had recourse to other measures, which were suited to the iniquity of the times, though they were disavowed by the dictates of reason and the precepts of the Gospel. These measures were, the force of the secular arm, and the authority of imperial edicts. On the 19th day of November, a severe decree was issued, by the express order of the emperor, during the absence of the Hessian and Saxon princes, who were

diet a private confession of his religious opinions. It is, however, remarkable, that though Bucer composed a separate remonstrance, his name appears among the subscribers at Smalcald, in 1537, to the confession of Augsburg, and to Melancthon's defence of it.

☞ * As in the confession of Augsburg there were three sorts of articles; one sort orthodox, and adopted by both sides; another that consisted of certain propositions, which the papal party considered as ambiguous and obscure; and a third, in which the doctrine of Luther was entirely opposite to that of Rome; this gave some reason to hope, that by the means of certain concessions and modifications, conducted mutually by a spirit of candour and charity, matters might at last be accommodated. For this purpose, select persons were apppointed to carry on this salutary work, at first seven from each party, consisting of princes, lawyers, and divines; which number was afterwards reduced to three. As Luther's obstinate, stubborn, and violent temper, rendered him unfit for healing divisions, he was not employed in these conferences; but he was constantly consulted by the Protestant party, and it was with a view to this that he resided at Coburg.

the chief supporters of the protestant cause; and, in this decree, every thing was manifestly calculated to deject the friends of religious liberty, if we except a faint and dubious promise of engaging the pope to assemble (in about six months after the separation of the diet) a general council. The dignity and excellence of the papal religion are extolled, beyond measure, in this partial decree; new degrees of severity and force were added to the edict of Worms; the changes that had been introduced into the doctrine and discipline of the protestant churches, were severely censured; and a solemn order was addressed to the princes, states, and cities, that had thrown off the papal yoke, to return to their duty and their allegiance to Rome, on pain of incurring the indignation and vengeance of the emperor, as the patron and protector of the church.[a]

VI. No sooner were the elector of Saxony and the confederate princes informed of this deplorable issue of the diet, than they assembled in order to deliberate upon the measures that were proper to be taken on this critical occasion. In 1530, and the following year, they met, first at Smalcald, afterwards at Frankfort, and formed a solemn alliance, with the intention of defending vigorously their religion and liberties against the dangers and encroachments with which they were menaced by the edict of Augsburg, without attempting, however, any thing positively offensive against the votaries of Rome. Into this confederacy they invited the kings of England, France, and Denmark, with several other republics and states, and left no means unemployed that might tend to corroborate and cement this important alliance.[b] Amidst these intrigues and preparations, which portended an approaching rupture, the electors of Mentz and of the Palatinate offered their mediation, and endeavoured to reconcile the contending princes. With respect to the emperor, various reasons united to turn his views towards peace. For, on the one hand, he stood in need of succours against the Turks, which the protestant princes refused to grant while the edicts of Worms and Augsburg remained in force; and, on the other, the election of his brother Ferdinand to the dignity of king of the Romans, which had been concluded by a majority of votes, at the diet of Cologne in 1531, was contested by the same princes as contrary to the fundamental laws of the empire.

VII. In this troubled state of affairs, many projects of reconciliation were proposed; and, after various negotiations, a treaty of peace was concluded at Nuremberg, in 1532, between the emperor and the protestant princes, on the following conditions: that the latter should furnish a subsidy for carrying on the war against the Turks, and acknowledge Ferdinand as lawful king of the Romans; and that the emperor should annul the edicts of Worms and Augsburg, and allow the Lutherans the free and unmolested exercise of their religious doctrine and discipline, until a rule of faith should be fixed, either in the free general council that was to be assembled in the space of six months, or in a diet of the empire. The apprehension of an approaching rupture was scarcely removed by this agreement, when John, elector of Saxony died, and was succeeded by his son John Frederic, a prince of invincible fortitude and magnanimity, whose reign, however, was little better than a continued scene of disappointments and calamities.

VIII. The religious truce, concluded at Nuremberg, inspired with new vigour and resolution all the friends of the reformation. It gave strength to the feeble, and perseverance to the bold. Encouraged by it, those who had been hitherto only secret enemies to the Roman pontiff, now spurned his yoke publicly, and refused to submit to his imperious jurisdiction. This appears from the various cities and provinces in Germany, which, about this time, boldly enlisted themselves under the religious standard of Luther. On the other hand, as all hopes of terminating the religious debates that divided Europe were founded in the meeting of a general and independent council, so solemnly promised, Charles renewed his earnest request to Clement, that he would hasten an event that was expected and desired with so much impatience. The pontiff, whom the history of past councils filled with the most uneasy and discouraging apprehensions, endeavoured to retard what he could not, with any decency, absolutely refuse.[c] He formed innumerable pretexts to put off the evil day; and his whole conduct evidently showed, that he was more desirous of having these reli

☞ [a] To give the greater degree of weight to this edict, it was resolved, that no judge who refused to approve and subscribe its contents, should be admitted into the imperial chamber of Spire, which was the supreme court in Germany. The emperor also, and the popish princes, engaged themselves to employ their united forces in order to maintain its authority, and to promote its execution.

☞ [b] Luther, who at first seemed averse to this confederacy, from an apprehension of the calamities and troubles it might produce, at length perceived its necessity, and consented to it; but, uncharitably, as well as imprudently, refused to comprehend in it the followers of Zuingle among the Swiss, together with the German states or cities, which had adopted the sentiments and confession of Bucer. And yet we find that the cities of Ulm and Augsburg had embraced the Reformation on the principles of Zuingle. In the invitation addressed to Henry VIII., whom the associated princes were willing to declare the head and protector of their league, the following points were expressly stipulated among several others: viz. That the king should encourage, promote, and maintain the true doctrine of Christ, as it was contained in the confession of Augsburg, and defend the same at the next general council;—that he should not agree to any council summoned by the bishop of Rome, but protest against it, and neither submit to its decrees, nor suffer them to be respected in his dominions;—that he should never allow the pontiff to have any pre-eminence or jurisdiction in his dominions;—that he should advance 100,000 crowns for the use of the confederacy, and double that sum if it should appear to be necessary; all which articles the confederate princes were obliged equally to observe on their parts. To these demands the king answered, immediately, in a manner that was not satisfactory. He declared, that he would maintain and promote the true doctrine of Christ; but, at the same time, as the true ground of that doctrine lay only in the Holy Scriptures, he would not accept, at any one's hand, what should be his faith, or that of his kingdoms, and therefore desired they would send over learned men to confer with him, in order to promote a religious union between him and the confederates. He moreover declared himself of their opinion with respect to the meeting of a free general council, and promised to join with them, in all such councils, for the defence of the true doctrine; but thought the regulation of the ceremonial part of religion, being a matter of indifference, ought to be left to the choice of each sovereign for his own dominions. After this, he gave them a second answer more full and satisfactory; but, upon the fall of Anne Boleyn, this negotiation proved abortive. On the one hand, the king grew cold, when he perceived that the confederates could no longer be of service to him in supporting the validity of his marriage; and, on the other, the German princes were sensible that they could never succeed with Henry, unless they would allow him an absolute dictatorship in matters of religion.

☞ [c] Beside the fear of seeing his authority diminished by a general council, another reason engaged Clement to avoid an assembly of that nature; for, being conscious of the illegitimacy of his birth, as Father Paul observes, he had ground to fear that the Colonnas, or his other enemies, might plead this circumstance before the council, as a reason for his exclusion from the pontificate, since it might be well questioned whether a *bastard* could be a pope, though it is known, from many instances, that a *profligate* may.

gious differences decided by the force of arms, than by the power of argument. He indeed, in 1533, made a proposal by his legate, to assemble a council at Mantua, Placentia, or Bologna; but the protestants refused their consent to the nomination of an Italian council, and insisted, that a controversy, which had its rise in the heart of Germany, should be decided within the limits of the empire. The pope, by his usual artifices, eluded his own promise, disappointed their expectations, and was cut off by death, in 1534, in the midst of his stratagems.[a]

IX. His successor Paul III. seemed to show less reluctance to the convocation of a general council, and even appeared disposed to comply with the desire of the emperor in that respect. Accordingly, in 1535, he expressed his inclination to convoke one at Mantua; and, in the following year, he actually sent circular letters for that purpose through all the kingdoms and states under his jurisdiction.[b] The protestants, on the other hand, fully persuaded, that, in such a council,[c] all things would be carried by the votaries of Rome, and nothing concluded but what might be agreeable to the sentiments and ambition of the pontiff, assembled at Smalcald in 1537; and there they protested solemnly against such a partial and corrupt council as that which was convoked by Paul, but, at the same time, had a new summary of their doctrine drawn up by Luther, in order to present it to the assembled bishops, if it should be required of them. This summary, which was distinguished by the title of the *Articles of Smalcald*, is generally joined with the creeds and confessions of the Lutheran church.

X. During these transactions, two remarkable events happened, of which the one was most detrimental to the cause of religion in general, to that of the Reformation in particular, and produced, in Germany, civil tumults and commotions of the most horrid kind; while the other was more salutary in its consequences and effects, and struck at the very root of the papal authority and dominion. The former event was a new sedition, excited by a fanatical and outrageous mob of the Anabaptists; and the latter, the rupture between Henry VIII. and the Roman pontiff, whose jurisdiction and spiritual supremacy were publicly renounced by that rough and resolute monarch.

In 1533, there came to Munster, a city in Westphalia, a certain number of Anabaptists, who surpassed the rest of that fanatical tribe in the extravagance of their proceedings, the phrensy of their disordered brains, and the madness of their pretensions and projects. They gave themselves out for the messengers of Heaven, invested with a divine commission to lay the foundations of a new government, a holy and spiritual empire, and to destroy and overturn all temporal rule and authority, all human and political institutions. Having turned all things into confusion and uproar at Munster by this seditious and extravagant declaration, they began to erect a new republic,[d] conformable to their absurd and chimerical notions of religion, and committed the administration of it to John Bockholt, a tailor by profession, and a native of Leyden. Their reign, however, was of a short duration; for, in 1535, the city was besieged, and taken by the bishop of Munster, assisted by other German princes; this fanatical king and his wrong-headed associates were put to death in the most terrible and ignominious manner, and the new hierarchy destroyed with its furious and extravagant founders. This outrageous conduct of a handful of Anabaptists drew upon the whole body heavy marks of displeasure from the greatest part of the European princes. The severest laws were enacted against them for the second time, in consequence of which the innocent and the guilty were involved in the same terrible fate, and prodigious numbers were devoted to death in the most dreadful forms.[e]

XI. The pillars of papal despotism were at this time shaken in England, by an event, which, at first, did not seem to promise such important consequences. Henry VIII., a prince who, in vices and in abilities, was surpassed by none who swayed the sceptre in this age, and who, in the beginning of these religious troubles, had opposed the doctrine and views of Luther with the utmost vehemence, was the principal agent in this great revolution.[f] Bound in the chains of matrimony to Catharine of Arragon, aunt to Charles V., but at the same time captivated by the charms of an illustrious virgin, whose name was Anne Boleyn, he ardently desired to be divorced from the former, that he might render lawful his passion for the latter.[g] For this purpose, he addressed himself to Clement VII. in order to obtain a dissolution of his marriage with Catharine, alleging, that a principle of religion restrained him from enjoying any longer the sweets of connubial love with that princess, as she had been previously married to his elder brother Arthur, and as it was repugnant to the divine law to contract wedlock with a brother's

[a] See an ample account of every thing relative to this council in Father Paul's History of the Council of Trent, book i.

[b] This council was summoned by Paul III. to assemble at Mantua, on the 23d of May, 1537, but several obstacles prevented its meeting. Frederic, duke of Mantua, was not much inclined to receive at once so many guests, some of whom might be very turbulent, into the place of his residence.

[c] That is, in a council assembled by the authority of the pope alone, and that also in Italy; two circumstances that must have greatly contributed to give Paul an undue influence in that assembly. The protestants maintained, that the emperor and the other Christian princes of Europe had a right to be *authoritatively* concerned in calling a general council; so much the more, as the pontiff was evidently one of the parties in the present debate.

[d] This fanatical establishment they distinguished by the title of the *New Jerusalem*.

[e] Hermanni Hamelmanni Historia Eccles. renati Evangelii per inferiorem Saxoniam et Westphal. part ii.—De Prinz, Specimen Historiæ Anabapt. c. x. xi. xii.

This sect was, in process of time, considerably reformed by the ministry of two Friselanders, Ubbo and Mennon, who purified it from the enthusiastic, seditious, and atrocious principles of its first founders, as will be seen in the progress of this history.

[f] Among the various portraits that have been given by historians of Henry VIII., there is not one that equals the masterly one drawn by Mr. Hume. This great painter, whose colouring, in other subjects, is sometimes more artful than accurate, has caught from nature the striking lines of Henry's motley character, and thrown them into a composition, in which they appear with the greatest truth, set out with all the powers of expression.

[g] From Dr. Mosheim's manner of expressing himself, an uninformed reader might be led to conclude, that the charms of Anne Boleyn were the only motive that engaged Henry to dissolve his marriage with Catharine. But this representation of the matter is not accurate. The king had entertained scruples concerning the legitimacy of that marriage, before his acquaintance with the beautiful and unfortunate Anne. Conversant in the writings of Thomas Aquinas and other schoolmen, who looked upon the Levitical law as of moral and permanent obligation, and attentive to the remonstrances of the bishops, who declared his marriage unlawful, he was filled with anxious doubts, which had made him break off all conjugal commerce with the queen, before his affections had been engaged by any other. This appears by cardinal Wolsey's proposing a marriage between his majesty and the sister of Francis I., which that pliant courtier would never have done, had he known that the king's affections were otherwise engaged. After all, it is very possible, that the age and infirmities of Catharine, together with the bloom-

widow. The pope was greatly perplexed upon this occasion, by the apprehension of incurring the indignation of the emperor, if his decision should be favourable to Henry; and therefore he contrived various pretexts to evade a positive answer, and exhausted all his policy and artifice to cajole and deceive the English monarch. Tired with the pretexts, apologies, vain promises, and tardy proceedings of the pontiff, Henry had recourse, for the accomplishment of his purposes, to an expedient which was suggested by the famous Thomas Cranmer, who was a secret friend to Luther and his cause, and who was afterwards raised to the see of Canterbury. This expedient was, to demand the opinions of the most learned European universities concerning the subject of his scruples. The result of this measure was favourable to his views. The greatest part of the universities declared the marriage with a brother's widow unlawful. Catharine was consequently divorced; Anne was conducted by a formal marriage into the royal bed, notwithstanding the remonstrances of Clement; and the English nation delivered from the tyranny of Rome, by Henry's renouncing the jurisdiction and supremacy of its imperious pontiff. Soon after this, the king was declared by the parliament and people supreme head, on earth, of the church of England; the monasteries were suppressed, and their revenues applied to other purposes; and the power and authority of the pope were abrogated and entirely overturned.[a]

XII. It is however carefully to be observed here, that Henry's subversion of the papal authority in England was not productive of much benefit, either to the friends or to the cause of the reformation; for the same monarch, who had so resolutely withdrawn himself from the dominion of Rome, yet superstitiously retained the greatest part of its errors, with its imperious and persecuting spirit. He still adhered to several of the most monstrous doctrines of popery, and frequently presented the terrors of death to those who differed from him in their religious sentiments. Besides, he considered the title of Head of the English Church, as if it transferred to him the enormous power which had been claimed, and indeed usurped, by the Roman pontiffs; and, in consequence of this interpretation of his title, he looked upon himself as master of the religious sentiments of his subjects, and as authorized to prescribe modes of faith according to his fancy. Hence it came to pass, that, during the life and reign of this prince, the face of religion was constantly changing, and thus resembled the capricious and unsteady character of its new chief. The prudence, learning, and activity of archbishop Cranmer, who was the favourite of the king, and the friend of the Reformation, counteracted, however, in many instances, the humour and vehemence of this inconstant and turbulent monarch. The pious productions and wise counsels of that venerable prelate diminished daily the influence of the ancient superstitions, dispelled by degrees the mists of ignorance that blinded the people in favour of popery, and considerably increased the number of those who wished well to the Reformation.[b]

XIII. After the meeting of the council of Mantua was prevented, various measures were taken, and many schemes proposed, by the emperor on the one hand, and the protestant princes on the other, for the restoration of concord and union, both civil and religious. But these measures and projects were unattended with any solid or salutary fruit, and were generally disconcerted by the intrigues and artifice of the court of Rome, whose legates and creatures were always lying in wait to blow the flame of discord in all those councils which seemed unfavourable to the ambition of its pontiffs. In 1541, the emperor, regardless of the pope's authority, appointed a conference at Worms, on the subject of religion, between persons of piety and learning chosen from each party. It was here that Melancthon and Eckius disputed for three days.[c] This conference was, for certain reasons, removed to the diet holden at Ratisbon in the same year, in which the principal subject of deliberation was a memorial, presented by a person unknown, containing a project of peace, with the terms of accommodation that were proper to terminate these religious differences.[d] This conference, however, produced no other effect, than a mutual agreement of the contending parties to refer the decision of their pretensions and debates to a general council; or, if the meeting of such a council should be prevented by any unforeseen obstacles, to the next German diet.

XIV. This resolution was rendered ineffectual by the period of perplexity and trouble that succeeded the diet of Ratisbon, and by various incidents that widened the breach, and delayed the deliberations which were designed to heal it. It is true, the pontiff ordered his legate to declare in the diet, which was assembled at Spire in 1542, that he would, according to the promise he had already made, assemble a general council, and that Trent should be the place of its meeting, if the diet had no objection to that city. Ferdinand, king of the Romans, and the princes who adhered to the papal cause, gave their consent to this proposal; while the protestant members of the diet objected both to a council summoned by the papal authority alone, and also to the place appointed for its meeting, and demanded a free and lawful council, which should not be influenced by the dictates, or awed by the proximity of the pontiff. This protestation produced no effect; Paul persisted in his purpose, and issued his circular letters for the convocation of the council,[e] with the approbation of the emperor; while this prince

ing charms of Anne Boleyn, tended much to animate Henry's remorse, and to render his conscience more scrupulous. See Burnet's History of the Reformation, and Hume's History of Great Britain.

[a] Beside the full and accurate account of this and other important events, that may be found in bishop Burnet's excellent History of the Reformation of the Church of England, the curious reader will do well to consult the records of this memorable revolution in Wilkins' Concil. Magnæ Britanniæ et Hiberniæ, tom. iii.—Raynal's Anecdotes Historiques, Politiques, et Militaires, tom. i.—Gen. Dictionary at the article Boleyn.

[b] Beside Burnet's History of the Reformation, see Neal's History of the Puritans, vol. i.

[c] See Jo. And. Roederi Libellus de Colloquio Wormatiensi. Norimb. 1744.

[d] See Jo. Erdmanni Bieckii Triplex Interim, cap. i.

☞ [e] It is proper to observe here, that having summoned successively a council at Mantua, Vicenza, and Venice, without any effect, (for the council did not meet,) this pontiff thought it necessary to show the protestants that he was not averse to every kind of reformation; and therefore appointed four cardinals and five other persons eminent for their learning, to draw up a plan for the reformation of the church in general, and of the church of Rome in particular, well knowing, by the spirit which reigned in the conclave, that the project would come to nothing. A plan, however, was drawn up by the persons appointed for that purpose. The reformation proposed in this plan was indeed extremely superficial and partial; yet it contained some particulars, which scarcely could have been expected from the pens of those who composed it. They complained, for instance, of the pride and ignorance of the bishops, and proposed that none should receive orders but learned and pious men; and that, therefore, care should be taken to have proper masters to instruct the youth. They condemned transla-

endeavoured, at the diet of Worms, in 1545, to persuade the protestants to consent to the meeting of this council at Trent. But they were fixed in their resolution, and the efforts of Charles were vain; upon which the emperor, who had hitherto disapproved the violent measures which were incessantly suggested by the court of Rome, departed from his usual prudence and moderation, and, listening to the sanguinary counsels of Paul, formed, in conjunction with that artful pontiff, the design of terminating religious debates by the force of arms. The landgrave of Hesse, and the elector of Saxony, the chief protectors of the protestant cause, were no sooner informed of this, than they took the proper measures to prevent themselves from being surprised and overwhelmed by a superior force, and, accordingly, raised an army for their defence. While this terrible storm was rising, Luther, whose aversion to all violence in matters of religion was well known, and who recommended prayer and patience as the only arms worthy of those who had the cause of genuine Christianity at heart, was removed by Providence from this scene of tumult, and from the calamities that threatened his country. He died in peace, on the 18th of February, 1546, at Eisleben, the place of his birth.

CHAPTER IV

The History of the Reformation from the Commencement of the War of Smalcald, to the famous Pacification, commonly called the Peace of Religion, concluded at Augsburg.

I. CHARLES and the pontiff had determined upon the ruin of all who should dare to oppose the council of Trent. The meeting of that assembly was to serve as a signal for their taking arms; and accordingly, its deliberations were scarcely begun, in 1546, when the protestants perceived undoubted marks of the approaching storm, and of a formidable union of their chief adversaries to overwhelm and crush them by a sudden blow. There had been, it is true, a new conference in this very year, at the diet of Ratisbon, between some eminent doctors of both parties, with a view to the accommodation of their religious differences; but it appeared sufficiently, both from the nature of this dispute, the manner in which it was carried on, and its issue and result, that the matters in debate would sooner or later be decided in the field of battle. In the mean time, the fathers, assembled in the council of Trent, promulgated their decrees; while the protestant princes in the diet protested against their authority, and were, in consequence of this conduct, proscribed by the emperor, who raised an army to reduce them to obedience.

II. The elector of Saxony and the landgrave of Hesse led their forces into Bavaria against the emperor, and cannonaded his camp at Ingolstadt with great spirit. It was supposed that this would bring the two armies to a general action; but several circumstances prevented a battle, which was expected by most of the confederates, and, probably, would have been advantageous to their cause. Among these we may reckon, principally, the perfidy of Maurice, duke of Saxony, who, seduced by the promises of the emperor, and by his own ambition and avarice, invaded the electoral dominions of his uncle John Frederic, while that worthy prince was maintaining against the emperor the sacred cause of religion and liberty. Add to this the divisions that were fomented by the dissimulation of the emperor among the confederate princes, the failure of France in furnishing the subsidy that had been promised by its monarch, and some incidents of less moment. All these things so discouraged the heads of the protestant party, that their troops were soon dispersed, and the elector of Saxony directed his march homewards. But he was pursued by the emperor, who made several forced marches, with a view of subduing his enemy, before he should have time to recover his vigour; in which design he was assisted by the ill-grounded security of the elector, and, as there is too much reason to think, by the treachery of his officers. The two armies drew up in order of battle near Muhlberg on the Elbe, on the 24th of April, 1547, and, after a fierce conflict, that of the elector, being inferior in number, was entirely defeated, and himself made prisoner. Philip, landgrave of Hesse, the other chief of the protestants, was persuaded by the entreaties of his son-in-law, Maurice, now declared elector of Saxony,[a] to throw himself upon the mercy of the emperor, and to implore his pardon. To this he consented, relying on the promise of Charles for obtaining forgiveness, and being restored to liberty; but, notwithstanding these expectations, he was unjustly detained prisoner by a scandalous violation of the most solemn convention. It is said, that the emperor retracted his promise, and deluded this unhappy prince by the ambiguity of two German words, which resemble each other;[b] but this point of history has not been hitherto so far cleared up, as to enable us to judge with certainty of the confinement of this prince, and the real causes to which it may be ascribed.[c]

III. This revolution seemed to threaten ruin to the pro-

tions from one benefice to another, grants of reservation, non-residence, and pluralities. They proposed that some convents should be abolished; that the liberty of the press should be restrained and limited; that the colloquies of Erasmus should be suppressed; that no ecclesiastic should enjoy a benefice out of his own country; that no cardinal should have a bishopric; that the questors of St. Antony, and several other saints, should be abolished; and (which was the best of all their proposals) that the effects and personal estate of ecclesiastics should be given to the poor. They concluded with complaining of the prodigious number of indigent and ragged priests that frequented St. Peter's church; and declared, that it was a great scandal to see the prostitutes lodged so magnificently at Rome, and riding through the streets on fine mules, while the cardinals and other ecclesiastics accompanied them in a most courteous and familiar manner. The several articles of this plan of reformation (which Luther and Sturmius of Strasburg turned into ridicule, and which indeed left unredressed the most intolerable grievances of which the protestants complained) were published at Antwerp in or about the year 1539, with the answer of Cochlæus to the objections of Sturmius. They are likewise prefixed to the History of the Council of Trent, by Crabre, and were afterwards published at Paris in 1612.

[a] In the room of John Frederic, whom he had so basely betrayed.

[b] There is scarcely in history an instance of such mean, perfidious, and despotic behaviour, as that of the emperor to the landgrave in the case now before us. After having received in public the humble submissions of that unhappy prince, made upon his knees, in the most respectful and affecting terms, and after having set him at liberty by a solemn treaty, he ordered him to be again arrested, without alleging any reason, or even any pretext, and kept him for several years in a close and severe confinement. When Maurice remonstrated to the emperor against this new imprisonment, Charles answered, that he had never promised that the landgrave should not be imprisoned anew, but only that he should be exempted from perpetual imprisonment; and, to support this assertion, he produced the treaty, in which his ministers, in order to elude the true meaning of the accommodation, had perfidiously foisted in *ewiger gefangnis*, which signifies a *perpetual prison*, instead of *einiger gefangnis*, which means *any prison*. This point, however, is contested by some historians.

[c] See a German work entitled, Benj. Grosch Vertheidigung der Evangelischen Kirche gegen Gottfr. Arnold.

testant cause, and to crown the efforts of the pontiff with the most triumphant success. In the diet of Augsburg, which was assembled soon after, with an imperial army at hand to promote union and despatch, the emperor required of the protestants, that they would leave the decision of these religious contests to the wisdom of the council that was to meet at Trent. The greatest part of the members consented to this proposal; and, among others, Maurice, the new elector of Saxony, who owed both his electorate and his dominions to the emperor, and who was ardently desirous of obtaining the liberty of his father-in-law the landgrave of Hesse. This general submission to the will of Charles, did not, however, produce the fruits that were expected from such a solemn and almost universal approbation of the council of Trent. A plague, which manifested itself (or was said to do so) in that city, induced the greatest part of the assembled fathers to retire to Bologna, and thereby the council was, in effect, dissolved; nor could all the entreaties and remonstrances of the emperor prevail upon the pope to reassemble it without delay. While affairs were in this situation, and the prospect of seeing a council assembled was obscured, the emperor judged it necessary, during this *interval*, to devise some method of maintaining peace in religious matters, until the decision, so long expected, should be finally obtained. It was with this view that he ordered Julius Pflugius, bishop of Naumburg, Michael Sidonius, a creature of the pontiff, and John Agricola, a native of Eisleben, to draw up a *formulary*, which might serve as a rule of faith and worship to both parties, until a council should begin to act. As this was only a temporary appointment, and had not the force of a permanent or perpetual institution, the rule in question was called the *Interim*.[a]

IV. This temporary rule of faith and discipline, though it was extremely favourable to the interests and pretensions of the court of Rome, had yet the fate to which schemes of reconciliation are often exposed; it pleased neither party, but was equally offensive to the followers of Luther and to the Roman pontiff. It was, however, promulgated with solemnity, by the emperor, at the diet of Augsburg; and the elector of Mentz, without even deigning to ask the opinions of the assembled princes and states, rose with an air of authority, and, as if he had been commissioned to represent the whole diet, gave a formal and public approbation to this famous *Interim*.[b] Thus were many princes of the empire, whose silence, though it proceeded from want of courage, was interpreted as the mark of a tacit consent, engaged against their will to receive this *book* as a body of ecclesiastical law. The major part of those, who had the resolution to dispute the authority of this imperial creed, were obliged to submit to it by the force of arms; and hence arose deplorable scenes of violence and bloodshed, which involved the empire in the greatest calamities. Maurice, elector of Saxony, who for some time, had affected to be neutral, and neither declared himself for those who rejected, nor for those who had adopted the formulary, assembled, in 1548, the Saxon nobility and clergy, with Melancthon at the head of the latter, and, in several conferences at Leipsic and other places, took counsel concerning what was to be done in this critical affair. The deliberations, on this occasion, were long and tedious, and their result was ambiguous; for Melancthon, whose opinion was respected as a law by the reformed doctors, fearing the emperor on the one hand, and attentive to the sentiments of his sovereign on the other, pronounced a sort of conciliatory sentence, which, he hoped, would be offensive to no party. He gave it as his opinion, that the whole of the book called *Interim* could not, by any means, be adopted by the friends of the Reformation; but he declared, at the same time, that he saw no reason, why this book might not be approved, adopted, and received, as an authoritative rule, in things that did not relate to the essential parts of religion, or in points which might be considered as accessory or *indifferent*.[c] This decision, instead of pacifying matters, produced, on the contrary, new divisions, and formed, among the followers of Luther, a schism which placed the cause of the Reformation in the most perilous and critical circumstances, and might have contributed either to ruin it entirely, or to retard considerably its progress, had the pope and the emperor been dexterous enough to make the proper use of these divisions, and to seize the favourable occasion that was presented to them, of turning the force of the protestants against themselves.

V. Amidst these contests Paul III. was obliged to quit this life in the year 1549, and was succeeded, in the following year, by Julius III., who, yielding to the repeated and importunate solicitations of the emperor, consented to convoke a council at Trent. Accordingly, in the diet of Augsburg, which was again holden under the formidable artillery of an imperial army, Charles laid this matter before the states and princes of the empire. The majority of the princes gave their consent to the convocation of this council, to which also the elector Maurice submitted upon certain conditions.[d] The emperor then concluded the diet

☞ [a] This project of Charles was formed, partly to vent his resentment against the pope, and partly to answer other purposes of a more political kind. Be that as it may, the *Formula ad Interim*, or temporary rule of faith and worship here mentioned, contained all the essential doctrines of the church of Rome, though considerably softened and mitigated by the moderate, prudent, and artful terms in which they were expressed; terms quite different from those that were employed, before and after this period, by the council of Trent. There was even an affected ambiguity in many expressions, which rendered them susceptible of different senses, applicable to the sentiments of both communions, and therefore disagreeable to both. The *Interim* was composed with that fraudulent, specious, and seducing dexterity, which in after-times appeared in the deceitful exposition of the Catholic faith, by M. Bossuet, bishop of Meaux; and it was almost equally rejected by the Protestants and Roman Catholics. The cup was allowed, by this imperial creed, to the protestants in the administration of the Lord's supper, and priests and clerks were permitted by it to enter into the married state. These grants were, however, accompanied with the two following conditions: "1. That every one should be at liberty to use the cup, or to abstain from it, and to choose a state of marriage, or a state of celibacy, as he should judge most fit or convenient: 2. That these grants should remain in force no longer than the happy period when a general council should terminate all religious differences." This second condition tended to produce the greatest disorder and confusion in case the future council should think proper to enjoin celibacy on the clergy, and declare, as it did in effect, their marriage unchristian and unlawful.

[b] See Jo. Erdm. Bieck, Triplex Interim.—Luc. Osianders Cent. XVI. Histor. Eccles. lib. ii. cap. lxviii. p. 425.—For an account of the authors and editions of the book called *Interim*, see Die Danische Biblioth. part v. and vi.

☞ [c] By things *indifferent*, Melancthon understood particularly the ceremonies of the popish worship, which, superstitious as they were, that reformer, yielding to the softness and flexibility of his natural temper, treated with a singular and excessive indulgence upon this occasion.

☞ [d] Maurice (who was desirous of regaining the esteem of the protestants of Saxony, which he had lost by his perfidious behaviour to the late elector John Frederic, his benefactor and friend) gave his consent to the renewal of the council of Trent on the following conditions:—1st. That the points of doctrine, which had been already decided there

in 1551, desiring the assembled princes and states to prepare all things for the approaching council, and promising that he would use his most zealous endeavours to promote moderation and harmony, impartiality and charity, in the deliberations and transactions of that assembly. When the diet broke up, the protestants took the steps they judged most prudent to prepare themselves for what was to happen. The Saxons employed the pen of Melancthon, and the Wirtembergers that of Brentius, to draw up confessions of their faith, which were to be laid before the new council. Beside the ambassadors of the duke of Wirtemberg, several doctors of that city repaired to Trent. The Saxon divines, with Melancthon at their head, set out also for that place, but proceeded in their journey no farther than Nuremberg. They had received secret orders to stop there; for Maurice had no intention of submitting to the emperor's views: on the contrary, he hoped to reduce that prince to a compliance with his own projects. He therefore yielded in appearance, that he might carry his point, and thus command in reality.

VI. The real views of Charles, amidst the divisions and troubles in Germany, (which he fomented by negotiations that carried the outward aspect of a reconciling spirit,) will appear evidently to such as consider attentively the nature of the times, and compare the transactions of this prince, one with another. Relying on the extent of his power, and the success that frequently accompanied his enterprises, with a degree of confidence that was highly imprudent, he proposed to turn these religious commotions and dissensions to the confirmation and increase of his dominion in Germany, and, by sowing the seeds of discord among the princes of the empire, to weaken their power, and thereby the more easily to encroach upon their rights and privileges. On the other hand, ardently desirous of reducing within narrower limits the jurisdiction and dominion of the Roman pontiffs, that they might not set bounds to his ambition, or prevent the execution of his aspiring views, he flattered himself that this would be the natural effect of the approaching council. He was confirmed in this pleasing hope, by reflecting on what had happened in the assemblies of Constance and of Basil, in which the lust of papal ambition had been opposed with spirit, and restrained within certain limits. He also persuaded himself, that, by the dexterity of his agents, and the number of the Spanish and German bishops devoted to his interests, he should be able to influence and direct the deliberations of the council in such a manner, as to make its decisions answer his expectations, and contribute effectually to the accomplishment of his views. Such were the specious dreams of ambition that filled the imagination of this restless prince; but his views and projects were disconcerted by that very individual, that supposed friend, who had been one of the principal instruments of the violence and oppression which he had exercised against the protestant princes, and of the injury he had done to the protestant cause.

VII. The most considerable princes, not only of Germany, but even of all Europe, had, for a long time, addressed to the emperor their united entreaties for the deliverance of Philip, landgrave of Hesse, and John Frederic, elector of Saxony, from their confinement; and Maurice had solicited, with peculiar warmth and assiduity, the liberty of the former, who was his father-in-law. But all these solicitations produced no effect. Perceiving at length that he was duped by the emperor, and also convinced that this ambitious monarch was forming insidious designs upon the liberties of Germany, and the jurisdiction of its princes, the elector entered, with the utmost secrecy and expedition, into an alliance with the king of France and several of the German princes, for the maintenance of the rights and liberties of the empire. Encouraged by this respectable confederacy, the active Saxon led a powerful army against the emperor in 1552, with such astonishing valour and rapidity, that he surprised Charles at Inspruck, where he lay with a small force in the utmost security, and without the least apprehension of danger. This unforeseen event alarmed and dejected the emperor to such a degree, that he was willing to make peace on almost any conditions; and, consequently, he not only concluded, at Passau, the famous treaty of pacification with the protestants,[a] but also promised to assemble, within the space of six months, a diet, in which all the tumults and dissensions that had been occasioned by a diversity of sentiment in religious matters should be entirely removed. Thus did the same prince, who stands foremost in the list of those that oppressed the protestants, and reduced their affairs to extremities, restore their expiring hopes, support and render triumphant their desperate cause, and procure for them that bulwark of peace and of liberty which still remains. Maurice, however, did not live to see this happy issue of his glorious expedition; for he lost his life in the following year, by a wound received at the battle of Siverhausen, while he was fighting against Albert of Brandenburg.[b]

VIII. The troubles of Germany, with several other incidents, rendered it impossible to assemble the diet, which the emperor had promised at the pacification of Passau, so soon as the period mentioned in the articles of that treaty. This famous diet met, however, at Augsburg, in 1555, was opened by Ferdinand in the name of the emperor, and terminated those deplorable scenes of bloodshed desolation, and discord, that had so long afflicted both

should be examined and discussed anew; 2dly, That this examination should be made in presence of the protestant divines, or their deputies; 3dly, That the Saxon protestants should have a liberty of *voting*, as well as of *deliberating*, in the council; and, 4thly, That the pope should not pretend to preside in that assembly, either in person or by his legates. This declaration was read in the diet, and the elector's deputies insisted upon its being registered, which the archbishop of Mentz, however, obstinately refused.

☞ [a] As this treaty is deemed by the German protestants the basis of their religious liberty, it will not be amiss to insert here some of its principal articles. By the three first articles it was stipulated, that Maurice and the confederates should lay down their arms, and should lend their troops to Ferdinand to defend Germany against the Turks, and that the landgrave of Hesse should be set at liberty. By the fourth it was agreed that the rule of faith, called *Interim*, should be considered as null and void; that the contending parties should enjoy the free and undisturbed exercise of their religion, until a diet should be assembled to determine amicably the present disputes (which diet was to meet in the space of six months); and that this religious liberty should continue always, if it should be found impossible to come to an uniformity in doctrine and worship. It was also resolved, that all those who had suffered banishment, or any other calamity, on account of their having been concerned in the league or war of Smalcald, should be reinstated in their privileges, possessions, and employments; that the Imperial chamber at Spire should be open to the protestants as well as to the catholics; and that there should be always a certain number of the Lutheran persuasion in that high court.

☞ [b] Albert, marquis of Brandenburg, after the pacification of Passau, to which he refused to subscribe, continued the war against the Roman catholics; and afterwards committed such ravages in the empire, that a confederacy was formed against him, at the head of which Maurice was placed.

church and state, by that *religious peace* (as it is commonly called) which secured to the protestants the free exercise of their religion, and established this inestimable liberty upon the firmest foundations; for, after various debates, the following memorable acts were passed, on the 25th of September; that the protestants who followed the confession of Augsburgh, should be for the future considered as entirely exempt from the jurisdiction of the Roman pontiff, and from the authority and superintendence of the bishops; that they were left at perfect liberty to enact laws for themselves, relating to their religious sentiments, discipline, and worship; that all the inhabitants of the German empire should be allowed to judge for themselves in religious matters, and to join themselves to that church whose doctrine and worship they thought the purest, and the most consonant to the spirit of true Christianity; and that all those who should injure or persecute any person under religious pretexts, and on account of opinions and belief, should be declared and proceeded against as public enemies of the empire, invaders of its liberty, and disturbers of its peace.[a] The difficulties that were to be surmounted before this equitable decision could be procured, the tedious deliberations, the warm debates, the violent animosities, and bloody wars, that were necessary to engage the greatest part of the German states to consent to conditions so agreeable to the dictates of right reason, as well as to the sacred injunctions of the Gospel, show us, in a shocking and glaring point of light, the ignorance and superstition of these miserable times, and stand upon record, as one of the most evident proofs of the necessity of religious reform.

IX. During these transactions in Germany, the friends of genuine Christianity in England deplored the gloomy reign of superstition, and the almost total extinction of true religion; and, seeing before their eyes the cause of popery maintained by the terrors of bloody persecution, and daily victims brought to the stake, to expiate the pretended crime of preferring the dictates of the Gospel to the despotic laws of Rome, they deemed the Germans happy, in having thrown off the yoke of an imperious and superstitious church. Henry VIII., whose personal vices, and whose arbitrary and capricious conduct, had greatly retarded the progress of the Reformation, was now no more. He died in 1547, and was succeeded by his only son, Edward VI. This amiable prince, whose early youth was crowned with that wisdom, sagacity, and virtue, that would have done honour to advanced years, gave new spirit and vigour to the protestant cause, and was its brightest ornament, as well as its most effectual support. He encouraged learned and pious men of foreign countries to settle in England, and addressed a particular invitation to Martin Bucer and Paul Fagius, whose moderation added a lustre to their other virtues, that, by the ministry and labours of these eminent men, in concert with those of the friends of the reformation in England, he might purge his dominions from the vile fictions of popery, and establish the pure doctrines of Christianity in their place. For this purpose he issued the wisest orders for the restoration of true religion; but his reign was too short to accomplish fully such a glorious purpose. In 1553, he was taken from his loving and afflicted subjects, whose sorrow was inexpressible, and suited to their loss. His sister Mary, (the daughter of Catharine of Arragon, from whom Henry had been separated by the famous divorce,) a furious bigot to the church of Rome, and a princess whose natural character, like the spirit of her religion, was despotic and cruel, succeeded him on the English throne, and imposed anew the arbitrary laws and the tyrannical yoke of Rome upon her reluctant subjects. Nor were the methods she employed, in the cause of superstition, better than the cause itself, or tempered by any sentiments of equity or compassion. Barbarous tortures, and death in the most shocking forms, awaited those who opposed her will, or made the least stand against the restoration of popery. And, among many other victims, the learned and pious Cranmer, archbishop of Canterbury, who had been one of the most illustrious instruments of the Reformation in England, fell a sacrifice to her fury.* This odious scene of persecution was happily concluded, in 1558, by the death of the queen, who left no issue; and, as soon as her successor, the lady Elizabeth, ascended the throne, all things assumed a new and a pleasing aspect. This illustrious princess, whose sentiments, counsels, and projects, breathed a spirit superior to the natural softness and delicacy of her sex, exerted this vigorous and manly spirit in the defence of oppressed conscience and expiring liberty, broke anew the despotic yoke of papal authority and superstition, and delivering her people from the bondage of Rome, established that form of religious doctrine and ecclesiastical government which England still enjoys. This religious establishment differs, in some respects, from the plan formed by those whom Edward VI. had employed for promoting the cause of the reformation, and approaches nearer to the rites and discipline of former times, though it is widely different from, and in the most important points entirely opposite to, the principles of the Roman hierarchy.

X. The seeds of the reformation were very early sown in Scotland, by several noblemen of that nation, who had resided in Germany during the religious disputes that divided the empire. But the power of the Roman pontiff, supported and seconded by inhuman laws and barbarous executions, choked, for many years, these tender seeds, and prevented their taking root. The first and most eminent opposer of the papal jurisdiction was John Knox,[b]

[a] Jo. Schilteri Liber de Pace Religiosâ.—Christ. Lehmanni Acta Publica et Originalia de Pace Religiosâ.

* This prelate was the less entitled to compassion, as, when in power, he followed the execrable example of the Romanists, by committing to the flames, against the will of the young king, two supposed heretics, two unfortunate foreigners, whom, one would think, every humane Briton would have spared, and whose destruction nothing could justify.—EDIT.

[b] It will not be improper to insert here the character of this famous Scottish reformer, as it is drawn by the spirited, accurate, and impartial pen of Dr. Robertson, in his History of Scotland, book vi. "Zeal, intrepidity, disinterestedness, (says that incomparable writer,) were virtues which he possessed in an eminent degree. He was acquainted, too, with the learning cultivated in that age, and excelled in that species of eloquence which is calculated to rouse and to inflame. His maxims, however, were often too severe, and the impetuosity of his temper excessive. Rigid and uncomplying himself, he showed no indulgence to the infirmities of others. Regardless of the distinctions of rank and character, he uttered his admonitions with an acrimony and vehemence, more apt to irritate than to reclaim; and this often betrayed him into indecent and undutiful expressions with respect to the queen's person and conduct. Those very qualities, however, which now render his character less amiable, fitted him to be the instrument of Providence for advancing the reformation among a fierce people, and enabled him to face dangers, and to surmount opposition, from which a person of a more gentle spirit would have been apt to shrink back. By an unweari-

a disciple of Calvin, whose eloquence was persuasive, and whose fortitude was invincible.[a] This resolute reformer set out from Geneva for Scotland, in 1559, and, in a very short time, inspired the people, by his private exhortations and his public discourses, with such a violent aversion to the superstitions of Rome, that the greatest part of the Scottish nation abandoned them entirely, and aimed at nothing less than the total extirpation of popery.[b] From this period to the present times, the doctrine, worship, and discipline that had been established at Geneva by the ministry of Calvin, have been maintained in Scotland with invincible obstinacy and zeal; and every attempt to introduce into that kingdom the rites and government of the church of England, has proved impotent and unsuccessful.[c]

XI. The cause of the reformation underwent, in Ireland, the same vicissitudes and revolutions that had attended it in England. When Henry VIII., after the abolition of the papal authority, was declared 'supreme head, upon earth, of the church of England,' George Brown, a monk of the Augustine order, whom that monarch had created, in 1535, archbishop of Dublin, began to act with the utmost vigour in consequence of this change in the hierarchy. He purged the churches of his diocese from superstition in all its various forms, pulled down images, destroyed relics, abolished absurd and idolatrous rites, and by the influence as well as authority which he possessed in Ireland, caused the king's supremacy to be acknowledged by that nation.[d] Henry showed soon after, that this supremacy was not a vain title; for he banished the monks out of that kingdom, confiscated their revenues, and secularized or suppressed their convents. In the reign of Edward VI. farther progress was made in the removal of popish superstitions, by the zealous labours of archbishop Brown, and the auspicious encouragement he granted to all who exerted themselves in the cause of the reformation. But the death of this excellent prince, and the accession of his sister to the throne, changed the face of affairs in Ireland,[e] as it had done in England.

Mary pursued with fire and sword, and all the marks

ed application to study and to business, as well as by the frequency and fervour of his public discourses, he had worn out a constitution naturally strong. During a lingering illness, he discovered the utmost fortitude, and met the approaches of death with a magnanimity inseparable from his character. He was constantly employed in acts of devotion, and comforted himself with those prospects of immortality, which not only preserve good men from desponding, but fill them with exultation in their last moments."

☞ [a] The earl of Morton, who was present at his funeral, pronounced his eulogium in a few words, the more honourable for Knox, as they came from one whom he had often censured with peculiar severity: "There lies he who never feared the face of man."

[b] See Neal's History of the Puritans, vol. i.—Calderwood's History of Scotland's Reformation.—Georg. Buchanani Rerum Scoticar. Hist.—Melvil's Memoirs, vol. i.

☞ [c] The indignation of the people, which had been excited by the *vices* of the clergy, was soon transferred to their *persons*, and settled at last, by a transition not unusual, upon the offices they enjoyed; and thus the effects of the reformation extended, not only to the doctrine, but also to the government of the popish church. But in Germany, England, and the northern kingdoms, its operations were checked by the power and policy of their princes, and episcopal hierarchy (which appears to be the most conformable to the practice of the church, since Christianity became the established religion of the Roman empire) was still continued in these countries, under certain limitations. The ecclesiastical government was in a great measure borrowed from the civil; and the dioceses and jurisdiction of patriarchs, archbishops, and bishops, corresponded with the division and constitution of the empire. In Switzerland and the Low Countries, the nature and spirit of a republican policy gave fuller scope to the reformers; and thus all pre-eminence of order in the church was destroyed, and that form of ecclesiastical government established, which has been since called Presbyterian. The situation of the primitive church (oppressed by continued persecutions, and obliged by its sufferings to be contented with a form of government extremely simple, and with a parity of rank for want of ambition to propose, or power to support, a subordination) suggested, without doubt, the idea of this latter system; though it would be unfair to allege this consideration as a victorious argument in favour of Presbyterianism, because a change of circumstances will sometimes justify a change in the methods and plans of government. Be that as it may, the church of Geneva, which received the decisions of Calvin with an amazing docility, restored this presbyterian or republican form of ecclesiastical policy; Knox studied, admired, and recommended it to his countrymen, and he was seconded by many of the Scottish nobles, of whom some hated the persons, while many others coveted the wealth of the dignified clergy. But, in introducing this system, that reformer did not deem it expedient to depart altogether from the ancient form; for, instead of bishops, he proposed the establishment of ten superintendants, to inspect the lives and doctrines of the other clergy, and preside in the inferior judicatories of the church, without pretending to claim either a seat in parliament, or the revenues and dignity of the former bishops. This proposal was drawn up, and presented to a convention of estates in 1561; and what it contained, in relation to ecclesiastical jurisdiction and discipline, would have easily obtained the sanction of that assembly, had not a design to recover the patrimony of the church, in order to apply it to the advancement of religion and learning, been insinuated in it. After this, at certain periods, the name of bishop was revived, but without the prerogatives, jurisdiction, or revenues, that were formerly appropriated to that order. They were made subject to the general assemblies of the clergy, and their power was gradually diminished, until their name and order were abolished at the revolution in 1688, when presbyterianism was established in Scotland by the laws of the state. See Robertson's History of Scotland.

☞ [d] The learned and pious primate Usher, in his Memoirs of the Ecclesiastical Affairs of Ireland, speaks of archbishop Brown in the following manner: "George Brown was a man of a cheerful countenance, in his acts and deeds plain down-right; to the poor merciful and compassionate, pitying the state and condition of the souls of the people, and advising them, when he was provincial of the Augustine order in England, to make their application solely to Christ; which advice coming to the ears of Henry VIII., he became a favourite, and was made archbishop of Dublin. Within five years after he enjoyed that see, he caused all superstitious relics and images to be removed out of the two cathedrals in Dublin, and out of all the churches in his diocese; and caused the Ten Commandments, the Lord's Prayer, and the Creed, to be placed in gilded frames about the altars. He was the first that turned from the Romish religion of the clergy here in Ireland, to embrace the reformation of the church of England." See a very curious pamphlet in the fifth volume of the Harleian Miscellany, entitled Historical Collections of the Church of Ireland.

☞ [e] Here Dr. Mosheim has fallen into a mistake, by not distinguishing between the designs of the queen, which were indeed cruel, and their execution, which was happily and providentially prevented. This appears from a very singular and comical adventure, of which the account, as it has been copied from the papers of Richard, earl of Cork, and is to be found among the manuscripts of Sir James Ware, is as follows:

"Queen Mary, having dealt severely with the protestants in England, about the latter end of her reign signed a commission to take the same course with them in Ireland; and, to execute the same with greater force, she nominates Dr. Cole one of the commissioners. This doctor coming with the commission to Chester on his journey, the mayor of that city, hearing that her majesty was sending a messenger into Ireland, and he being a churchman, waited on the doctor, who, in discourse with the mayor, taketh out of a cloak-bag a leather box, saying unto him, 'Here is a commission that shall lash the *heretics* of Ireland,' (calling the protestants by that title.) The good woman of the house, being well affected to the protestant religion, and also having a brother named John Edmonds, of the same, then a citizen in Dublin, was much troubled at the doctor's words; but watching her convenient time, while the mayor took his leave, and the doctor complimented him down the stairs, she opens the box, takes the commission out, and places in lieu thereof a sheet of paper, with a pack of cards wrapped up therein, the knave of clubs being placed uppermost. The doctor coming up to his chamber, suspecting nothing of what had been done, put up the box as formerly. The next day, going to the water-side, wind and weather serving him, he sails towards Ireland, and landed on the 7th of October, 1558, at Dublin. Then coming to the castle, the lord Fitz-Walter, being lord-deputy, sent for him to come before him and the privy council; who, coming in, after he made a speech relating upon what account he came over, presents the box unto the lord-deputy, who causing it to be opened, that the secretary might read the commission, there was nothing save a pack of cards with the knave of clubs uppermost; which not only startled the lord-deputy and council, but the doctor, who assured them he had a commission, but knew not how it was gone. Then the lord deputy made answer, 'Let us have another commission, and we will shuffle the

of unrelenting vengeance, the promoters of a pure and rational religion, and deprived Brown and other protestant bishops of their dignities in the church. But the reign of Elizabeth gave a new and a deadly blow to popery, which was recovering its force, and arming itself anew with the authority of the throne; and the Irish were obliged again to submit to the form of worship and discipline established in England.[a]

XII. The reformation had not been long established in Britain, when seven of the Netherland provinces, united by a respectable confederacy, renounced their spiritual allegiance to the Roman pontiff. Philip II. king of Spain, apprehending the danger to which the religion of Rome was exposed from that spirit of liberty and independence which reigned among the inhabitants of the Low-Countries, took the most violent measures to dispel it. For this purpose he augmented the number of the bishops, enacted the most severe and barbarous laws against all innovators in matters of religion, and erected that unjust and inhuman tribunal of the inquisition, which would intimidate and tame, as he thought, the manly spirit of an oppressed and persecuted people. But his measures, in this respect, were as unsuccessful as they were absurd; his furious and intemperate zeal for the superstitions of Rome accelerated their destruction; and the papal authority, which had only been in a critical state, was reduced to a desperate one, by the very steps that were designed to support it. The nobility formed themselves into an association, in 1566, with a view to procure the repeal of these tyrannical edicts; and, when their solicitations and requests were treated with contempt, they resolved to obtain, by force, what they hoped to have gained from clemency and justice. They addressed themselves to a free and an abused people, spurned the authority of a cruel yoke, and, with an impetuosity and vehemence that were perhaps excessive, trampled upon whatever was deemed sacred or respectable by the church of Rome.[b] To quell these tumults, a powerful army was sent from Spain, under the command of the duke of Alva, whose horrid barbarity and sanguinary proceedings kindled that long and bloody war from which the powerful republic of the United Provinces derived its origin, consistence, and grandeur. It was the heroic conduct of William of Nassau, prince of Orange, seconded by the succours of England and France, that delivered this state from the Spanish yoke; and no sooner was this deliverance obtained, than the reformed religion, as it was professed in Switzerland, was established in the United Provinces;[c] and, at the same time, an universal toleration was granted to those whose religious sentiments were of a different nature, whether they retained the faith of Rome, or embraced the reformation in another form,[d] provided that they made no attempts against the authority of the government, or the tranquillity of the public.[e]

XIII. The reformation made a considerable progress in Spain and Italy, soon after the rupture between Luther and the Roman pontiff. In all the provinces of Italy, but more especially in the territories of Venice, Tuscany, and Naples, the religion of Rome lost ground, and great numbers of persons, of all ranks and orders, expressed an aversion to the papal yoke. This gave rise to violent and dangerous commotions in the kingdom of Naples in 1536, of which the principal authors were Bernardo Ochino and Peter Martyr, who, in their public discourses from the pulpit, exhausted all the force of their irresistible eloquence in exposing the enormity of the reigning superstition. These tumults were appeased with much difficulty by the united efforts of Charles V. and his viceroy don Pedro de Toledo.[f] In several places the popes put a stop to the progress of the reformation, by letting loose, upon the pretended heretics, their bloody inquisitors, who spread the marks of their usual barbarity through the greatest part of Italy. These formidable ministers of superstition put such a number of supposed heretics to death, and perpetrated, on the friends of religious liberty, such horrid acts of cruelty and oppression, that most of the reformists consulted their safety by a voluntary exile, while others returned to the religion of Rome, at least in external appearance. But the terrors of the inquisition, which frightened back into the profession of popery many protestants in other parts of Italy, could not penetrate into the kingdom of Naples; nor could either the authority or entreaties of the Roman pontiffs engage the Neapolitans to admit within their territories either a court of inquisition, or even visiting inquisitors.[g]

The eyes of many persons in Spain were opened upon

cards in the mean while.' The doctor, being troubled in his mind, went away, and returned into England; and coming to the court, obtained another commission; but staying for a wind on the water-side, news came to him that the queen was dead; and thus God preserved the protestants of Ireland."

Queen Elizabeth was so delighted with this story, which was related to her by Lord Fitz-Walter on his return to England, that she sent for Elizabeth Edmonds, and gave her a pension of forty pounds during her life. See Cox, Hibernia Anglicana, or History of Ireland, vol. ii.—Harleian Miscellany, vol. v.

[a] See the Life of Dr. George Brown, Archbishop of Dublin, published at London in 1681, and reprinted in the Harleian Miscellany.

☞ [b] Dr. Mosheim seems here to distinguish too little between the spirit of the nobility and that of the multitude. Nothing was more temperate and decent than the conduct of the former; and nothing could be more tumultuous and irregular than the behaviour of the latter. While the multitude destroyed churches, pulled down monasteries, broke the images used in public worship, abused the officers of the inquisition, and committed a thousand enormities, the effects of furious resentment and brutish rage, the nobility and opulent citizens kept within the bounds of moderation and prudence. Though justly exasperated against a despotic and cruel government, they dreaded the consequences of popular tumults as the greatest of misfortunes. Many of them even united their counsels and forces with those of the governess, (the duchess of Parma,) to restrain the seditious and turbulent spirit of the people. The prince of Orange and count Egmont (whose memories will live for ever in the grateful remembrance of the Dutch nation, and be dear to all the lovers of heroic patriotism and sacred liberty throughout the world) signalized their moderation upon this occasion, and were the chief instruments of the repose that ensued. Their opposition to the government proceeded from the dictates of humanity and justice, and not from a spirit of licentiousness and rebellion; and their merit and respectability had secured to them such influence and authority among the people, that, had the imperious court of Spain condescended to make any reasonable concessions, the public tranquillity might have been restored, and the affections of the people entirely regained. See Le Clerc, Histoire des Prov. Un.

[c] In the year 1573.

☞ [d] It is necessary to distinguish between the toleration that was granted to the Roman catholics, and that which the Anabaptists, Lutherans, and other protestant sects, enjoyed. They were all indiscriminately excluded from the civil employments of the state; but though they were equally allowed the exercise of their religion, the latter were permitted to enjoy their religious worship in a more open and public manner than the former, from whom the churches were taken, and whose religious assemblies were confined to private conventicles, which had no external resemblance to the edifices usually set apart for divine worship.

[e] See a farther account of this affair in Gerard Brandt's History of the Reformation in the Netherlands.

[f] See Giannone, Historia di Napoli, tom. iv.—Vita Galeacii in Museo Helvetico, tom. ii.

☞ [g] It was an attempt to introduce a Roman inquisitor into the city

the truth, not only by the spirit of inquiry, which the controversies between Luther and Rome had excited in Europe, but even by the efforts of those divines whom Charles V. had brought with him into Germany, to combat the pretended heresy of the reformers; for these Spanish doctors imbibed this heresy instead of refuting it, and propagated it more or less, on their return home, as evidently appears from several circumstances.[a] But the inquisition, which could not gain any footing in the kingdom of Naples, reigned triumphant in Spain; and by racks, gibbets, stakes, and other formidable instruments of its method of persuading, soon terrified the people back into popery, and suppressed the vehement desire they had of changing a superstitious worship for a rational religion.[b]

XIV. I shall not enter into a contest with those writers, whatever their secret intentions may be, who observe, that many unjustifiable proceedings may be imputed to some of the most eminent promoters of this great change in the state of religion. For every impartial and attentive observer of the rise and progress of this reformation will ingenuously acknowledge, that wisdom and prudence did not always attend the transactions of those who were concerned in the glorious cause; that many things were done with violence, temerity, and precipitation; and, what is still worse, that several of the principal agents in this great revolution were actuated more by the impulse of passion and views of interest, than by a zeal for the advancement of true religion. But, on the other hand, the wise and candid observer of human affairs will own, as a most evident and incontestable truth, that many things which, when stripped of the circumstances and motives that attended them, appear to us, at this time, as real crimes, will be deprived of their enormity, and even acquire the aspect of noble deeds, if they be considered in one point of view with the times and places in which they were transacted, and with the frauds and crimes of the Roman pontiffs and their creatures, by which they were occasioned. But, after all, in defending the cause of the reformation, we are under no obligation to defend, in every respect, the moral characters of its promoters and instruments. These two objects are entirely distinct. The most just and excellent cause may be promoted with low views, and from sinister motives, without losing its nature, or ceasing to be just and excellent.

The true state of the question is, whether the opposition of Luther and other reformers to the Roman pontiff arose from just and solid reasons; and this question is entirely independent of the virtues or vices of particular persons.[c] Let many of these individuals be supposed as odious as, or still more detestable than, they are represented by their adversaries, provided that the cause which they supported be allowed to have been just and good.

---

of Naples, that, properly speaking, produced the tumult and sedition which Dr. Mosheim attributes in this section to the pulpit discourses of Ochino and Martyr; for these famous preachers, particularly the former, taught the doctrines of the reformation with great art, prudence, and caution, and secretly converted many, without giving public offence. The emperor himself, who heard him at Naples, declared that "he preached with such spirit and devotion as might almost make the very stones weep." After Ochino's departure from Naples, the disciples he had formed gave private instructions to others, among whom were some eminent ecclesiastics and persons of distinction, who began to form congregations and conventicles. This awakened the jealousy of the viceroy Toledo, who published a severe edict against heretical books, ordered some productions of Melancthon and Erasmus to be publicly burned, looked with a suspicious eye on all kinds of literature, suppressed several academies, which had been erected about this time by the nobility for the advancement of learning; and, having received orders from the emperor to introduce the inquisition, desired pope Paul III. to send from Rome to Naples a deputy of that formidable tribunal. It was this that excited the people to take up arms in order to defend themselves against this branch of spiritual tyranny, which the Neapolitans never were patient enough to suffer, and which, on many occasions, they had opposed with vigour and success. Hostilities ensued, which were followed by an accommodation and a general pardon; while the emperor and viceroy, by this resolute opposition, were deterred from their design of introducing this despotic tribunal into the kingdom of Naples. Several other attempts were afterwards made, during the reigns of Philip II., III., IV., and Charles II. to establish the inquisition in Naples; but, by the jealousy and vigilance of the people, they all proved ineffectual. At length the emperor Charles VI., early in the eighteenth century, published an edict, expressly prohibiting all causes, relating to the holy faith, from being tried by any persons except the archbishop and bishops as ordinaries. See Giannone, lib. xxxii. and the Modern Univ. History.

☞ [a] This appears from the unhappy end of all the ecclesiastics who had attended Charles, and followed him into his retirement. No sooner was that monarch dead, than they were seized by order of the court of inquisition, and were afterwards committed to the flames, or sent to death in other forms equally terrible. Such was the fate of Augustin Casal, the emperor's preacher; of Constantine Pontius, his confessor; of the learned Egidius, whom he had nominated to the bishopric of Tortosa; of Bartholomew de Caranza, a Dominican, who had been confessor to king Philip and queen Mary, with above twenty more of less note. All this gave reason to presume that Charles died a protestant. Certain it is, that he knew well the corruptions and frauds of the church of Rome, and the grounds and reasons of the protestant faith, though business, ambition, interest, and the prejudices of education, may have blinded him for a while, until leisure, retirement, the absence of worldly temptations, and the approach of death, removed the veil, and led him to wise and serious reflections. See Burnet's History of the Reformation.

[b] See Geddes' Spanish Protestant Martyrology, in his Miscellaneous Tracts, tom. i.

[c] The *translator* has here added some paragraphs, to render more perspicuous the important observation of the learned author; and the *continuator* takes the opportunity of remarking, as an excuse for the intemperance and vehemence of Luther, that the mildness of a Melancthon, and the timidity of an Erasmus, would never have produced the desired reformation.

SECTION II.

THE GENERAL HISTORY OF THE CHURCH.

I. THE Spaniards and Portuguese, if we may give credit to their historians, exerted themselves, with the greatest vigour and success, in the propagation of the Gospel among the darkened nations;[a] and it must, indeed, be allowed, that they communicated some notions, such as they were, of the Christian religion to the inhabitants of America, to those parts of Africa where they carried their arms, and to the islands and maritime provinces of Asia, which they reduced under their dominion. It is also true, that considerable numbers of these savage people, who had hitherto lived, either under the bondage of the most extravagant superstitions, or in a total ignorance of any object of religious worship, embraced, at least in outward appearance, the doctrines of the Gospel. But when we reflect on the methods of conversion which were employed by the Spanish missionaries among these wretched nations, on the barbarous laws and inhuman tortures that were used to force them into the profession of Christianity; when it is considered, farther, that the denomination of a Christian was conferred upon every poor wretch who discovered a blind and excessive veneration for his stupid instructors, and who could by certain gestures, and the repetition of a little jargon, perform a few superstitious rites and ceremonies; then, instead of rejoicing at, we shall be tempted to lament, such a propagation of the Gospel, and to behold the labours of such miserable apostles with indignation and contempt. Such is the judgment passed upon these missionaries, not only by those whom the church of Rome placed in the list of heretics, but also by many of the most pious and eminent of her own doctors, in France, Germany, Spain, and Italy.

II. When the pontiffs saw their ambition checked by the progress of the Reformation, which deprived them of a great part of their spiritual dominion in Europe, they turned their lordly views toward the other parts of the globe, and became more solicitous than ever about the propagation of the Gospel among the nations that were yet involved in the darkness of paganism. This they considered as the best method of making amends for the loss they had sustained in Europe, and the most specious pretext for assuming to themselves, with some appearance of justice, the title of heads or parents of the universal church. The famous society, which, in 1540, took the denomination of *Jesuits*, or the *Company of Jesus*, seemed every way proper to assist the court of Rome in the execution of this extensive design. And accordingly, from their rise, this peculiar charge was given to them, that they should form a certain number of their order for the propagation of Christianity among the unenlightened nations, and that these missionaries should be at the absolute disposal of the pope, and always ready, at a moment's warning, to repair to whatever part of the world he should fix for the exercise of their ministry.[b] The many histories and relations which mention the labours, perils, and exploits of that prodigious multitude of Jesuits, who were employed in the conversion of the African, American, and Indian infidels, abundantly show, with what fidelity and zeal the members of this society executed the orders of the successive pontiffs.[c] And their labours would have undoubtedly crowned them with immortal glory, had it not appeared evident, from the most authentic records, that the greatest part of these new apostles had more in view the promotion of the ambitious views of Rome, and the advancement of the interests of their own society, than the propagation of the Christian religion, or the honour of its divine author.[d] It may also be affirmed, from records of the highest credit and authority, that the inquisition erected by the Jesuits at Goa, and the penal laws, whose terrors they employed so freely in the propagation of the Gospel, contributed much more than their arguments and exhortations, which were but sparingly used, to engage the Indians to embrace Christianity.[e] The converting zeal of the Franciscans and Dominicans, which had, for a long time, been not only cooled, but almost totally extinguished, was animated anew by the example of the Jesuits; and several other religious orders, that slumbered in their cells, were roused from their lethargy, if not by a principle of envy, at least by a spirit of emulation.

III. Of all the Jesuits who distinguished themselves by their zealous and laborious attempts to extend the limits of the church, none acquired a more shining reputation than Francis Xavier, who is commonly called the Apostle of the Indies.[f] An undaunted resolution, and no small degree of genius and sagacity, rendered this famous missionary one of the most proper persons that could be employed in such an arduous task. Accordingly, in 1522, he set sail for the Portuguese settlements in India, and, in a short time, spread the knowledge of the Christian re-

---

[a] See Lafitau's Histoire des Decouvertes et Conquêtes des Portugais dans le nouveau Monde, tom. iii. p. 420. All the relations given by this eloquent writer (who was afterwards created bishop of Sisteron) are taken from the Portuguese historians.—The other writers who have thrown light upon this part of ecclesiastical history, are enumerated by Fabricius, in his Lux Salutar. Evangelii toti Orbi exoriens.

☞ [b] When the fanatic Ignatius first solicited the confirmation of his order by pope Paul III., the learned and worthy cardinal Guidiccioni opposed his request with great vehemence. But this opposition was vanquished by the dexterity of Ignatius, who changing the articles of his institution, in which he had promised obedience to the pope with certain restrictions, turned it in such a manner as to bind his order by a solemn vow of implicit, blind, and unlimited submission and obedience to the Roman pontiff. This change produced the desired effect, and made the popes look upon the Jesuits as the chief support of their authority. Hence arose the zeal which Rome has ever shown for that order. It is remarkable, that Ignatius and his company, in the very same charter in which they declared their implicit and blind allegiance to the court of Rome, promised a like implicit and unlimited allegiance to the general of their society, notwithstanding the impossibility of serving two absolute masters, whose commands might be often contradictory. See Histoire des Religieux de la Compagnie de Jesus, printed at Utrecht in 1741.

[c] See Jo. Alb. Fabricii Lux Evangelii toti Orbi exoriens, cap. xxxii. p. 550.

[d] B. Christ. Eberh. Weismanni Oratio de Virtutibus et Vitiis Mission. Roman. in Orat. ejus Academ.

[e] See the Hist. de la Compagnie de Jesus, tom. ii.

[f] The late king of Portugal, in 1747, obtained for Xavier, or rather for his memory, the title of Protector of the Indies, from Benedict XIV. See the Lettres Edifiantes et Curieuses des Missions Etrangeres, tom. xliii. The body of this sainted missionary lies interred at Goa, where it is worshipped with the highest marks of devotion. There is also a magnificent church at Cotati dedicated to Xavier, to whom the inhabitants of that Portuguese settlement pay the most devout tribute of veneration and worship.

ligion, or, to speak more properly, of the Romish system, over a great part of the continent, and in several of the islands of that remote region. Thence, in 1529, he passed into Japan, and laid there, with amazing rapidity, the foundations of the famous church, which flourished during so many years in that vast empire. His indefatigable zeal prompted him to attempt the conversion of the Chinese; and with this view he embarked for that extensive and powerful kingdom, in sight of which he ended his days, in 1552.[a] After his death, other members of his insinuating order penetrated into China. Of these missionaries the chief was Matthew Ricci, an Italian, who, by his skill in the mathematics, became so acceptable to the Chinese nobility, and even to their emperor, that he obtained, both for himself and his associates, the liberty of explaining to the people the doctrines of the Gospel.[b] He may, therefore, be considered as the parent and founder of the Christian churches, which, though often dispersed, and tossed to and fro by the storms of persecution, still subsist in China.[c]

IV. The jurisdiction and territories of those princes, who first threw off the papal yoke, being confined within the limits of Europe, the churches that were under their protection could contribute little to the propagation of the Gospel in those distant regions of which we have been speaking. It is, however, recorded in history, that, in 1556, fourteen protestant missionaries were sent from Geneva to convert the Americans,[d] though it is not well known who was the promoter of this pious design, or with what success it was carried into execution. The English also, who, toward the conclusion of this century, sent colonies into the northern parts of America, transplanted with them the reformed religion, which they themselves professed; and, as their possessions were extended and multiplied from time to time, their religion also made a considerable progress among that rough and uncivilized people. We learn, moreover, that about this time the Swedes exerted their religious zeal in converting to Christianity many of the inhabitants of Finland and Lapland, of whom a considerable number had hitherto retained the impious and extravagant superstitions of their pagan ancestors.

V. It does not appear, from authentic records, that the sword of persecution was drawn against the Gospel, or any public opposition made to the progress of Christianity during this century; and it would betray a great ignorance, both of the situation, opinions, and maxims of the Turks, to imagine, that the war they waged against the Christians was carried on upon religious principles, or with a view to maintain and promote the doctrines of Mohammed. On the other hand, it is certain, that there lay concealed, in different parts of Europe, not a few persons who entertained a virulent enmity against religion in general, and, in a more especial manner, against the religion of the Gospel; and who, both in their writings and in private conversation, sowed the seeds of impiety and error, and instilled their odious principles into weak, unsteady, and credulous minds. In this pernicious and unhappy class are generally placed some of the Peripatetic philosophers, who adorned Italy by their erudition, and particularly Pomponatius; several French wits and philosophers, such as Bodin, Rabelais, Montagne, Bonaventure des Perieres, Dolet, Charron; some Italians, at whose head appears Leo X., followed by Bembo, Politian, Jordano Bruno, Ochino; and a few Germans, such as Theophrastus Paracelsus, Nicolas Taurellus, and others.[e] It is even reported, that, in certain provinces of France and Italy, schools were erected, whence whole swarms of these impious doctors soon issued to deceive the simple and unwary. This accusation will not be wholly rejected by such as are acquainted with the spirit and genius of these times; nor can it be said with truth, that all the persons charged with this heavy reproach were entirely guiltless. It is nevertheless certain, on the other hand, that, upon an accurate and impartial examination of this matter, the accusation brought against many of them will appear to be entirely groundless; and that, with respect to several who may deserve censure in a certain degree, their errors are less pernicious and criminal, than they are uncharitably or rashly represented to be.

VI. It is, at the same time, evident, that, in this century, the arts and sciences were carried to a degree of perfection unknown to preceding ages; and, from this happy renovation of learning, the European churches derived the most signal and inestimable advantages, which they also transmitted to the most remote nations. The benign influence of true science, and its tendency to improve both the form of religion and the institutions of civil policy, were perceived by many of the states and princes of Europe: hence large sums were expended, and great zeal and industry employed, in promoting the progress of knowledge, by founding and encouraging literary societies, by protecting and exciting a spirit of emulation among men of genius, and by annexing distinguished honours and advantages to the culture of the sciences. And it is particularly worthy of observation, that this was the period, when the wise and salutary law, which excludes ignorant and illiterate persons from the sacred functions of the ministry, acquired, at length, that force which it still retains in the greatest part of the Christian world. There still remained, however, some seeds of that ancient discord between religion and philosophy, which had been sown and fomented by ignorance and fanaticism; and there were found, both among the friends and enemies of the reformation, several well-meaning, but inconsiderate men, who, in spite of common sense, maintained, with more vehemence and animosity than ever, that vital religion and piety could never flourish without being totally separated from learning and science, and nourished by the holy simplicity that reigned in the primitive ages of the church.

VII. The first rank in the literary world was now enjoyed by those who consecrated their studious hours, and their critical sagacity, to the publication, correction, and illustration, of the most famous Greek and Latin authors of ancient times, to the study of antiquity and the langua-

[a] See the writers enumerated by Fabricius, in his Lux Evangelii, &c. cap. xxxix. p. 677. Add to these Lafitau's Histoire des Decouvertes des Portugais dans le nouveau Monde, tom. iii. iv.—Histoire de la compagnie de Jesus, tom. i.

[b] J. B. Du-Halde, Description de l'Empire de la Chine, tom. iii.

[c] It appears, however, that before the arrival of Ricci in China, some of the Dominicans had already been there, though to little purpose. See Le Quien, Oriens Christianus, tom. iii.

[d] Picteti Oratio de Trophæis Christi, in Orat. ejus, p. 570. There is no doubt that the divines here mentioned were those whom the illustrious admiral Coligni invited into France, when, in 1555, he had formed the project of sending a colony of Protestants into Brazil and other provinces of America. See Charlevoix, Histoire de la Nouvelle France, tom. i.

[e] See Reimanni Historia Atheismi et Atheorum.—Jo. Franc. Buddeus, Theses de Atheismo et Superstitione.—Dictionnaire de Bayle.

ges, and to the culture of eloquence and poetry. We see by the productions of this age (which yet remain, and continue to excite the admiration of the learned,) that in all the provinces of Europe these branches of literature were cultivated with a kind of enthusiasm, by such as were most distinguished by their taste and genius; and, what is still more extraordinary, (and perhaps not a little extravagant,) the welfare of the church, and the prosperity of the state, were supposed to depend upon the improvement of these branches of erudition, which were considered as the very essence of true and solid knowledge. If such encomiums were swelled beyond the bounds of truth and wisdom by enthusiastical philologists, it is nevertheless certain, that the species of learning here under consideration, was of the highest importance, as it opened the way that led to the treasures of solid wisdom, to the improvement of genius, and thus undoubtedly contributed, in a great measure, to deliver both reason and religion from the prepossessions of ignorance and the servitude of superstition.[a] And, therefore, we ought not to be surprised, when we meet with persons who exaggerate the merit, and dwell beyond measure on the praises of those who were our first guides from the regions of darkness and error, into the luminous paths of evidence and truth.

VIII. Though the lovers of philology and the *belles lettres* were much superior in number to those who turned their principal views to the study of philosophy, yet the latter were far from being contemptible either in point of number or capacity. The philosophers were divided into two classes: some were wholly absorbed in contemplation, while others were employed in the investigation of truth, and endeavoured by experience, as well as by reasoning, to trace out the laws and operations of nature. The former were subdivided into two sects, one of which followed certain leaders, while the other, unrestrained by the dictates of authority, struck out a new way for themselves, following freely their own inventions. Those who submitted to the direction of philosophical guides, enlisted themselves under the standard of Aristotle, or that of Plato, who continued still to have many admirers, especially in Italy.—Nor were the followers of Aristotle agreed among themselves; they all acknowledged the Stagirite as their chief, but they followed him through very different paths. Some were for retaining the ancient method of proceeding in philosophical pursuits, which their doctors falsely called the Peripatetic system. Others pleaded for the pure and unmixed philosophy of Aristotle, and recommended his writings as the source of wisdom, and as the system which was most adapted, when properly illustrated and explained, to the instruction of youth. A third sort of Aristotelians, who differed equally from these now mentioned, and of whom the celebrated Melancthon was the chief, pursued another method. They extracted the marrow out of the lucubrations of the Grecian sage, illustrated it by the aids of genuine literature and the rules of good criticism, and corrected it by the dictates of right reason and the doctrines and principles of true religion.

Of those who struck out a path to themselves in the regions of philosophy, without any regard to that which had been opened by ancient sages, and pursued by their followers, Cardan,[b] Telesius,[c] and Campanella,[d] deservedly hold the first rank, as they were undoubtedly men of superior genius, though too much addicted to the suggestions and visions of an irregular fancy. To these may be added Peter Ramus, that ingenious French philosopher, who, by attempting to substitute, in the place of Aristotle's logic, a method of reasoning more adapted to the use of rhetoric and the improvement of eloquence, excited such

☞ [a] Many vehement debates have been carried on concerning the respective merit of literature and philosophy; but these debates are almost as absurd as a comparison that should be made between the means and the end, the instrument and its effect. Literature is the key by which we often open the treasures of wisdom, both human and divine. But, as the sordid miser absurdly converts the means into an end, and acquires a passion for the shining metal, considered abstractedly from the purposes which it was calculated to serve, so the pedantic philologist erects literature into an independent science, and contemns the divine treasures of philosophy, which it was designed both to discover and to illustrate. Hence arose that wretched tribe of "word-catchers that live on syllables," (as Pope, I think, happily expresses their tasteless pursuits,) who made the republic of letters groan under their commentaries, annotations, various readings, &c., and who forget that an acquaintance with language was intended to lead us to the improvement of the mind and to the knowledge of things.

☞ [b] Cardan was a man of a bold, irregular, enterprising genius, who by a wild imagination, was led into the study of astrology and magic, by which he excited the astonishment and attracted the veneration of the multitude, while his real merit as a philosopher was little known. He was accused of atheism, but seems much rather chargeable with superstition. His life and character seem to have formed an amazing mixture of wisdom and folly; and nothing can give a more unfavourable idea of his temper and principles, than the hideous portrait he has drawn of himself in his book De Genituris. His knowledge of physic and of mathematics was considerable, and his notions of natural philosophy may be seen in his famous book De Subtilitate et Veritate Rerum, in which some important truths and discoveries are mixed with the most fanatical visions, and the most extravagant and delirious effusions of mystical folly. See the ample and judicious account that has been given of the character and philosophy of this writer (whose voyage to Britain is well known) by the learned Brucker, in his Historia Critica Philosophiæ, tom. iv.

☞ [c] This philosopher, less known than the former, was born in 1508, at Cosenza, in the kingdom of Naples, and was the restorer of the philosophy formerly taught by Parmenides, upon whose principles he built a new system, or at least, a system which appeared new, by the elegant connexion which he gave to its various parts, and the arguments used to maintain and support it against the philosophy of Aristotle. It was the vague and uncertain method of reasoning which the Stagirite had introduced into natural philosophy, that engaged Telesius to compose his famous book De Principiis Rerum Naturalium. In this work, after having refuted the visionary principles of the Aristotelian philosophy, he substitutes in their place such as are immediately derived from the testimony of the senses, even heat and cold, from which, like Parmenides, he deduces the nature, origin, qualities, and changes, of all material beings. To these two principles he adds a third, namely, matter; and on these three he builds with some dexterity his physical system, for a part of which he seems also to have been indebted to a book of Plutarch, De Primo Frigido. It will be entertaining to the philosophical reader, to compare this work of Telesius with lord Bacon's physical account of the story of Cupid and Cœlus, in his book de Principiis et Originibus, &c.

☞ [d] Campanella, a native of Calabria, made a great noise in the seventeenth century, by his innovations in philosophy. Shocked at the atheism and absurdities of the Aristotelian system, he early acquired a contempt of it, and turned his pursuits toward something more solid, perusing the writings of all the ancient sages, and comparing them with the great volume of nature, to see whether the pretended copies resembled the original. The sufferings that this man endured are almost incredible; but they were said to be inflicted on him in consequence of the treasonable practices which were imputed to him, partly against the court of Spain, and partly against the kingdom of Naples, which (it was supposed) he had formed the design of delivering into the hands of the Turks. He was freed from his prison and tortures by the interposition of pope Urban VIII., who gave him particular marks of his favour and esteem, and, finding that he was not safe at Rome, had him conveyed to Paris, where he was honoured with the protection of Louis XIII. and cardinal Richelieu, and ended his days in peace. As to the writings and philosophy of this great man, they are tinged, indeed, with the colour of the times, and bear, in many places, the marks of a chimerical and undisciplined imagination; but, among a few visionary notions, they contain a great number of important truths. He undertook an entire reformation of philosophy, but was unequal to the task. For an account of his principles of logic, ethics, and natural philosophy, see Brucker's Hist. Critica Philosophiæ, tom. iv. He was accused of atheism, but unjustly; he was also accused of suggesting cruel measures against the protestants, and not without reason.

a terrible uproar in the Gallic schools. Nor must we omit here the mention of Theophrastus Paracelsus, who, by an assiduous observation of nature, by a great number of experiments indefatigably repeated, and by applying the penetrating force of fire[a] to discover the first principles or elements of bodies, endeavoured to throw new light and evidence on the important science of natural philosophy. As the researches of this industrious inquirer into nature excited the admiration of all, his example was consequently followed by many; and hence arose a new sect of philosophers, who assumed the denomination of *Theosophists*,[b] and who, placing little confidence in the decisions of human reason, or the efforts of speculation, attributed all to divine illumination and repeated experience.

IX. This revolution in philosophy and literature, together with the spirit of emulation that animated the different sects or classes into which the learned men of this age were divided, produced many happy effects of various kinds. It, in a more particular manner, brought into disrepute, though it could not at once utterly eradicate, that intricate, barbarous, and insipid method of teaching theology, which had hitherto prevailed in all the schools and pulpits of Christendom. The sacred writings, which, in the preceding ages, had been either entirely neglected, or very absurdly explained, were now much more consulted and respected in the debates and writings of the Christian doctors than they had formerly been; the sense and language of the inspired writers were more carefully studied and more accurately developed; the doctrines and precepts of religion taught in a more methodical manner, and with greater connexion and perspicuity; and that dry, barren, and vapid language, which the ancient schoolmen affected so much in their theological compositions, was wholly exploded by the wiser part of the divines of this century. It must not, however, be imagined, that this reformation of the schools was so perfect, as to leave no room for improvement in succeeding ages; this, indeed, was far from being the case. Much imperfection yet remained in the method of treating theology; and many things, which had great need of a correcting hand, were left untouched. It would, nevertheless, be either an instance of ingratitude, or a mark of great ignorance, to deny to this age the honour of having begun what was afterwards more happily finished, and of having laid the foundations of that striking superiority, which the divines of succeeding ages obtained over those of ancient times.

X. The improvements, which have been now mentioned, as proceeding from the restoration of letters and philosophy, not only extended to the method of conveying theological instruction, but also purified the science of theology itself. For the true nature, genius, and design of the Christian religion, which even the most learned and pious doctors of antiquity had but imperfectly comprehended, were now unfolded with evidence and precision, and drawn, like truth, from an abyss in which they had hitherto lain concealed. It is true, the influence of error was far from being totally suppressed, and many false and absurd doctrines are still maintained and propagated in the Christian world. But it may nevertheless be affirmed, that the Christian societies, whose errors at this day are the most numerous and extravagant, have much less absurd and perverse notions of the nature and design of the Gospel, and the duties and obligations of its votaries, than were entertained by those doctors of antiquity, who ruled the church with an absolute authority, and were considered as the chief oracles of theology. It may farther be observed, that the reformation contributed much to soften and civilize the manners of many nations, who, before that happy period, were sunk in the most savage stupidity, and carried the most rude and insocial aspect. It must indeed be confessed, that a variety of circumstances, not immediately connected with religion, combined to produce that lenity of character, and that milder temperature of manners, maxims, and actions, which gradually appeared in the greatest part of the European nations, after the period that was signalized by the reformative exertions of Luther. It is nevertheless evident, beyond all contradiction, that the disputes concerning religion, and the accurate and rational inquiries into the doctrines and duties of Christianity to which those disputes gave rise, had a great tendency to eradicate from the minds of men the ferocity that had been so long nourished by the barbarous suggestions of unmanly superstition. It is also certain, that at the very dawn of this happy revolution in the state of Christianity, and even before its salutary effects were manifested in all their extent, pure religion had many sincere and fervent votaries, though they were concealed from public view by the multitudes of fanatics with which they were surrounded.

☞ [a] The principal merit of Paracelsus consisted in inventing, or at least restoring from oblivion and darkness, the important science of chemistry, giving it a regular form, reducing it into a connected system, and applying it most successfully to the art of healing, which was the peculiar profession of this philosopher, whose friends and enemies have drawn him in the falsest colours. His application to the study of magic, of which he treats in the tenth volume of his works, under the denomination of the Sagacious Philosophy, is a circumstance dishonourable to his memory, and nothing can discover a more total absence of common sense and reasoning than his discourses on that subject. As to his philosophical system, it is so obscure, and so contradictory, that we shall not pretend to delineate it here.

[b] See, for an ample account of the lives, transactions, and systems of these philosophers, Brucker's Historia Critica Philosophiæ.

SECTION III.

THE PARTICULAR HISTORY OF THE CHURCH.

PART I.

THE HISTORY OF THE ANCIENT CHURCHES.

CHAPTER I.

History of the Roman or Latin Church.

I. The Roman or Latin church is a system of government, whose jurisdiction extends over a great part of the known world, though its authority has been circumscribed within narrower limits since the happy revolution that, in many countries, delivered Christianity from the yoke of superstition and spiritual tyranny. This system of ecclesiastical policy, extensive as it is, is under the direction of the bishop of Rome alone, who, by virtue of a sort of hereditary succession, claims the authority, prerogatives, and rights, of St. Peter, the supposed prince of the apostles, and gives himself out for the supreme head of the universal church, the vicegerent of Christ upon earth. This lordly ruler of the church is, at this time, elected to his high office, by the chosen members of the Roman clergy, who bear the ancient denomination of cardinals. Of these, six are bishops, within the precincts of Rome; fifty are ministers of the Roman churches, and are called priests or presbyters; and fourteen are inspectors of the hospitals and charitable foundations, and are called deacons. These cardinals (while the papal chair is vacant, and they are employed in the choice of a successor to the deceased pontiff) are closely confined in a sort of prison, called the Conclave, that they may thus be induced to bring this difficult matter to a speedy conclusion. No person, except one who is an Italian by descent, and who has already obtained a place in the college of cardinals, is capable of being raised to the supremacy of the church: nor have all the Italian cardinals the privilege of aspiring to this high office.[a] Some are rendered incapable of filling the papal chair by the place of their birth, others by the manner of their life, and a few by other reasons.[b] It is also to be observed, that the emperor and the kings of France and Spain have acquired, either expressly by stipulation, or imperceptibly through custom, the privilege of excluding, from the number of the candidates for this high office, such as they dislike or think proper to oppose. Hence it often happens, that, in the numerous college of cardinals, a very small number are permitted, upon a vacancy, to aspire to the papacy; the greatest part being generally prevented by their birth, their characters, their circumstances, and by the force of political intrigues, from flattering themselves with the pleasing hope of ascending that towering summit of ecclesiastical power and dominion.

II. It must not be imagined that the personal power and authority of the Roman pontiff are circumscribed by no limits, since it is well known, that in all his decisions relating to the government of the church, he previously consults the *brethren*, i. e. the cardinals, who compose his ministry or privy council. In matters of religious controversy and doctrine, he is even obliged to ask the advice and opinion of eminent divines, in order to secure his pretended infallibility from the suggestions of error. Besides this, all affairs that are not of the highest moment and importance, are divided into classes according to their respective nature, and left to the management of certain colleges, called *Congregations*,[c] in every one

---

[a] See J. F. Mayer's Comment. de Electione Pontif. Romani, published at Hamburg in 1691. The ceremonies observed in the election and installation are amply described by Meuschen, in a work published at Frankfort in 1732, under the following title, Ceremoniale Electionis et Coronationis Pontificis Romani.

[b] The great obstacle that prevents several cardinals from aspiring to the pontificate, is what they call at Rome, *il peccato originale*, or *original sin*. This mark of exclusion belongs to those who are born subjects of some crown or republic which are beyond the bounds of Italy, or are upon a footing of jealousy with the court of Rome. Those also who were made cardinals by the nomination of the kings of France or Spain, or their adherents, are also included in this imputation of original sin, which excludes from the papal chair. The accidental circumstances that excludes certain cardinals from the pontificate, are their being born princes or independent sovereigns, or their declaring themselves openly in favour of certain courts, or their family's being too numerous, or their morals being irregular. Even youth, and a good complexion and figure, are considered as obstacles. But all these maxims and rules vary and change according to the inconstant and precarious impulse of policy and faction.

For an account of the different methods of electing the pope, whether by compromise, inspiration, scrutiny, or access, (by which last is meant a second election, employed when the other methods fail,) see Aymon's Tableau de la Cour de Rome.

[c] These congregations are as follow: I. The congregation of the pope, instituted first by Sixtus V. to prepare the matters that were to be brought before the consistory, at which the pontiff is always present. Hence this is called the Consistorial Congregation, and in it are treated all affairs relative to the erection of bishoprics and cathedral churches, the re-union or suppression of episcopal fees, the alienation of church goods, and the taxes and annates that are imposed upon all benefices in the pope's gift. The cardinal dean presides in this assembly. II. The congregation of the Inquisition, or (as it is otherwise called) of the Holy Office, instituted by Paul III., which takes cognizance of heresies, apostacy, magic, and profane writings. The office of Grand Inquisitor, which encroached upon the prerogatives of the pontiff, has been long suppressed, or rather distributed among the cardinals who belong to this congregation, and whose decisions come under the supreme cognizance of his holiness. III. The congregation for the propagation of the Roman catholic faith, founded under the pontificate of Gregory XV. composed of eighteen cardinals, one of the secretaries of state, a protonotary, a secretary of the inquisition, and other members of less rank. Here it is that the deliberations are carried on, which relate to the extirpation of heresy, the appointment of missionaries, &c. This congregation has built a most beautiful and magnificent palace in one of the most agreeable situations that could be chosen at Rome, where proselytes to popery from foreign countries are lodged and nourished *gratis*, in a manner suitable to their rank and condition, and instructed in those branches of knowledge to which the bent of their genius points. The prelates, curates, and vicars also, who are obliged, without any fault of theirs, to abandon the places of their residence, are entertained charitably in this noble edifice in a manner proportioned to their station in the church. IV. The congregation designed to explain the decisions of the council of Trent. V. The congregation of the Index, whose principal business is to examine manuscripts and books that are designed for publication, to decide whether the people may be permitted to read them, to correct those books whose errors are not numerous, and which contain useful and salutary truths, to condemn those whose principles are here-

of which, one or more cardinals preside.[a] The decisions of these societies are generally approved by the pontiff, who has not a right, without alleging the most weighty and evident reasons, to reverse what they pronounce to be just and expedient. This form of ecclesiastical government is, doubtless, a check to the authority of the pope; and hence it is, that many things are transacted at Rome in a manner that is in direct opposition to the sentiments of its spiritual ruler. This may serve to show us, that those persons are little acquainted with the nature and limits of the papal hierarchy, who pretend, that all the iniquitous proceedings of the court of Rome, the calamities it has occasioned, the contentions, rebellions, and tumults it has excited, are entirely imputable to the pontiff himself.[b]

III. The power of the pope hath excited debates even among those who are under the papal hierarchy; and the spiritual subjects of this pretended head of the church, are very far from agreeing with respect to the extent of his authority and jurisdiction. Hence it happens, that this authority and dominion are not the same in all places, having a larger scope in some provinces, and being reduced within narrower bounds in others. If, indeed, we consider only the pretensions of the pontiff, we shall find that his power is unlimited and supreme; for there are no prerogatives that can flatter ambition, which he does not claim for himself and his court. He not only pretends, that the whole power and majesty of the church reside in his person, and are transmitted, in certain portions, from him to the inferior bishops, but moreover asserts the absolute infallibility of all decisions and decrees which he pronounces from his lordly tribunal. These arrogant pretensions are, however, opposed by many, and chiefly by the French, who expressly maintain, that every bishop receives immediately from Christ himself a portion of that spiritual power which is imparted to the church; that the collective sum, or whole of this power, is lodged in the aggregate body of its pastors, or (which is the same thing) in a general council lawfully assembled; and that the pontiff, considered personally, and as distinct from the church, is liable to error. This complicated and important controversy may be easily brought within narrower bounds, and may be reduced to the following plain question;—'Is the Roman pontiff, properly speaking, the Legislator of the church, or, is he no more than the Guardian and Depository of the laws enacted by Christ and the church?' There is no prospect of seeing this question decided, or the debates terminated to which it has given rise, since the contending parties do not even agree about the proper and lawful judge of this important controversy.[c] Some great revolution alone can effect the decision of this matter.

IV. The church of Rome lost much of its ancient splendour and majesty, as soon as Luther, and the other luminaries of the reformation, had exhibited to the view of the European nations the Christian religion restored, at least to a considerable part of its native purity, and delivered from many of the superstitions under which it had lain so long disfigured. Among the most opulent states of Europe, several withdrew entirely from the jurisdiction of Rome; in others, certain provinces threw off the yoke of papal tyranny; and, upon the whole, this defection produced a striking diminution both of the wealth and power of the Roman pontiffs. It must also be observed, that even the kings, princes, and sovereign states, who adhered to the religion of Rome, yet changed their sentiments with respect to the claims and pretensions of its bishop. If they were not persuaded by the writings of the protestants to renounce the superstitions of popery, yet they received most useful instructions from them in other matters of very great moment. They drew from these writings important discoveries of the groundless claims and unlawful usurpations of the Roman pontiffs, and came, at length, to perceive, that, if the

tical and pernicious, and to grant to certain individuals the peculiar privilege of perusing heretical books. This congregation, which is sometimes held in the presence of the pope, but generally in the palace of the cardinal-president, has a more extensive jurisdiction than that of the inquisition, as it not only takes cognizance of books that contain doctrines contrary to the Roman catholic faith, but of those also which concern the duties of morality, the discipline of the church, and the interests of society. Its name is derived from the alphabetical tables, or indexes of heretical books and authors, which have been composed by its appointment. VI. The congregation for maintaining the rights and immunities of the clergy, and of the knights of Malta. This congregation was formed by Urban VIII, to decide the disputes, and remove the difficulties and inconveniences that arose from the trials of ecclesiastics, before princes, or other lay-judges. VII. The congregations relating to the bishops and regular clergy, instituted by Sixtus V. to decide the debates which arise between the bishops and their diocesans, and to compose all differences that occur among the monastic orders. VIII. The congregation appointed by Gregory XIV. for examining the capacity and learning of the bishops. IX. Another for inquiring into their lives and morals. X. A third, for obliging them to reside in their dioceses, or to dispense them from that obligation. XI. The congregation for suppressing monasteries, i. e. such whose revenues are exhausted, and who thereby become a charge upon the public. XII. The congregation of the Apostolic Visitation, which names the visitors, who perform the duties and visitations of the churches and convents within the district of Rome. XIII. The congregation of relics, authorized to examine the marks, and to augment the number of these instruments of superstition. XIV. The congregation of indulgences, designed to examine the cases of those who have recourse to this method of quieting the conscience. XV. The congregation of rites, which Sixtus V. appointed to regulate and invent the religious ceremonies that are to be observed in the worship of each new saint that is added to the calendar.

These are the congregations of cardinals, set apart for administering the spiritual affairs of the church; and they are undoubtedly, in some respects, a check upon the power of the pontiff, enormous as it may be. There are six more, which relate to the temporal government of the papal territories. In these congregations, all things are transacted which relate to the execution of public justice in civil or criminal matters, the levying of taxes, the providing of the cities and each of the provinces with good governors, the relieving of those who are unjustly oppressed by subordinate magistrates, the coinage, the care of the rivers, aqueducts, bridges, roads, churches, and public edifices.

[a] The court of Rome is very particularly and accurately described by Aymon (who had been, before his conversion to the protestant religion, domestic chaplain to Innocent XI.) in a book entitled Tableau de la Cour de Rome. See also Relation de la Cour de Rome, et des Ceremonies qui s'y observent, which Father Labat translated into French from the Italian of Jerome Limadoro, and subjoined to his Voyages en Espagne et Italie, tom. viii.—For an account of the Roman congregations, &c. see Doroth. Ascian. de Montibus Pietatis Romanis, p. 510, as also Hunold. Plettenberg, Notitia Tribunalium et Congregationum Curiæ Romanæ.

[b] Hence arises that important distinction, frequently employed by the French and other nations in their debates with the pope; I mean the distinction between his holiness and the court of Rome. The latter is often loaded with the bitterest reproaches and the heaviest accusations, while the former is spared, and in some measure excused. Nor is this distinction by any means groundless, since the cardinals and congregations, whose rights and privileges are deemed sacred, undertake and execute many projects without the knowledge, and sometimes against the will and consent, of the pontiff himself.

[c] The arguments employed by the pontiff's creatures in defence of his unlimited authority, may be seen in the words of Bellarmine and other writers, of which a voluminous collection has been made by Roccaberti; and what is not a little extraordinary, a French writer, named Petitdier, appeared in defence of the pope's pretensions, in a book published at Luxemburg, in 1724, sur l' Autorité et l' Infallibilité des Papes. The sentiments of the Gallican church, and the arguments by which it opposes the pretensions of Rome, may be seen in the writings of Richer and Launoy.

jurisdiction and authority of Rome should continue the same as before the rise of Luther, the rights of temporal princes, and the majesty of civil government, would, sooner or later, be absorbed in the gulph of papal avarice and ambition. Hence it was, that most of the sovereign states of Europe, partly by secret and prudent measures, partly by public negociations and remonstrances, set bounds to the daring ambition of Rome, which aimed at nothing less than universal dominion both in ecclesiastical and civil affairs; nor did the pontiff think it either safe or expedient to have recourse to the ancient arms of the church, *war* and *excommunication*, in order to repel these attacks upon his authority. Even those very kingdoms, which acknowledged the Roman pontiff as the lawgiver of the church, and an infallible guide, confined his power of enacting laws within narrow limits.

V. In this declining state of their affairs, it was natural for the humble pontiffs to look about for some method of repairing their losses; and, for this purpose, they exerted much more zeal and industry, than had been shown by their predecessors, in extending the limits of their spiritual dominion beyond Europe, and left no means unemployed of gaining proselytes and adherents in the Indies and in Africa, both among the pagan nations and the Christian sects. The Jesuits, as we have already had occasion to observe, were the first missionaries who were employed for this purpose in those distant parts of the world; but able men, selected from the other monastic orders, were afterwards entrusted with this arduous undertaking. If, however, we except the exploits of Francis Xavier and his companions in India, China, and Japan, of which notice has been already taken, there were no great matters effected in this century; as, generally speaking, the persons who were appointed to execute this grand project, were not endowed with that experience and dexterity which it necessarily required, and entered upon the work with more zeal than prudence and knowledge.

The Portuguese had, in the preceding century, opened a passage into the country of the Abyssinians, who professed the doctrine, and observed the religious rites of the Monophysites; and hence arose a favourable occasion of reducing that people under the papal yoke. Accordingly John Bermudez was sent into Ethiopia for this purpose; and, that he might appear with a certain degree of dignity, he was invested with the title of Patriarch of the Abyssinians. The same important commission was afterwards given to Ignatius Loyola, and the companions of his labours;[a] and, at the commencement of their undertaking, several circumstances, and particularly a war with a neighbouring prince, which the Abyssinian monarch was desirous of terminating by the powerful succours of the Portuguese, seemed to promise them a successful and happy ministry. But the event did not answer this fond expectation; and, in some time, it appeared plainly, that the Abyssinians stood too firm in the faith of their ancestors, to be easily engaged to abandon and forsake it; so that, toward the conclusion of this century, the Jesuits had almost lost all hopes of succeeding in their attempts.[b]

VI. The Egyptians, or Copts, who were closely connected with the Abyssinians in their religious sentiments, and also in their external forms of worship, became the next objects of Rome's ambitious zeal; and, in 1562, Christopher Roderic, a Jesuit of note, was sent, by the express order of pope Pius IV., to propagate the cause of popery among that people. This ecclesiastic, notwithstanding the rich presents and ingenious arguments by which he attempted to change the sentiments and shake the constancy of Gabriel,[c] who was at that time patriarch of Alexandria, returned to Rome with no other effect of his embassy, than fair words and a few compliments.[d] It is, however, true, that, in 1594, during the pontificate of Clement VIII., an envoy from another patriarch of Alexandria, whose name was also Gabriel, appeared at Rome, and this circumstance was considered as a subject of triumph and boasting by the creatures of the pope.[e] But the more candid and sensible, even among the Roman catholics, looked upon this embassy, and not without reason, as a stratagem of the Jesuits to persuade the Abyssinians (who were so prone to follow the example of their brethren of Alexandria) to join themselves to the communion of Rome, and submit to the authority and jurisdiction of its pontiff.[f] It is at least certain, that we do not subsequently find the smallest token of a propensity in the Copts to embrace the doctrine or discipline of Rome.

Many years before this period, a considerable sect of the Armenians had been accustomed to treat the pope with particular marks of veneration and respect, without departing, however, from the religious doctrine, discipline, or worship of their ancestors. Of this a farther account shall be given in the history of the Eastern Churches: it may, however, be proper to observe here, that the attachment of this sect to the pontiff was greatly increased, and his votaries were considerably multiplied, by the zeal of Serapion, an opulent man, who was entirely devoted to the court of Rome, and who, by engaging himself to discharge the debts under which the Armenians groaned, obtained, in 1593, the title and dignity of Patriarch, though there were already two patriarchs at the head of the Armenian church. He did not, however, long enjoy this dignity; for, soon after his promotion, he was sent into exile by the Persian monarch, at the desire of those Armenians who adhered to the ecclesiastical discipline of their ancestors; and thus the boasting and exultation of the Romans suddenly subsided, and their hopes vanished.[g]

☞ [a] It is certainly by mistake that Dr. Mosheim mentions Loyola as having made a voyage into Abyssinia. Jesuits were sent at different periods to that country, and with little success; but their founder was never there in person.

[b] See Ludolfi Histor. Ethiopica et Comm.—Geddes, Church History of Ethiopia, p. 120.—Le Grand, Dissertation de la Conversation des Abyssins, which is to be found in the Voyage Historique d'Abyssinie du R. P. Jerome Lobo.—La Croze, Hist. du Christianisme en Ethiopie, liv. ii.

[c] Franc. Sacchini, Histor. Societat. Jesu. pars ii. lib. v.—Euseb. Renaudot, Historia Patriarchar. Alexandrin. p. 611.—Hist. de la Compagnie de Jesus, tom. iii.

☞ [d] This patriarch offered to send one of his bishops to the council of Trent, in order to get rid of the importunity of these Jesuits; but he positively refused to send any of his young students to be educated among their order, and declared plainly, that he owed no obedience or submission to the bishop of Rome, who had no more dignity or authority than any other prelate, except within the bounds of his own diocese. See Histoire des Religieux de la Compagnie de Jesus, tom. ii.

[e] The transactions of this embassy, adorned with an ample and pompous preface, are subjoined to the sixth vol. of the Ann. Eccl. of Baronius.

[f] Renaudot, in his Hist. Patriarch. Alexandrin., endeavours to maintain the credit and importance of this mission, of which Baronius has given such a pompous account. He is, however, in an error when he asserts, that father Simon, relying upon the fallacious testimony of George Douza, was the only person who ever considered this embassy as a stratagem, since it is evident, that Thomas a Jesu, a Carmelite, in his treatise de Conversione omnium Gentium procurandâ, has considered it in the same light, as well as several other writers. See Geddes, Church History of Ethiopia.

[g] See Nouv. Mem. des Mis. de la Com. de Jesus dans le Levant, t. iii.

VII. The ambitious views of the Roman pontiffs sowed the pestilential seeds of animosity and discord among all the eastern churches; and the Nestorian Christians, who are also known by the denomination of Chaldeans, felt early the effects of their imperious counsels. In 1551, a warm dispute arose among that people about the creation of a new patriarch, Simeon Barmamas being proposed by one party, and Sulaka earnestly desired by the other. The latter, to support his pretensions the more effectually, repaired to Rome, and was consecrated patriarch, in 1553, by pope Julius III., whose jurisdiction he had acknowledged, and to whose commands he had promised unlimited submission and obedience. Julius gave the name of John to the new Chaldean patriarch, and, upon his return to his own country, sent with him several persons, skilled in the Syriac language, to assist him in establishing and extending the papal empire among the Nestorians. From this time that unhappy people were divided into two factions, and were often involved in the greatest dangers and difficulties by the jarring sentiments and perpetual quarrels of their patriarchs.[a]

The Nestorians, or as they are more commonly called, the Christians of St. Thomas, who inhabited a part of the coast of India, suffered much from the methods employed by the Portuguese to engage them to embrace the doctrine and discipline of the church of Rome, and to abandon the religion of their ancestors, which was much more simple and infinitely less absurd.[b] The finishing stroke was put to the violence and brutality of these attempts by don Alexis de Menezes, bishop of Goa, who, about the conclusion of this century, calling the Jesuits to his assistance, obliged this unhappy and reluctant people to embrace the religion of Rome, and to acknowledge the pope's supreme jurisdiction; against both of which acts they had always expressed the utmost abhorrence. These violent counsels and arrogant proceedings of Menezes, and his associates, were condemned by such of the Roman catholics as were most remarkable for their equity and wisdom.[c]

VIII. The greatest part of the first legates and missionaries of the court of Rome treated with much severity and injustice the Christians whom they were desirous of gaining over to their communion. For they not only required that these Christians should renounce the particular opinions that separated them from the Greek and Latin churches, and that they should acknowledge the pontiff as Christ's sole vicegerent upon earth: their demands went still farther; they opposed some opinions that were at least worthy of toleration, and others which were highly agreeable to the dictates both of reason and Scripture; they insisted upon the suppression and abolition of several customs, rites, and institutions, which had been handed down from successive ancestors, and which were perfectly innocent in their nature and tendency; in a word, they would be satisfied with nothing less than an entire and minute conformity of the religious rites and opinions of the people, with the doctrine and worship of the church of Rome. The papal court, however, rendered wise by experience, perceived, at length, that this manner of proceeding was highly imprudent, and very unlikely to extend the limits of the papal empire in the East. It was therefore determined to treat with more artifice and moderation a matter of such moment and importance, and the missionaries were, consequently, ordered to change the plan of their operations, and confine their views to the two following points; namely, the subjection of these Christians to the jurisdiction of the pope, and their renouncing, or at least professing to renounce, the opinions that had been condemned in the general councils of the church. In all other matters, the Roman envoys were commanded to allow a perfect toleration, and to let the people remain unmolested in following the sentiments, and observing the institutions, which they had derived from their ancestors. To give the greater credit and plausibility to this new method of conversion, certain learned doctors of the church endeavoured to demonstrate, that the religious tenets of Rome, when explained according to the simplicity of truth, and not by the subtilties and definitions of the schools, differed very little from the opinions received in the Greek and the other eastern churches. But this demonstration was very far from being satisfactory, and it discovered less of an ingenuous spirit, than a disposition to gain proselytes by all sorts of means, and at all events. Be that as it may, the cause of Rome received much more advantage from this plan of moderation, than it had derived from the severity of its former counsels, though much less than the authors of this reconciling plan fondly expected.

IX. While the pontiffs were using their utmost efforts to extend their dominion abroad, they did not neglect the means that were proper to strengthen and maintain it at home. On the contrary, from the dawn of the reformation, they began to redouble their diligence in defending the internal form and constitution of their church against the dexterity and force of its adversaries. They could no more have recourse to the expedient of crusades, by which they had so often diminished the power and influence of their enemies. The revolutions which had happened in the affairs of Rome, and in the state of Europe, rendered any such method of subduing heretics visionary and impracticable. Other methods were, therefore, to be found out, and all the resources of prudence were to be exhausted in support of a declining church. Hence the laws and proceedings of the inquisition were revised and corrected in those countries where that formidable court was permitted to exert its dreadful power. Colleges and schools of learning were erected in various places, in which the studious youth were trained up, by perpetual exercise, in the art of disputing, that thus they might wield, with more dexterity and success, the arms of controversy against the enemies of Rome. The circulation of such books as were supposed to have a pernicious tendency, was either entirely prevented, or at least much obstructed, by certain lists or indexes, composed by men of learning and sagacity, and published by authority, in which these books were marked with a note of infamy, and their perusal prohibited, though with certain restrictions. The pursuit of knowledge was earnestly recommended to the clergy, and honourable marks of distinction, as well as ample

[a] Jos. Sim. Assemani, Bib. Orient. Clementino-Vaticana, t. iii. pars ii.

[b] For an account of the doctrines and worship of these, and the other eastern Christians, see the following chapter; as also two learned books of La Croze; one entitled, Histoire du Christianisme des Indes, and the other, Histoire du Christianisme en Ethiopie.

[c] La Croze, Hist. du Christ. des Indes, liv. ii. p. 88.

rewards, were bestowed on those who made the most remarkable progress in the cultivation of letters. And, to enlarge no farther on this head, the youth, in general, were more carefully instructed in the principles and precepts of their religion, than they had formerly been. Thus it happens, that signal advantages are frequently derived from what are looked upon as the greatest evils, and much wisdom and improvement are daily acquired in the school of opposition and adversity. It is more than probable, that the church of Rome would never have been enriched with the acquisitions we have now been mentioning, had it continued in that state of uninterrupted ease and undisputed authority, which nourish a spirit of indolence and luxury, and had not the pretended heretics attacked its territories, trampled upon its jurisdiction, and eclipsed a great part of its ancient majesty and splendour.

X. The monastic orders and religious societies have been always considered by the Roman pontiffs as the principal support of their authority and dominion. It is chiefly by them that they rule the church, maintain their influence on the minds of the people, and augment the number of their votaries. And, indeed, various causes contribute to render the connexion between the pontiff and these religious communities much more intimate, than that which subsists between him and the other clergy, of whatever rank or order we may suppose them to be. It was therefore judged necessary, when the success of Luther and the progress of the reformation had effaced such a considerable part of the majesty of Rome, to found some new religious fraternity, that should, in a particular manner, be devoted to the interests of the Roman pontiff, and the very express end of whose institution should be to renew the vigour of a declining hierarchy, to heal the deep wound it had received, to preserve those parts of the papal dominions that remained yet entire, and to augment them by new accessions. This was so much the more necessary, as the two famous *Mendicant* societies,[a] by whose ministry the popes had chiefly governed, during many ages, with success and glory, had now lost, on several accounts, a considerable part of their influence and authority, and were thereby less capable of serving the church with efficacy and vigour than they had formerly been. What the pontiff sought in this declining state of his affairs, was found in that famous and most powerful society, which, from the name of Jesus, derived the appellation of *Jesuits*, while its members were styled by their enemies *Loyolites* from *Loyola*, and sometimes *Inighists*,[b] from the Spanish name of their founder.[c] This zealot was Ignatius Loyola, a Spanish knight, who, from an illiterate soldier, became an unparalleled fanatic; a fanatic, indeed, of a fertile and enterprising genius,[d] who, after having passed through various scenes of life, repaired to Rome, and, being there directed by the prudent counsels of persons much wiser than himself, was rendered capable of instituting such an order as the state of the church at that time essentially required.[e]

XI. The Jesuits hold a middle rank between the monks and the secular clerks, and, with respect to the nature of their institute, approach nearer to the regular canons than to any other order; for, though they resemble the monks in this, that they live separate from the multitude, and are bound by religious vows, yet they are exempt from stated hours of worship, and other numerous and burthensome services, which lie heavy upon the monastic orders, that they may have more time to employ in the education of youth, in directing the consciences of the faithful, in edifying the church by their pious and learned productions, and in transacting other matters that relate to the prosperity of the papal hierarchy. Their whole order is divided into three classes. The first comprehends the *professed members*, who live in what are called the professed houses; the second contains the *scholars*, who instruct the youth in the colleges; and to the third belong the *novices*, who live in the houses of probation.[f] The professed members, beside the three ordinary vows of poverty, chastity, and obedience, common to all the monastic tribes, are obliged to take a fourth, by which they solemnly bind themselves to go without deliberation or delay wherever the pope shall think fit to send them; they are also a kind of Mendicants, being without any fixed subsistence, and living upon the liberality of pious and well-disposed persons. The other Jesuits, and more particularly the scholars, possess large revenues, and are obliged, in case of urgent necessity, to contribute to the support of the professed members. The latter, who are few in number, in comparison with the other classes, are, in general, men of prudence and learning, deeply skilled in the affairs of the world, and dexterous in transacting all kinds of business from long experience, added to their natural penetration and sagacity; in a word, they are

☞ [a] These two orders were the Franciscans and the Dominicans.

☞ [b] The Spanish name of the founder of this order was Don Inigo de Guipuscoa.

[c] The writers who have given the most particular and circumstantial accounts of the order of the Jesuits, are enumerated by Christoph. Aug. Salig, in his Historia August. Confessionis, tom. ii. p. 73.

[d] Many Jesuits have written the life of this extraordinary man: but the greatest part of these biographers seem more intent upon advancing the glory of their founder, than solicitous about the truth and fidelity of their relations; and hence the most common events, and the most trivial actions that concern Ignatius, are converted into prodigies and miracles. The history of this enterprising fanatic has been composed with equal truth and ingenuity, though seasoned with a very large portion of wit and pleasantry, by a French writer, who calls himself Hercules Rasiel de Selve.* This work, which is divided into two volumes, is entitled, Histoire de l'admirable Don Inigo de Guipuscoa, Chevalier de la Vierge, et Fondateur de la Monarchie des Inighistes.

* Not only the Protestants, but also a great number of the more learned and judicious Roman catholics, have unanimously denied, that Ignatius Loyola had either learning sufficient to compose the writings of which he is said to be the author, or genius enough to form the society of which he is considered as the founder. They maintain, on the contrary, that he was no more than a flexible instrument in the hands of able and ingenious men, who made use of his fortitude and fanaticism to answer their purposes; and that persons much more learned than he, were employed to compose the writings which bear his name. See Geddes' Miscellaneous Tracts, vol. iii.—The greatest part of his works are supposed to have proceeded from the pen of his secretary John de Palanco; see La Croze, Histoire du Christianisme en Ethiopie, p. 55, 271. The Benedictines affirm, that his book of Spiritual Exercises is copied from the work of a Spanish Benedictine monk, whose name was Cisneros (see La Vie de M. de la Croze par Jordan;) and the constitutions of the society were probably the work of Lainez and Salmeron, two learned men who were among its first members. See Histoire des Religieux de la Compagnie de Jesus, tom. i.

☞ [e] Other writers add a fourth class, consisting of the spiritual and temporal co-adjutors, who assist the professed members, and perform the same functions, without being bound by any more than the three *simple* vows; though, after a long and approved exercise of their employment, the spiritual coadjutors are admitted to the fourth vow, and thus become *professed* members.

☞ * This is a feigned name; the real author was Le Vier, an ingenious bookseller, who lived formerly at the Hague.

the true and perfect Jesuits. The rest have, indeed, the title, but are rather the companions and assistants of the Jesuits, than real members of that mysterious order; and it is only in a very vague and general sense, that the denomination of Jesuits can be applied to them. What is still more remarkable, the secrets of the society are not revealed even to all the professed members. It is only a small number of this class, whom old age has enriched with thorough experience, and whom long trial has declared to be worthy of such an important trust, that are instructed in the mysteries of the order.

XII. The church and court of Rome, since the remarkable period when so many kingdoms and provinces withdrew from their jurisdiction, have derived more influence and support from the labours of this single order than from all their other emissaries and ministers, and all the various exertions of their power and opulence. It was this famous company which, spreading itself with an astonishing rapidity over the greatest part of the habitable world, confirmed the wavering nations in the faith of Rome, restrained the progress of the rising sects, gained over a prodigious number of Pagans in the most barbarous and remote parts of the globe to the profession of popery, and attacked the pretended heretics of all denominations; appearing almost alone in the field of controversy, sustaining with fortitude and resolution the whole burthen of this religious war, and far surpassing the champions of antiquity, both in the subtlety of their reasonings, and the eloquence of their discourses. Nor was this all; for, by the affected softness and complying spirit which reigned in their conversation and manners, by their consummate skill and prudence in civil transactions, by their acquaintance with the arts and sciences, and a variety of other qualities and accomplishments, they insinuated themselves into the peculiar favour and protection of statesmen, persons of the first distinction, and even of crowned heads. Nor did any thing contribute more to give them a general ascendancy, than the cunning and dexterity with which they relaxed and modified their system of morality, accommodating it artfully to the propensities of mankind, and depriving it, on certain occasions, of the severity that rendered it burthensome to the sensual and voluptuous. By this they supplanted, in the palaces of the great, and in the courts of princes, the Dominicans and other rigid doctors, who formerly held there the tribunal of confession and the direction of consciences; and engrossed to themselves an exclusive and irresistible influence in those retreats of royal grandeur, whence issue the counsels that govern mankind.[a] An order of this nature could not but be highly adapted to promote the interests of the court of Rome; and this, indeed, was its great end, and the leading purpose of which it never lost sight, employing every where its utmost vigilance and art to support the authority of the pontiffs, and to save them from the contempt, of which they must have been naturally apprehensive, in consequence of a revolution that opened the eyes of a great part of mankind.

All these circumstances placed the order of Jesuits in a conspicuous point of light. Their capacity, their influence, and their zeal for the papacy, had a very advantageous retrospect upon themselves, as it swelled the sources of their opulence, and procured to their society an uncommon, and indeed an excessive degree of respect and veneration. But it is also true, that these signal honours and advantages exposed them, at the same time, to the envy of other religious orders; that their enemies multiplied from day to day; and that they were often involved in the greatest perplexities and perils. Monks, courtiers, civil magistrates, public schools, united their efforts to crush this rising fabric of ambition and policy; and a prodigious number of books were published to prove, that nothing could be more detrimental to the interests of religion, and the well-being of society, than the institution of the Jesuits. In France, Poland, and other countries, they were declared public enemies to their country, traitors, and parricides, and were even banished with ignominy.[b] But the prudence, or rather the craft and artifice, of the disciples of Loyola, calmed this storm of opposition, and, by gentle and imperceptible methods, restored the credit and authority of their order, delivered it from the perils with which it had been threatened, and even put it in a state of defence against the future attempts of its adversaries.[c]

XIII. The pontiffs of this century, after Alexander VI., were Pius III., Julius II.,[d] Leo X., Adrian VI., whose characters and transactions have been already noticed; Clement VII., of the house of Medici; Paul III.,[e] of the

[a] Before this order was instituted, the Dominicans alone directed the consciences of all the European kings and princes; and it was by the Jesuits that the Dominicans were deprived of a privilege so precious to spiritual ambition. See Peyrat's Antiquités de la Chapelle de France.

[b] See the Histoire des Religieux de la Compagnie de Jesus, tom. iii. p. 48, &c.—Boulay, Hist. Academ. Paris, tom. vi. p. 559—648—as well as almost all the writers (but more particularly the Jansenists,) who have given accounts of the sixteenth century.

[c] The character and spirit of the Jesuits were admirably described, and their transactions and fate foretold, with a sagacity almost prophetic, so early as the year 1551, in a sermon preached in Christ Church, Dublin, by Dr. George Brown, archbishop of that see; a copy of which was given to Sir James Ware, and may be found in the Harleian Miscellany, vol. v. p. 566. The remarkable passage relating to that order, is as follows: "There are a new fraternity of late sprung up, who call themselves *Jesuits*, which will deceive many, who are much after the Scribes' and Pharisees' manner. Amongst the Jews they shall strive to abolish the truth, and shall come very near to do it. For these sorts will turn themselves into several forms; with the heathens a heathenist, with the atheist an atheist, with the Jews a Jew, with the Reformers a Reformade, purposely to know your intentions, your minds, your hearts, and your inclinations, and thereby bring you at last to be like the fool that said in his heart, 'There was no God.' These shall spread over the whole world, shall be admitted into the councils of princes, and they never the wiser; charming of them, yea, making your princes reveal their hearts and the secrets therein, and yet they not perceive it; which will happen from falling from the law of God, by neglect of fulfilling the law of God, and by winking at their sins; yet, in the end, God, to justify his law, shall suddenly cut off this society, even by the hands of those who have most succoured them, and made use of them; so that, at the end, they shall become odious to all nations. They shall be worse than Jews, having no resting-place upon earth; and then shall a Jew have more favour than a Jesuit."—This singular passage, I had almost said prediction, seems to be accomplished in part, by the present suppression of the Jesuits in France, (I write this note in the year 1762,) and by the great indignation which the perfidious stratagems, iniquitous avarice, and ambitious views of that society, have excited among all orders of the French nation, from the throne to the cottage.

[d] It was from a foolish ambition of resembling Cæsar, (a very singular model for a Christian pontiff,) that this pope, whose name was Rovere, assumed the denomination of Julius II. It may indeed be said, that Cæsar was sovereign pontiff, (*pontifex maximus*,) and that the bishop of Rome enjoyed the same dignity, though with some change in the title.

[e] The sentiments and character of Paul III. have given rise to much debate, even in our time, especially between the late cardinal Quirini, and Keisling, Schelhorn, and some other writers. The cardinal has used his utmost efforts to defend the probity and merit of this pontiff, while the two learned men above mentioned represent him as a perfidious po-

illustrious family of Farnese, Julius III.,[a] whose name was John Maria Giocci; Marcellus II.; Paul IV.,[b] whose name, before his elevation to the pontificate, was John Peter Caraffa; Pius IV., who was ambitious of being looked upon as a branch of the house of Medici, and who had been known, before his promotion, by the name of John Angelo de Medicis; Pius V., a Dominican, called Michael Ghisleri, a man of an austere and melancholy turn of mind, by which, and other similar qualities, he obtained a place in the calendar; Gregory XIII., who was previously known by the name of Hugo Buoncompagno;[c] Sixtus V., otherwise named Felix Peretti di Montalto, who, in pride, magnificence, intrepidity, and strength of mind, and in other great virtues and vices, far surpassed all his predecessors; Urban VII., Gregory XIV., Innocent IX., the shortness of whose reigns prevented them from acquiring reputation, or incurring reproach.

Among these pontiffs there were better and worse;[d] but they were all men of decent and even exemplary characters, when compared with the greatest part of those who governed the church before the reformation. For the number of adversaries, both foreign and domestic, that arose to set limits to the despotism of Rome, and to call in question the authority and jurisdiction of its pontiff, rendered the college of cardinals, and the Roman nobility, more cautious and circumspect in the choice of a spiritual ruler; nor did they dare, in these critical circumstances of opposition and danger, to entrust such an important dignity to any ecclesiastic, whose bare-faced licentiousness, shameless arrogance, or inconsiderate youth, might render him peculiarly obnoxious to reproach, and furnish new matter of censure to their adversaries. It is also worthy of observation, that from this period of opposition, occasioned by the ministry of the Reformers, the pontiffs have never pretended to such an exclusive authority, as they had formerly usurped; nor could they, indeed, make good such pretensions, were they so presumptuous as to avow them. They claim, therefore, no longer a power of deciding, by their single authority, matters of the highest moment and importance; but, for the most part, pronounce according to the sentiments that prevail in the college of cardinals, and in the different congregations, which are entrusted with their respective parts in the government of the church; and they rarely venture to excite serious divisions in foreign states, to arm subjects against their rulers, or to level the thunder of their excommunications at the heads of princes. All such proceedings, which were formerly so frequent at the court of Rome, have been in a great measure suspended, in consequence of the gradual decline of that ignorance and superstition which prescribed a blind obedience to the pontiff, and of the new degrees of power and authority that monarchs and other civil rulers have gained by the revolutions that have shaken the papal throne. In a word, imperious necessity has produced prudence and moderation even at Rome.

XIV. That part of the body of the clergy, which was more peculiarly devoted to the pope, seemed to undergo no change during this century. As to the bishops, it is certain that they made several zealous attempts, and some even in the council of Trent, for the recovery of the ancient rights and privileges, of which they had been forcibly deprived by the pontiffs. They were even persuaded that his holiness might be lawfully obliged to acknowledge, that the episcopal dignity was of divine original, and that the bishops received their authority immediately from Christ himself.[e] But all these attempts were successfully opposed by the artifice and dexterity of the court of Rome, which did not cease to propagate and enforce this despotic maxim: "That the bishops are no more than the legates or ministers of Christ's vicar; and that the authority which they exercise is entirely derived from the munificence and *favour of the apostolic see:*" a maxim, however, that several bishops, and more especially those of France, treated with little respect. Some advantages, however, and those not inconsiderable, were obtained for the clergy at the expense of the pontiffs; for those *reservations*, *provisions*, *exemptions*, and *expectatives*, (as they are termed by the Roman lawyers,) which before the Reformation had excited such heavy and bitter complaints throughout Europe, and exhibited the clearest proofs of papal avarice and tyranny, were now almost totally suppressed.

XV. Among the subjects of deliberation in the council of Trent, the reformation of the lives and manners of the clergy, and the suppression of the scandalous vices that had too long reigned in that order, were not forgotten; and several wise and prudent laws were enacted with a view to that important object. But those who had the cause of virtue at heart, complained (and the reason of such complaint still subsists) that these laws were no more

litician, whose predominant qualities were dissimulation and fraud. See Quirini's work de Gestis Pauli III. Farnesii. ☞ Among the *res gestæ* of Paul III. were two bastards, whose offspring, Farnese and Sforza, were made cardinals in their infancy. See Keislingii Epist. de Gestis Pauli III.—Schelhorn Amœnitates His. Eccles. et Liter. But the licentious exploits of this pope do not end here. He was reproached, in a book published before his death under the name of Ochino, with having poisoned his mother and his nephew, with having ravished a young virgin at Ancona, with an incestuous and adulterous commerce with his daughter Constantia, who died of poison administered by him, to prevent any interruption in his odious amours. It is said, in the same book, that, being caught in bed with his niece, Laura Farnese, who was the wife of Nic. Quercei, he received from this incensed husband a stab of a dagger, of which he bore the marks to his death. See Sleidan's Comment. de Statu Relig. et Reipublicæ, Carolo Quinto Cæsare, lib. xxi.

☞ [a] This was the worthy pontiff, who was scarcely seated in the papal chair, when he bestowed the cardinal's hat on the keeper of his monkeys, a boy chosen from among the lowest of the populace, and who was also the infamous object of his unnatural pleasures. See Thuan. lib. vi. et xv.—Hoffin. His. Eccl. t. v. p. 572—and more especially Sleidan's Histor. lib. xxi.—When Julius was reproached by the cardinals for introducing such an unworthy member into the sacred college, a person who had neither learning, nor virtue, nor merit of any kind, he impudently replied by asking them, "What virtue or merit they had found in him, that could induce them to place him (Julius) in the papal chair?"

☞ [b] Nothing could exceed the arrogance and ambition of this violent and impetuous pontiff, as appears from his treatment of Queen Elizabeth. See Burnet's History of the Reformation.—It was he who, by a bull, pretended to raise Ireland to the privilege and quality of an independent kingdom; and it was he also who first instituted the Index of prohibited books, mentioned above, in the first note, sect. iii.

[c] See Jo. Petr. Maffei Annales Gregorii XIII.

[d] Pius V. and Sixtus V. made a much greater figure in the annals of fame, than the other pontiffs here mentioned; the former on account of his excessive severity against heretics, and the famous bull *In Cœnâ Domini*, which is read publicly at Rome every year on the Festival of the Holy Sacrament; and the latter, in consequence of many services rendered to the church, and numberless attempts, carried on with spirit, fortitude, generosity, and perseverance, to promote its glory, and maintain its authority.—Several modern writers employed their pens in describing the life and actions of Pius V. as soon as they saw him canonised, in 1712, by Clement XI. Of the bull to which we have alluded, and the tumults it occasioned, there is an ample account in Giannone's Historia di Napoli, vol. iv. The life of Sixtus V. was written by Gregorio Leti, and the work has been translated intto several languages; it is, however, a very indifferent performance, and the relations which it contains are, in many places, inacurate and unfaithful.

[e] See Paolo Sarpi's History of the Council of Trent.

than feeble precepts, without any avenging arm to maintain their authority; and that they were transgressed, with impunity, by the clergy of all ranks, and particularly by those who filled the highest stations and dignities of the church. In reality, if we cast our eyes upon the Romish clergy, even in the present time, these complaints will appear as well founded now, as they were in the sixteenth century. In Germany, as is notorious to daily observation, the bishops, if we except their habit, their title, and a few ceremonies that distinguish them, have nothing in their manner of living that is, in the least, adapted to point out the nature of their sacred office. In other countries, a great part of the episcopal order, unmolested by the remonstrances or reproofs of the Roman pontiff, pass their days amidst the pleasures and cabals of courts, and appear rather the slaves of temporal princes, than the servants of Him *whose kingdom is not of this world*. They court glory; they aspire after riches, while very few employ their time and labours in edifying the people, or in promoting among them the vital spirit of practical religion and substantial virtue; and (what is still more deplorable) those bishops, who, sensible of the sanctity of their character and the duties of their office, distinguish themselves by their zeal in the cause of virtue and good morals, are frequently exposed to the malicious efforts of envy, often loaded with false accusations, and involved in perplexities of various kinds. It may, indeed, be partly in consequence of the examples they have received, and still too often receive, from the heads of the church, that so many of the bishops live dissolved in the arms of luxury, or toiling in the service of ambition. Many of them, perhaps, would have been more attentive to their vocation, and more exemplary in their manners, if they had not been corrupted by the models exhibited to them by the bishops of Rome, and if they had not constantly before their eyes a splendid succession of popes and cardinals, remarkable only for their luxury and avarice, their arrogance and vindictive spirit, their voluptuousness and vanity.

Those ecclesiastics who go under the denomination of canons, continue, almost every where, their ancient course of life, and consume, in a manner far remote from piety and virtue, the treasures which the religious zeal and liberality of their ancestors had consecrated to the uses of the church and the relief of the poor.

It must not, however, be imagined, that all the other orders of the clergy are at liberty to follow such corrupt models, or, indeed, that their inclinations and reigning habits tend toward such a loose and voluptuous manner of living: for it is certain, that the Reformation had a manifest influence even upon the Roman catholic clergy, by rendering them, at least, more circumspect and cautious in their external conduct, that they might be thus less obnoxious to the censures of their adversaries; and it is accordingly well known, that since that period the clergy of the inferior orders have been more attentive than they formerly were to the rules of outward decency, and have given less offence by open and scandalous vices and excesses.

XVI. The same observation holds good with respect to the monastic orders. There are, indeed, several things, worthy of the severest animadversion, chargeable upon many of the heads and rulers of these societies; nor are these societies themselves entirely exempt from that indolence, intemperance, ignorance, artifice, discord, and voluptuousness, which were formerly the common and reigning vices in the monastic retreats. It would be, nevertheless, an instance of great partiality and injustice to deny, that in many countries the manner of living, among these religious orders, has been considerably reformed, severe rules have been employed to restrain licentiousness, and much pains taken to conceal, at least, such vestiges of ancient corruption and irregularity as may yet remain. In some places, the austerity of the ancient rules of discipline, which had been so shamefully relaxed, was restored by several zealous patrons of monastic devotion; while others, animated with the same zeal, instituted new communities, in order to promote, as they piously imagined, a spirit of religion, and thus to contribute to the well-being of the church.

Of this latter number was Matthew de Bassi, a native of Italy, the extent of whose capacity was much inferior to the goodness of his intentions. He was a Franciscan of the rigid class,[a] one of those who were zealous in observing rigorously the primitive rules of their institution. This honest enthusiast seriously persuaded himself, that he was divinely inspired with the zeal which impelled him to restore the rules of the Franciscan order to their primitive austerity; and, looking upon this violent and irresistible impulse as a celestial commission, attended with sufficient authority, he commenced this work of monastic reformation with the most devout assiduity and ardour.[b] His enterprise was honoured, in 1525, with the solemn approbation of Clement VII.; and this was the origin of the order of *Capuchins*. The vows of this order implied the greatest contempt of the world and its enjoyments, and the most profound humility, accompanied with the most austere and sullen gravity of external aspect;[c] and its reputation and success excited, in the other Franciscans, the most bitter feelings of indignation and envy.[d] The Capuchins were so called from the sharp-pointed *capuche*, or cowl,[e] which they added to the ordinary Franciscan habit, and which is supposed to have been used by St. Francis himself.[f]

☞ [a] The dispute that arose among the Franciscans by Innocent the Fourth's relaxing so far their institute as to allow property and possessions in their community, produced a division of the order into two classes, of which the more considerable, who adopted the papal relaxation, were denominated Conventuals, and the other, who rejected it, Brethren of the Observance. The latter professed to observe and follow rigorously the primitive laws and institute of their founder.

☞ [b] The Brethren of the Observance, mentioned in the preceding note, had degenerated, in process of time, from their primitive self-denial; and hence arose the reforming spirit that animated Bassi.

[c] See Luc. Waddingi Annales Ordinis Minorum, tom. xvi.—Helyot, Histoire des Ordres Monastiques, tom. vii. ch. xxiv. and, above all, Zach. Boverii Annales Capucinorum.

☞ [d] One of the circumstances that exasperated most the Franciscans, was the innovation made in their habit by the Capuchins. Whatever was the cause of their choler, true it is, that their provincial persecuted the new monks, and obliged them to fly from place to place, until they at last took refuge in the palace of the duke of Camerino, by whose credit they were received under the obedience of the Conventuals, in the quality of hermits minors, in 1527. The next year the pope approved this union, and confirmed to them the privilege of wearing the square capuche; and thus the order was established in 1528.

☞ [e] I know not on what authority the learned Michael Geddes attributes the erection and denomination of this order to one Francis Puchine.

[f] See Du Fresne, Glossarium Latinitat. medii Ævi, tom. ii.

Another branch of the Franciscan order formed a new community, under the denomination of Recollets in France, Reformed Franciscans in Italy, and Barefooted Franciscans in Spain; these were erected into a separate order, with their respective laws and rules of discipline, in 1532, by the authority of Clement VII. They differed from the other Franciscans in this only, that they professed to follow, with greater zeal and exactness, the austere institute of their common founder and chief; whence they were sometimes called Friars Minors of the strict observance.[a]

St. Theresa, a Spanish lady of an illustrious family, undertook the difficult task of reforming the Carmelite order,[b] which had departed much from its primitive sanctity, and of restoring its neglected and violated laws to their original credit and authority. Her associate, in this arduous attempt, was Juan de Santa-Cruz; and her enterprise was not wholly unsuccessful, although the greater part of the Carmelites opposed her aims. Hence the order was, during a period of ten years, divided into two branches, of which one followed a milder rule of discipline, while the other embraced an institute of the most severe and self-denying kind.[c] But, as these different rules of life among the members of the same community were a perpetual source of animosity and discord, the more austere, or bare-footed Carmelites, were separated from the others, and formed into a distinct body, in 1580, by Gregory XIII. at the particular desire of Philip II. king of Spain. This separation was confirmed, in 1587, by Sixtus V. and completed, in 1593, by Clement VIII. who allowed the barefooted Carmelites to have their own chief, or general. But, after having withdrawn themselves from the others, these austere friars quarrelled among themselves, and in a few years their dissensions grew to an intolerable height: hence they were divided anew, by the last-mentioned pontiff, into two communities, each of which had its governor or general.[d]

XVII. Of all the new orders instituted in this century, the most eminent, beyond all doubt, was that of the Jesuits, which we have already had occasion to mention, in speaking of the chief pillars of the church of Rome, and the principal supports of the declining authority of its pontiffs. Compared with this aspiring and formidable society, all the other religious orders appear inconsiderable and obscure. The Reformation, among the other changes which it occasioned, even in the Romish church, by exciting the circumspection and emulation of those who still remained addicted to popery, gave rise to various communities, which were all comprehended under the general denomination of Regular Clerks; and as all these communities were, according to their own solemn declarations, formed with a design of imitating that sanctity of manners, and reviving that spirit of piety and virtue, which had distinguished the sacred order in the primitive times, this was a plain, though tacit confession of the present corruption of the clergy, and consequently of the indispensable necessity of the reformation.

The first society of these regular clerks arose in 1524, under the denomination of *Theatins*, which they derived from their principal founder John Peter Caraffa, (then bishop of Theate, or Chieti, in the kingdom of Naples, and afterwards pope, under the title of Paul IV.,) who was assisted in this pious undertaking by Caietan, or Gaetan, and other devout associates. These monks, being by their vows destitute of all possessions and revenues, and even precluded from the resource of begging, subsist entirely upon the voluntary liberality of pious persons. They are called by their profession and institute to revive a spirit of devotion, to purify and reform the eloquence of the pulpit, to assist the sick and the dying by their spiritual instructions and counsels, and to combat heretics of all denominations with zeal and assiduity.[e] There are also some female convents established under the rule and title of this order.

This establishment was followed by that of the *Regular Clerks of St. Paul*, so called from their having chosen that apostle for their patron; though they are more commonly known under the denomination of *Barnabites*, from the church of St. Barnabas, at Milan, which was bestowed upon them in 1545. This order, which was approved in 1532 by Clement VII., and confirmed about three years after by Paul III., was originally founded by Antonio Mavia Zacharias of Cremona, and Bartholemew Ferrari, and Ant. Morigia, noblemen of Milan. Its members were at first obliged to live after the manner of the Theatins, renouncing all worldly goods and possessions, and depending upon the spontaneous donations of the liberal for their daily subsistence. But they soon became weary of this precarious method of living from hand to mouth, and therefore took the liberty, in process of time, of securing to their community certain possessions and stated revenues. Their principal function is to go from place to place, like the apostles, in order to convert sinners, and bring back transgressors into the paths of repentance and obedience.[f]

The Regular Clerks of St. Maieul, who are also called the fathers of Somasquo, from the place where their community was first established, and which was also the residence of their founder, were erected into a distinct society by Jerome Æmiliani, a noble Venetian, and were afterwards successively confirmed, in the years 1540 and 1543, by the Roman pontiffs Paul III. and Pius IV.[g] Their chief occupation was to instruct the ignorant, and particularly young persons, in the principles and precepts of the Christian religion, and to procure assistance for those who were reduced to the unhappy condition of orphans. The same important ministry was committed to the Fathers of the Christian doctrine in France and Italy. The order that bore this title in France was instituted by Cæsar de Bus, and confirmed in 1597 by Clement VIII., while that which is known in Italy under the same denomination, derived its origin from Mark Cusani, a Milanese knight, and was established by the approbation and authority of Pius V. and Gregory XIII.

---

[a] See the Annales of Wadding, tom. xvi.—Helyot, Histoire des Ordres Monast. tom. vii. ch. xviii.

[b] Otherwise called the White-Friars.

☞ [c] The former, who were the Carmelites of the ancient observance, were called the moderate or mitigated, while the latter, who were of the strict observance, were distinguished by the denomination of bare-footed Carmelites.

[d] Helyot, Histoire des Ordres, tom. i. ch. xlvii. p. 340.

[e] Helyot, tom. iv. ch. xii.

[f] Helyot, tom. iv. ch. xvi. p. 100.—In the same volume of his incomparable history, this learned author gives a most accurate, ample, and interesting account of the other religious orders, which are here, for the sake of brevity, barely mentioned.

[g] Acta Sanctor. Februar. tom. ii. p. 217.

XVIII. It would be an endless, and, indeed, an unprofitable labour to enumerate particularly the prodigious multitude of less considerable orders and religious associations, that were instituted in Germany and other countries, from an apprehension of the pretended heretics, who disturbed by their innovations the peace, or rather the lethargy, of the church; for certainly no age produced such a swarm of monks, and such a number of convents, as that in which Luther and other reformers opposed the divine light and power of the Gospel to ignorance, superstition, and papal tyranny. We therefore pass over in silence these less important establishments, of which many have been long buried in oblivion, because they were erected on unstable foundations, while numbers were suppressed by the wisdom of certain pontiffs, who considered the multitude of these communities rather as prejudicial than advantageous to the church. Nor can we take particular notice of the female convents, or nunneries, among which the Ursulines shone forth with a superior lustre both in point of number and dignity.—The *Priests of the Oratory*, founded in Italy by Philip Neri, a native of Florence, and publicly honoured with the protection of Gregory XIII. in 1577, must, however, be excepted from this general silence, on account of the eminent figure they made in the republic of letters. It was this community that produced Baronius, Raynaldus, and Ladurchius, who hold so high a rank among the ecclesiastical historians of the sixteenth and following centuries; and there are still to be found in it men of considerable erudition and capacity. The name of this religious society was derived from an apartment, accommodated in the form of an *Oratory*,[a] or cabinet for devotion, which St. Philip Neri built at Florence for himself, and in which, for many years, he held spiritual conferences with his more intimate companions.[b]

XIX. It is too evident to admit the least dispute, that all kinds of erudition, whether sacred or profane, were held in much higher esteem in the western world since the time of Luther, than they had been before that auspicious period. The Jesuits, more especially, boast, and perhaps not without reason, that their society contributed more, at least in this century, to the culture of the languages, the improvement of the arts, and the advancement of true science, than all the rest of the religious orders. It is certain that the directors of schools and academies, either through indolence or design, persisted obstinately in their ancient method of teaching, though that method was intricate and disagreeable in many respects; nor would they suffer themselves to be better informed, or permit the least change in their uncouth and disgusting systems. The monks were not more remarkable than the academic teachers for their compliance with the growing taste for polished literature, nor did they seem at all disposed to admit, into the retreats of their gloomy cloisters, a more solid and elegant method of instruction than they had been formerly accustomed to. These facts furnish a rational account of the surprising variety that appears in the style and manner of the writers of this age, of whom several express their sentiments with elegance, perspicuity, and order, while the diction and style of a great number of their contemporaries are barbarous, perplexed, obscure, and insipid.

Cæsar Baronius, already mentioned, undertook to throw light on the history of religion by his annals of the Christian church; but this pretended light was scarcely any thing better than perplexity and darkness.[c] His example, however, excited many to enterprises of the same nature. The attempts of the persons whom the Romanists called heretics, rendered indeed such enterprises necessary: for these heretics, with the learned Flacius and Chemnitz at their head,[d] demonstrated with the utmost evidence, that not only the declarations of Scripture, but also the testimony of ancient history and the records of the primitive church, were in direct opposition both to the doctrines and pretensions of the church of Rome. This was wounding popery with its own arms, and attacking it in its pretended strong-holds. It was, therefore, incumbent upon the friends of Rome to employ, while it was time, their most zealous efforts in maintaining the credit of those ancient fables, on which the greatest part of the papal authority reposed, as its only foundation and support.

XX. Several men of genius in France and Italy, who have been already mentioned with the esteem that is due to their valuable labours,[e] used their most zealous endeavours to reform the barbarous philosophy of the times. But the excessive attachment of the scholastic doctors to the Aristotelian philosophy on one hand, and, on the other, the timorous prudence of many weak-minded persons, who were apprehensive that the liberty of striking out new discoveries and ways of thinking might be prejudicial to the church, and open a new source of division and discord, crushed all these generous efforts. The throne of the Stagirite remained therefore unshaken; and his philosophy, whose very obscurity afforded a certain gloomy kind of pleasure, and flattered the pride of such as were implicitly supposed to understand it, reigned unrivalled in the schools and monasteries. It even acquired new credit and authority from the Jesuits, who taught it in their colleges, and made use of it in their writings and disputes. By this, however, these artful ecclesiastics showed evidently, that the captious jargon and subtleties of that intricate philosophy were much more adapted to puzzle heretics, and to give the popish doctors at least the appearance of carrying on the controversy with success, than the plain and obvious method of disputing, which is pointed out by the genuine dictates of right reason.

XXI. The church of Rome produced in this century, a prodigious number of theological writers. The most eminent of these, in point of reputation and merit, were the following: Thomas de Vio, otherwise named cardinal Caietan, Eckius, Cochlæus, Emser, Surius, Hosius,

[a] Helyot, tom. viii. ch. iv. p. 12.

☞ [b] He was peculiarly assisted in these conferences by Baronius, author of the Ecclesiastical Annals, who also succeeded him as general of the order, and whose annals, on account of his imperfect knowledge of the Greek language, are remarkably full of gross faults, misrepresentations, and blunders.

☞ [c] The learned Isaac Casaubon undertook a refutation of the Annals of Baronius, in an excellent work, entitled, Exercitationes, &c. and though he carried it no farther down than the 34th year of the Christian æra, yet he pointed out a prodigious number of palpable, and (many of them) shameful errors, into which the Romish annalist has fallen during that short space. Even the Roman-catholic *literati* acknowledge the inaccuracies and faults of Baronius; hence many learned men, such as Pagi, Noris, and Tillemont, employed themselves in the task of correction; and accordingly a new edition of the work, with their emendations, appeared at Lucca.

[d] The former in the Centuriæ Magdeburgenses; the latter in his Examen Concilii Tridentini.

[e] See above, Sect. II.

Faber, Sadolet, Pighius, Vatable, Canus, D'Espence, Caranza, Maldonatus, Turrianus, Arias Montanus, Catharinus, Reginald Pole, Sixtus Senensis, Cassander, Paya d'Andrada, Baius, Pamelius, and others.[a]

XXII. The religion of Rome, which the pontiffs are so desirous of imposing upon the faith of all that bear the Christian name, is derived, according to the unanimous accounts of its doctors, from two sources, the written word of God, and the unwritten; or, in other words, from Scripture and tradition. But, as the most eminent divines of that church are far from being agreed concerning the persons who are authorized to interpret the declarations of these two oracles, and to determine their sense; so it may be asserted, with truth, that there is, as yet, no possibility of knowing with certainty what are the real doctrines of the church of Rome, or where, in that communion, the judge of religious controversy is to be found. It is true, the court of Rome, and all who favour the despotic pretensions of its pontiff, maintain, that he alone, who governs the church as Christ's vicegerent, is authorized to explain and determine the sense of Scripture and tradition in matters pertaining to salvation, and that, in consequence, a devout and unlimited obedience is due to his decisions. To give weight to this opinion, Pius IV. formed the plan of a council, which was afterwards instituted and confirmed by Sixtus V., and called the Congregation for interpreting the decrees of the Council of Trent. This congregation was authorized to examine and decide, in the name of the pope, all matters of small moment relating to ecclesiastical discipline, while every debate of importance, and particularly all disquisitions concerning points of faith and doctrine, were left to the decision of the pontiff alone, as the great oracle of the church.[b] Notwithstanding all this, it was impossible to persuade the wiser part of the Roman-catholic body to acknowledge this exclusive authority in their head. And accordingly, the greatest part of the Gallican church, and a considerable number of very learned men of the popish religion in other countries, think very differently from the court of Rome on this subject. They maintain, that all bishops and doctors have a right to consult the sacred fountains of Scripture and tradition, and to draw thence the rules of faith and manners for themselves and their flock; and that all difficult points and debates of consequence are to be referred to the cognizance and decision of general councils. Such is the difference of opinion (with respect to the adjustment of doctrine and controversy) that still divides the church of Rome; and, as no judge has been (and perhaps none can be) found to compose it, we may reasonably despair of seeing the religion of Rome acquire a permanent, stable, and determinate form.

XXIII. The council of Trent was assembled, as was pretended, to correct, illustrate, and fix with perspicuity, the doctrine of the church, to restore the vigour of its discipline, and to reform the lives of its ministers. But, in the opinion of those who examine things with impartiality, this assembly, instead of reforming ancient abuses, rather gave rise to new enormities; and many transactions of this council have excited the just complaints of the wisest men in both communions. They complain that many of the opinions of the scholastic doctors on intricate points (that had formerly been left undecided, and had been wisely permitted as subjects of free debate) were, by this council, absurdly adopted as articles of faith, were recommended as such, and even imposed with violence upon the consciences of the people, under pain of excommunication. They complain of the ambiguity that prevails in the decrees and declarations of that council, by which the disputes and dissensions that had formerly rent the church, instead of being removed by clear definitions and wise and temperate decisions, were rendered, on the contrary, more perplexed and intricate, and were, in reality, propagated and multiplied, instead of being suppressed or diminished. Nor were these the only reasons of complaint; for it must have been afflicting to those who had the cause of true religion and Christian liberty at heart, to see all things decided, in that assembly, according to the despotic will of the pope, without any regard to the dictates of truth, or the authority of Scripture, its genuine and authentic source, and to see the assembled fathers reduced to silence by the arrogance of the Roman legates, and deprived of that influence and credit which might have rendered them capable of healing the wounds of the church. It was moreover a grievance justly to be complained of, that the few wise and pious regulations that were made in that council, were never supported by the authority of the church, but were suffered to degenerate into a mere lifeless form, or shadow of law, which was treated with indifference, and transgressed with impunity. To sum up all in one short sentence, the most candid and impartial observers of things consider the council of Trent as an assembly that was more attentive to what might maintain the despotic authority of the pontiff, than solicitous about entering into the measures that were necessary to promote the good of the church. It will not, therefore, appear surprising, that certain doctors of the Romish church, instead of submitting to the decisions of the council of Trent as an ultimate rule of faith, maintain, that these decisions are to be explained by the dictates of Scripture and the language of tradition; nor, when all these things are duly considered, shall we have reason to wonder, that this council has not throughout the same degree of credit and authority, even in those countries which profess the Roman-catholic religion.[c]

Some countries, indeed, such as Germany, Poland, and Italy, have adopted implicitly and absolutely the decrees of this assembly, without the smallest restriction of any kind. But in other regions it has been received and acknowledged on certain conditions, which modify not a little its pretended authority. Among the latter we may reckon the Spanish dominions, which disputed, during many years, the authority of this council, and acknowledged it at length only so far as it could be adopted without any prejudice to the rights and prerogatives of the

[a] For an ample account of the literary characters, rank, and writings of these learned men, and of several others whose names are here omitted, see Louis EI. Du-Pin, Bibliotheque des Auteurs Ecclesiastiques, tom. xiv. and xvi.

[b] See Aymon, Tableau de la Cour de Rome, part v. chap. iv. ☞ Hence it was, that the approbation of Innocent XI. was refused to the artful and insidious work of Bossuet, bishop of Meaux, entitled, 'An Exposition of the Doctrine of the Catholic Church,' until the author had suppressed the first edition of that work, and made corrections and alterations in the second.

☞ [c] The translator has here inserted in the text the note [h] of the original, and has thrown the citations it contains into different notes.

king of Spain.[a] In other countries, such as France[b] and Hungary,[c] it never has been solemnly received, or publicly acknowledged. It is true, indeed, that, in the former of these kingdoms, such decrees of Trent as relate to points of religious doctrine, have, tacitly and imperceptibly, through the power of custom, acquired the force and authority of rules of faith; but those which regard external discipline, spiritual power, and ecclesiastical government, have been constantly rejected, both in a public and private manner, as inconsistent with the authority and prerogatives of the throne, and prejudicial to the rights and liberties of the Gallican church.[d]

XXIV. Notwithstanding all this, such as are desirous of forming some notion of the religion of Rome, will do well to consult the decrees of the council of Trent, together with the compendious confession of faith, which was drawn up by the order of Pius IV. Those, however, who expect to derive, from these sources, a clear, complete, and perfect knowledge of the Romish faith, will be greatly disappointed. To evince the truth of this assertion, it might be observed, as has been already hinted, that both in the decrees of Trent, and in this papal confession, many things are expressed, *designedly*, in a vague and ambiguous manner, on account of the intestine divisions and warm debates that then reigned in the church. Another singular circumstance might also be added, that several tenets are omitted in both, which no Roman catholic is allowed to deny, or even to call in question. But, waving both these considerations, let it only be observed, that in these decrees and in this confession several doctrines and rules of worship are inculcated in a much more rational and decent manner, than that in which they appear in the daily service of the church, and in the public practice of its members.[e] Hence we may conclude, that the justest notion of the doctrine of Rome is not to be derived so much from the *terms* used in the decrees of that council, as from the *real signification* of these terms, which must be drawn from the customs, institutions, and observances, that prevail in the Romish church. Add, to all this, another consideration, which is, that, in the bulls issued out from the papal throne in these latter times, certain doctrines which were obscurely proposed in the council of Trent, have been explained with sufficient perspicuity, and avowed without either hesitation or reserve. Of this Clement XI. gave a notorious example, in the famous bull called Unigenitus, which was an enterprise as audacious as it proved unsuccessful.

XXV. As soon as the popes perceived the remarkable detriment which their authority had suffered from the accurate interpretations of the Scriptures that had been given by the learned, and from the perusal of these divine oracles, which were now very frequently consulted by the people, they left no methods unemployed that might discourage the culture of this most important branch of sacred erudition. While the tide of resentment ran high, they forgot themselves in the most unaccountable manner. They permitted their champions to indulge themselves openly in reflections injurious to the dignity of the sacred writings, and by an excess of blasphemy almost incredible (if the passions of men did not render them capable of the greatest enormities) to declare publicly, that the edicts of the pontiffs, and the records of oral tradition, were superior, in point of authority, to the express language of the Scriptures. As it was impossible, however, to bring the sacred writings wholly into disrepute, they took the most effectual methods in their power to render them obscure and useless. For this purpose the ancient Latin translation of the Bible, commonly called the Vulgate, though it abounds with innumerable gross errors, and, in a great number of places, exhibits the most shocking barbarity of style, and the most impenetrable obscurity with respect to the sense of the inspired writers, was declared, by a solemn decree of the council of Trent, an authentic, i. e. a faithful, accurate, and perfect[f] translation, and was consequently recommended as a production beyond the reach of criticism or censure. It was easy to foresee that such a declaration was calculated only to keep the people in ignorance, and to veil from their understandings the true meaning of the sacred writings. In the same council, farther steps were taken to execute, with success, the designs of Rome. A severe and intolerable law was enacted, with respect to all interpreters and expositors of the Scriptures, by which they were forbidden to explain the sense of these divine books, in matters relating to faith and practice, in such a manner as to make them speak a different language from that of the church and the ancient doctors.[g] The same law farther declared, that the church alone (i. e. its ruler) had the right of determining the true meaning and signification of Scripture. To fill up the measure of these tyrannical and iniquitous proceedings, the church persisted obstinately in affirming, though not always with the same impudence and plainness of speech, that the Scriptures were not composed for the use of the multitude, but

[a] See Giannone, Historia di Napoli, vol. iv.

[b] See Hect. Godofr. Masii Diss. de Contemptu Concilii Tridentini in Galliâ; and also the excellent discourse which Dr. Courayer has annexed to his French translation of Father Paul's History of the Council of Trent.

[c] See Lorand. Samuelof, Vita Andr. Dudithii.

[d] See Du-Pin, Biblioth. des Auteurs Ecclesiastiques, tom. xv. p. 380.

☞ For what relates to the literary history of the council of Trent, to the historians who have transmitted accounts of it, and other circumstances of that nature, see Jo. Chr. Kocheri Bibliotheca Theol. Symbolicæ, and Salig's History of the Council of Trent, in German.

☞ [e] This is true, in a more especial manner, with respect to the canons of the council of Trent, relating to the doctrine of purgatory, the invocation of saints, the worship of images and relics. The terms employed in these canons are artfully chosen, so as to avoid the imputation of idolatry, in the philosophical sense of that word; for, in the scriptural sense, they cannot avoid it, as all use of images in religious worship is expressly forbidden in various parts of the sacred writings. But this circumspection does not appear in the worship of the Roman Catholics, which is notoriously idolatrous in both senses of that word.

☞ [f] If we consult the canons of the council of Trent we shall find that the word *authentic* is there explained in terms less positive and offensive than those used by Dr. Mosheim. Nor is it strictly true, that the Vulgate was declared by this council to be a production beyond the reach of criticism or censure, since, as we learn from Fra. Paolo, it was determined that this version should be corrected, and a new edition of it published by persons appointed for that purpose.* There was, indeed, something highly ridiculous in the proceedings of the council in relation to this point; for, if the natural order of things had been observed, the revisal and correction of the Vulgate would have preceded the pompous approbation with which the council honoured, and, as it were, consecrated that ancient version. For how, with any shadow of good sense, could the assembled fathers set the seal of their approbation to a work which they acknowledged to stand in need of correction, and that before they knew whether or not the correction would answer their views, and merit their approbation?

☞ [g] It is remarkable, that this prohibition extends even to such interpretations as were not designed for public view: "Etiamsi hujusmodi interpretationes nullo unquam tempore in lucem edendæ forent." Sessio 4ta. tit. cap. ii.

* See Father Paul's History of the Council of Trent, book ii. part liii. and Dr. Courayer's French translation of this History, vol i. p. 284, note 29.

only for that of their spiritual teachers; and, in consequence, ordered these divine records to be taken from the people in all places where it was allowed to execute its imperious demands.[a]

XXVI. These circumstances had a visible influence upon the spirit and productions of the commentators and expositors of Scripture, which the example of Luther and his followers had rendered, through emulation, extremely numerous. The popish doctors, who vied with the protestants in this branch of sacred erudition, were insipid, timorous, servilely attached to the glory and interests of the court of Rome, and betrayed, in their explications, all the marks of slavish dependence and constraint. They seem to have been in constant apprehension that some expressions might escape from their pens that savoured of opinions different from what were commonly received; they appeal every moment to the declarations and authority of the holy *fathers*, as they usually style them; nor do they appear to have so much consulted the real doctrines taught by the sacred writers, as the language and sentiments which the church of Rome has taken the liberty to put into their mouths. Several of these commentators rack their imaginations in order to force out of each passage of Scripture the four kinds of significations, called *Literal*, *Allegorical*, *Topological*, and *Anagogical*, which ignorance and superstition had first invented, and afterwards held so sacred, in the explication of the inspired writings. Nor was their attachment to this manner of interpretation unskilfully managed, since it enabled them to make the sacred writers speak the language that was favourable to the views of the church, and to draw out of the Bible, with the help of a little subtlety, whatever doctrine they wished to impose upon the credulity of the multitude.

It must, however, be acknowledged, that, beside these miserable commentators whose efforts dishonour the church, there were some in its communion, who had wisdom enough to despise such senseless methods of interpretation, and who, avoiding all mysterious significations and fancies, followed the plain, natural, and literal sense of the expressions used in the holy Scriptures. In this class the most eminent were, Erasmus of Rotterdam, who translated into Latin, with an elegant and faithful simplicity, the books of the New Testament, and explained them with judgment in a paraphrase which is deservedly esteemed; cardinal Caietan, who disputed with Luther at Augsburg, and who gave a brief, but judicious exposition of almost all the books of the Old and New Testament; Francis Titelman, Isidorus Clarius, and John Maldonat, beside Benedict Justinian, who acquired no mean reputation by his commentaries on the Epistles of St. Paul. To these may be added Gagny, D'Espence, and other expositors.[b] but these eminent men, whose example was so adapted to excite emulation, had very few followers; and, in a short time, their influence was gone, and their labours were for gotten; for, toward the conclusion of this century, Edmund Richer, that strenuous opposer of the encroachments made by the pontiffs on the liberties of the Gallican church, was the only doctor in the university of Paris who followed the literal sense and the plain and natural signification of the words of Scripture, while all the other commentators and interpreters, imitating the pernicious example of several ancient expositors, were always racking their brains for mysterious and sublime significations, where none such either were, or could be, designed by the sacred writers.[c]

XXVII. The seminaries of learning were filled, before the Reformation, with that subtle kind of theological doctors, commonly known under the denomination of *schoolmen;* so that even at Paris, which was considered as the principal seat of sacred erudition, no doctors were to be found who were capable of disputing with the protestant divines in the method they generally pursued, which was that of proving the doctrines they maintained by arguments drawn from the Scriptures and the writings of the fathers. This uncommon scarcity of didactic and scriptural divines produced much confusion and perplexity, on many occasions, even in the council of Trent, where the scholastic doctors fatigued some, and almost turned the heads of others, by examining and explaining the doctrines that were there proposed, according to the intricate and ambiguous rules of their captious philosophy. Hence it became absolutely necessary to reform the methods of proceeding in theological disquisitions, and to restore to its former credit that practice which drew the truths of religion more from the dictates of the sacred writings, and from the sentiments of the ancient doctors, than from the uncertain suggestions of human reason, and the ingenious conjectures of philosophy.[d] It was, however, impossible to deprive entirely the scholastic divines of the ascendancy which they had acquired in the seminaries of learning, and had so long maintained almost without opposition; for, after having been threatened with a diminution of their authority, they seemed to resume new vigour from the time that the Jesuits adopted their philosophy, and made use of their subtle dialectic, as a more effectual armour against the attacks of the heretics, than either the language of Scripture, or the authority of the fathers. And, indeed, the scholastic jargon was every way proper to answer the purposes of a set of men, who found it necessary to puzzle and perplex, where they could neither refute with perspicuity, nor prove with evidence. Thus they artfully con-

[a] The papal emissaries were not suffered to execute this despotic order in all countries that acknowledged the jurisdiction of the church of Rome. The French and some other nations have the Bible in their mother-tongue, in which they peruse it, though much against the will of the pope's creatures.

[b] See Simon's Hist. Critique du Vieux et dû Nouv. Testament.

[c] See Baillet's Vie d'Edmund Richer, p. 9, 10.

[d] See Du-Boulay's account of the reformation of the theological faculty at Paris, in his Hist. Acad. Paris. tom. vi. In this reform the bachelors of divinity, called *Sententiarii* and *Biblici*, are particularly distinguished; and (what is extremely remarkable) the Augustine monks, who were Luther's fraternity, are ordered to furnish the college of divinity once a year with a scriptural bachelor (Baccalaureum Biblicum præsentare;) whence we may conclude, that the monks of the Augustine order were much more conversant in the study of the Scriptures than any of the other monastic societies which then existed. But this academical law deserves to be quoted here at length, so much the more, as Du-Boulay's History is in few hands. It is as follows: "Augustinenses quolibet anno Biblicum præsentabunt, secundum statutum fol. 21, quod sequitur: Quilibet ordo Mendicantium et Collegium S. Bernardi habeant quolibet anno Biblicum qui legat ordinarie, alioqui priventur pro illo anno Baccalaureo sententiario." It appears by this law, that each mendicant order was, by a decree of the theological faculty, obliged to furnish, yearly, a scriptural bachelor; (such was Luther;) and yet we see, that, in the reformation already mentioned, this obligation is imposed upon none but the Augustine monks. We may therefore presume that the Dominicans, Franciscans, and the other mendicants, had entirely neglected the study of the Scriptures, and consequently had among them no scriptural bachelors; and that the Augustine monks alone were in a condition to satisfy the demands of the theological faculty.

cealed their defeat, and retreated, in the dazzled eyes of the multitude, with the appearance of victory.[a]

The Mystics lost almost all their credit in the church of Rome after the Reformation, partly on account of the favourable reception they found among the protestants, and partly in consequence of their pacific system, which, giving them an aversion to controversy in general, rendered them little disposed to defend the papal cause against its numerous and formidable adversaries. These enthusiasts, however, were, in some measure, tolerated, and allowed to indulge themselves in their philosophical speculations, on certain conditions, which obliged them to abstain from censuring either the laws or the corruptions of the church, and from declaiming, with their usual freedom and vehemence, against the vanity of external worship, and the dissensions of jarring and contentious divines.

XXVIII. There was no successful attempt made, in this century, to correct or improve the practical or moral system of doctrine that was followed in the church of Rome; nor, indeed, could any one make such an attempt without drawing upon himself the displeasure, and perhaps the fury, of the papal hierarchy; for, in reality, such a project of reformation seemed in no wise conducive to the *interests* of the church, as these interests were understood by its ambitious and rapacious rulers; and it is undoubtedly certain, that many doctrines and regulations, on which the power, opulence, and grandeur of that church essentially depended, would have run the risk of falling into discredit and contempt, if the pure and rational system of morality, contained in the Gospel, had been exhibited in its native beauty and simplicity, to the view and perusal of all Christians without distinction. Little or no zeal was therefore exerted in amending or improving the doctrines that immediately relate to practice. On the contrary, many persons of eminent piety and integrity, in the communion of Rome, have grievously complained (with what justice shall be shown in its proper place,[b]) that, as soon as the Jesuits had gained an ascendancy in the courts of princes, and in the schools of learning, the cause of virtue began visibly to decline. It has been alleged, more particularly, that this artful order employed all the force of subtle distinctions to sap the foundations of morality, and, in process of time, opened a door to all sorts of licentiousness and iniquity, by the loose and dissolute rules of conduct which they propagated as far as their influence extended. This poisonous doctrine spread, indeed, its contagion, in a latent manner, during the sixteenth century; but, in the following age, its abettors ventured to expose some specimens of its turpitude to public view, and thus gave occasion to great commotions in several parts of Europe.

All the moral writers of the church, in this century, may be distinguished into three classes, the *Schoolmen*, the *Dogmatists*,[c] and the *Mystics*. The first explained, or rather obscured, the virtues and duties of the Christian life, by knotty distinctions and unintelligible forms of speech, and buried them under an enormous load of arguments and demonstrations: the second illustrated them from the declarations of Scripture and the opinions of the ancient doctors; while the third placed the whole of morality in the tranquillity of a mind withdrawn from all sensible objects, and habitually employed in the contemplation of the divine nature.

XXIX. The number of combatants brought by the pontiffs into the field of controversy, during this century, was prodigious, and their glaring defects are abundantly known. It may be said, with truth, of the greater part of them, that, like many warriors of another class, they generally lost sight of all considerations, except those of victory and plunder. The disputants, whom the order of Jesuits sent forth in great numbers against the adversaries of the church of Rome, surpassed all the rest in subtlety, impudence, and invective. The principal leader and champion of the polemic tribe was Robert Bellarmine, a Jesuit, and a member of the college of cardinals, who treated, in several bulky volumes, of all the controversies that subsisted between the protestants and the church of Rome, and whose merit as a writer consisted, principally, in clearness of style, and a certain copiousness of argument, which showed a rich and fruitful imagination. This eminent defender of the church of Rome arose about the conclusion of this century, and, on his first appearance, all the force and attacks of the most illustrious protestant doctors were turned against him alone. His candour and plain dealing exposed him, however, to the censures of several divines of his own communion; for he collected, with diligence, the reasons and objections of his adversaries, and proposed them, for the most part, in their full force, with integrity and exactness. Had he been less remarkable for his fidelity and industry; had he taken care to select the weakest arguments of his antagonists, and to render them still weaker, by proposing them in an imperfect and unfaithful light, his fame would have been much greater among the friends of Rome than it actually is.[d]

XXX. If we turn our view to the internal state of the church of Rome, and consider the respective sentiments, opinions, and manners of its different members, we shall find that, notwithstanding its boasted unity of faith, and its ostentatious pretensions to harmony and concord, it was, in the sixteenth century, and is, at this day, divided and distracted with dissensions and contests of various kinds. The Franciscans and the Dominicans contend with vehemence about several points of doctrine and discipline. The Scotists and Thomists are at eternal war. The bishops have never ceased disputing with the pope (and with the congregations that he has instituted to maintain his pretensions) upon the origin and precise limits of his authority and jurisdiction. The French and Flemings, with the inhabitants of other countries, openly oppose the pontiff on many occasions, and refuse to acknowledge his supreme and unlimited dominion in the church; while, on the other hand, he still continues to encroach upon their privileges, sometimes with violence and resolution, when he can do so with impunity, at other times with circumspection and prudence, when vigorous measures appear dangerous or unnecessary. The Jesuits, who, on their first appearance, had formed the project of diminishing the credit and influence of all

[a] The translator has added the two last sentences of this paragraph, to illustrate more fully the sense of the author.

[b] See cent. xvii. sect. ii. part i. chap. i. sect xxxiv.

[c] The reader will easily perceive, by the short account of these three classes, given by Dr. Mosheim, that the word *Dogmatist* must not be taken in that magisterial sense which it bears in modern language.

[d] See Mayer's Ecloga de fide Baronii et Bellarmini ipsis Pontificiis dubiâ, published at Amsterdam in 1698.

the other religious orders, used their warmest endeavours to share with the Benedictine and other monasteries, which were richly endowed, a part of their opulence; and their endeavours were crowned with success. Thus they drew upon their society the indignation and vengeance of the other religious communities, and armed against it the monks of every other denomination; and, in a more especial manner, the Benedictines and Dominicans, who surpassed all its enemies in the keenness and bitterness of their resentment. The rage of the Benedictines is animated by reflecting on the possessions of which they have been deprived, while the Dominicans contend for the honour of their order, the privileges annexed to it, and the religious tenets by which it is distinguished. Nor are the theological colleges and seminaries of learning more exempt from the flame of controversy than the clerical and monastic orders: on the contrary, debates concerning almost all the doctrines of Christianity are multiplied in them, and conducted with little moderation. It is true, indeed, that all these contests are tempered and managed, by the prudence and authority of the pontiffs, in such a manner as to prevent their being carried to an excessive height, to a length that might prove fatal to the church, by destroying that phantom of external unity which is the source of its consistence as an ecclesiastical body: I say, *tempered* and *managed;* for, to heal entirely these divisions, and calm these animosities, however it may be judged an undertaking worthy of one who calls himself the Vicar of Christ, is, nevertheless, a work beyond his power, and contrary to his intention.

XXXI. Beside these debates of inferior moment, which made only a slight breach in the tranquillity and union of the Romish church, there arose, after the period in which the council of Trent was assembled, controversies of much greater importance, which deservedly attracted the attention of Christians of all denominations. These controversies were set on foot by the Jesuits, and from small beginnings have increased gradually, and gathered strength; so that the flame they produced has been transmitted even to our times, and continues, at this very day, to divide the members of the church in a manner that does not a little endanger its stability. While the pontiffs foment, perhaps, instead of endeavouring to extinguish, the less momentous disputes mentioned above, they observe a different conduct with respect to those now under consideration. The most zealous efforts of artifice and authority are constantly employed to calm the contending parties (since it appears impossible to unite and reconcile them,) and to diminish the violence of commotion, which they can scarcely ever hope entirely to suppress. All their exertions, however, have hitherto been ineffectual. They have not been able to calm the agitation and vehemence with which these debates are carried on, or to inspire any sentiments of moderation and mutual forbearance into minds, which are less animated by the love of truth, than by the spirit of faction.

XXXII. Whoever will look with attention and impartiality into these controversies may easily perceive that there are two parties in the Romish church, whose notions with respect both to doctrine and discipline are extremely different. The Jesuits, considered as a body,[a] maintain with the greatest zeal and obstinacy, the ancient system of doctrine and manners, which pervaded the church before the rise of Luther, and which, though absurd and ill-digested, the zealots have constantly considered as highly favourable to the views of Rome, and the grandeur of its pontiffs. These sagacious ecclesiastics, whose peculiar office it is to watch for the security and defence of the papal throne, are fully persuaded that the authority of the pontiffs, the opulence, pomp, and grandeur of the clergy, depend entirely upon the preservation of the ancient forms of doctrine; and that every project which tends either to remove these forms, or even to correct them, must be, in the highest degree, detrimental to what they call the interests of the church, and gradually bring on its ruin. On the other hand, there are within the pale of the Romish church, especially since the dawn of the reformation, many pious and well-meaning men, whose eyes have been opened, by the perusal of the inspired and primitive writers, upon the corruptions and defects of the received forms of doctrine and discipline. Comparing the dictates of primitive Christianity with the vulgar system of popery, they have found the latter full of enormities, and have always been desirous of a reform (though indeed a partial one, according to their particular fancies,) that thus the church may be purified from those unhappy abuses which have given rise to such mischievous divisions, and still draw upon it the censures and reproaches of the heretics.

From these opposite ways of thinking, arose naturally the warmest contentions and debates, between the Jesuits and many doctors of the church. These debates may be reduced under the six following heads.

The first subject of debate concerns the limits and extent of the papal power and jurisdiction. The Jesuits, with their numerous tribe of followers and dependents, maintain, that the pontiff is infallible; that he is the only visible source of that universal and unlimited power which Christ has granted to the church; that all bishops and subordinate rulers derive from him alone the authority and jurisdiction with which they are invested; that he is not bound by any laws of the church, nor by any decrees of the councils that compose it; that he alone is the supreme legislator of that sacred community, and that it is in the highest degree criminal to oppose or disobey his edicts and commands. Such are the strange sentiments of the Jesuits; but they are very far from being universally adopted; for other members of the church hold, on the contrary, that the pope is liable to error; that his authority is inferior to that of a general council; that he is bound to obey the commands of the church, and its laws, as they are enacted in the councils that represent it; that these councils have a right to depose him from the papal chair, when he abuses, in a flagrant manner, the dignity and prerogatives with which he is intrusted; and that, in consequence of these principles, the bishops and inferior rulers and doctors derive the authority that is annexed to their respective dignities, not from the pontiff, but from Christ himself.

XXXIII. The extent and prerogatives of the church form the second subject of debate. The Jesuits and their adherents stretch out its borders far and wide. They not

☞ [a] The Jesuits are here taken in the general and collective sense of that denomination, because there are several individuals of that order, whose sentiments differ from those which generally prevail in their community.

only comprehend, within its large circuit, many who live separate from the communion of Rome,[a] but even extend the inheritance of eternal salvation to nations that have not the least knowledge of the Christian religion, or of its divine Author, and consider as true members of the church open transgressors, who outwardly profess its doctrines. But the adversaries of the Jesuits reduce within narrower limits the kingdom of Christ, and not only exclude from all hope of salvation those who are not within the pale of the church of Rome, but also those who, though they live within its external communion, yet dishonour their profession by a vicious and profligate course of life. The Jesuits moreover (not to mention differences of less moment) assert, that the church can never pronounce an erroneous or unjust decision, either relating to matters of fact, or points of doctrine;[b] while the adverse party declare, that, in judging of matters of fact, it is not secured against all possibility of erring.

XXXIV. In the third class of controversies, that divide the church, are comprehended the debates relating to the nature, efficacy, and necessity of divine grace, together with those which concern original sin, the natural power of man to obey the laws of God, and the nature and foundation of those eternal decrees that have for their object the salvation of men. The Dominicans, Augustinians, and Jansenists, with several other doctors of the church, adopt the following propositions: that the impulse of divine grace cannot be opposed or resisted; that there are no remains of purity or goodness in human nature since its fall; that the eternal decrees of God, relating to the salvation of men, are neither founded upon, nor attended with, any condition whatsoever; that God wills the salvation of all mankind: and they hold several other tenets connected with these. The Jesuits maintain, on the contrary, that the natural dominion of sin in the human mind, and the hidden corruption it has produced in our internal frame, are less general and dreadful than they are represented by the doctors now mentioned; that human nature is far from being deprived of all power of doing good; that the succours of grace are administered to all mankind in a measure sufficient to lead them to eternal life and salvation; that the operations of grace offer no violence to the faculties and powers of nature, and therefore may be resisted; and that God from all eternity has appointed everlasting rewards and punishments, as the portion of men in a future world, not by an absolute, arbitrary, and unconditional decree, but in consequence of that divine and unlimited prescience, by which he foresaw the actions, merit, and character, of every individual.

XXXV. The fourth head, in this division of the controversies that destroy the pretended unity of the church, contains various subjects of debate, relative to doctrines of morality and rules of practice, which it would be both tedious and foreign from our purpose to enumerate in a circumstantial manner, though it may not be improper to touch lightly the first principles of this endless controversy.[c]

The Jesuits and their followers have inculcated a very strange doctrine with respect to the motives that determine the moral conduct and actions of men. They represent it as a matter of perfect indifference from what motives men obey the laws of God, provided that these laws be really obeyed; and maintain, that the service of those who obey from the fear of punishment is as agreeable to the Deity, as are those actions which proceed from a principle of love to him and to his laws. This decision excites the horror of the greatest part of the doctors of the Roman church, who affirm, that no acts of obedience, when they do not proceed from the love of God, can be acceptable to that pure and holy Being. Nor is the doctrine of the Jesuits only chargeable with the corrupt tenets already mentioned. They maintain farther, that a man never sins, properly speaking, but when he transgresses a divine law that is fully known to him, which is present to his mind while he acts, and of which he understands the true meaning and intent. And they hence conclude, that, in strict justice, the conduct of that transgressor cannot be looked upon as criminal, who is either ignorant of the law, or is in doubt about its true signification, or loses sight of it, through forgetfulness, at the time that he violates it. From these propositions they deduce the famous doctrines of probability and philosophical sin, which have cast an eternal reproach upon the schools of the Jesuits.[d] Their adversaries behold these pernicious tenets with the utmost abhorrence, and assert that neither ignorance, nor forgetfulness of the law, nor the doubts that may be entertained with respect to its signification, will be admitted as sufficient to justify transgressors before the tribunal of God. This contest, about the main and fundamental points of morality, has given rise to a great variety of debates concerning the duties we owe to God, our neighbour, and ourselves; and has produced two sects of moral teachers, whose animosities and divisions have miserably rent the Romish church in all parts of the world, and involved it in the greatest perplexities.

XXXVI. The administration of the sacraments, especially those of penance and the eucharist, forms the fifth subject of controversy. The Jesuits and many other doc-

☞ [a] They were accused at Spoleto, in 1653, of having maintained, in their public instructions, the probability of the salvation of many heretics. See Le Clerc, Biblioth. Univers. et Historique, tom. xiv.

☞ [b] This distinction, with respect to the objects of infallibility, chiefly arose from the following historical circumstance. Pope Innocent X. condemned five propositions, drawn from the famous book of Jansenius, entitled *Augustinus*; and this condemnation occasioned the two following questions: 1st, Whether these propositions were erroneous? This was the question *de jure*, i. e. as the translator has rendered it, respecting doctrine. 2d, Whether these propositions were really taught by Jansenius? This was the question *de facto*, i. e. relating to the matter of fact. The church was supposed, by some, infallible only in deciding questions of the former kind.

[c] No author has given a more accurate, precise, and clear enumeration of the objections that have been made to the moral doctrine of the Jesuits, and the reproaches which have been cast on their rules of life; and no one at the same time has defended their cause with more art and dexterity than the eloquent and ingenious Gabriel Daniel (a famous member of their order,) in a piece, entitled, Entretiens de Cleandre et d'Eudoxe. This dialogue was intended as an answer to the celebrated Provincial Letters of Pascal, which did more real prejudice to the society of the Jesuits than many would imagine, and exposed their loose and perfidious system of morals with the greatest fidelity and perspicuity, embellished by the most exquisite strokes of humour and irony. Father Daniel, in the piece above mentioned, treats with great acuteness the famous doctrine of probability, the method of directing our intentions, equivocation and mental reservation, sins of ignorance and oblivion; and it must be acknowledged, that, if the cause and pretensions of the Jesuits were susceptible of defence or plausibility, they have found in this writer an able and dexterous champion.

☞ [d] The doctrine of probability consists in this: 'That an opinion or precept may be followed with a good conscience, when it is inculcated by four, or three, or two, or even by one doctor of considerable reputation, even though it be contrary to the judgment of the person who follows it, and even of him that recommends it.' This doctrine rendered the Jesuits capable of accommodating themselves to all the different

tors are of opinion, that the salutary effects of the sacraments are produced by their intrinsic virtue and immediate operation[a] upon the mind at the time when they are administered, and that consequently it requires little preparation to receive them to edification and comfort; nor do they think that God requires a mind adorned with inward purity, and a heart animated with divine love, in order to the obtaining of the ends and purposes of these religious institutions. And hence it is, that, according to their doctrine, the priests are empowered to give immediate absolution to all such as confess their transgressions and crimes, and afterwards to admit them to the use of the sacraments. But such sentiments are rejected with indignation by all those of the Romish communion who have the progress of vital and practical religion truly at heart. These look upon it as the duty of the clergy to use the greatest diligence and assiduity in examining the characters, tempers, and actions of those who demand absolution and the use of the sacraments, before they grant their requests; since, in their sense of things, the real benefits of these institutions can extend to those only whose hearts are carefully purged from the corruptions of iniquity, and filled with that divine love which 'casteth out fear.' Hence arose that famous dispute concerning a frequent approach to the holy communion, which was carried on with such warmth in the last (*the seventeenth*) century, between the Jesuits and the Jansenists, with Arnauld[b] at the head of the latter, and has been renewed in our times by the Jesuit Pichon, who thereby incurred the indignation of the greatest part of the French Bishops.[c] The frequent celebration of the Lord's supper is one of the main duties, which the Jesuits recommend with peculiar earnestness to all who are under their spiritual direction, representing it as the most certain and infallible method of appeasing the Deity, and obtaining from him the entire remission of their sins and transgressions. This manner of proceeding the Jansenists censure with their usual severity; and it is also condemned by many other learned and pious doctors of the Romish communion, who reject the intrinsic virtue and efficient operation which are attributed to the sacraments, and wisely maintain, that the sacrament of the Lord's supper can be profitable to those only whose minds are prepared, by faith, repentance, and the love of God, for that solemn service.

XXXVII. The sixth (or last) controversy turns upon the proper method of instructing Christians in the truths and precepts of religion. Some of the Romish doctors, who have the progress of religion truly at heart, deem it expedient and even necessary to sow the seeds of divine truth in the mind, in the tender and flexible state of infancy, when it is most susceptive of good impressions and to give it, by degrees, according to the measure of its capacity, a full and accurate knowledge of the doctrines and duties of religion. Others, who have a greater zeal for the interests of the church than the improvement of its members, recommend a devout ignorance to such as submit to their direction, and think a Christian sufficiently instructed when he has learned to yield a blind and unlimited obedience to the orders of the church. The former are of opinion, that nothing can be so profitable and instructive to Christians as the study of the Scriptures, and consequently judge it highly expedient that they should be translated into the vulgar tongue of each country. The latter exclude the people from the satisfaction of consulting the sacred oracles of truth, and look upon all vernacular translations of the Bible as dangerous, and even of a pernicious tendency. They accordingly maintain, that it ought only to be published in a learned language to prevent its instructions from becoming familiar to the multitude. The former compose pious and instructive books to nourish a spirit of devotion in the minds of Christians, to enlighten their ignorance, and dispel their errors; they illustrate and explain the public prayers and the solemn acts of religion in the language of the people, and exhort all, who attend to their instructions, to peruse constantly these pious productions, in order to improve their knowledge, purify their affections, and learn the method of worshipping the Deity in a rational and acceptable manner. All this, however, is highly displeasing to the latter kind of doctors, who are always apprehensive, that the blind obedience and implicit submission of the people will diminish in proportion as their views are enlarged, and their knowledge increased.[d]

XXXVIII. All the controversies that have been here mentioned did not break out at the same time. The disputes concerning divine grace, the natural power of man to perform good actions, original sin, and predestination, which have been ranged under the third class, were pub-

passions of men, and to persons of all tempers and characters, from the most austere to the most licentious. Philosophical sin (according to the Jesuits' doctrine) is an action, or course of actions, repugnant to the dictates of reason, and yet not offensive to the Deity. See a more particular account of these two odious doctrines in the following part of this work, cent. xvii. sect. ii. part i. chap. i. sect. xxxv. and in the author's and translator's notes.

☞ [a] This is the only expression that occurred to the translator, as proper to render the true sense of that phrase of the scholastic divines, who say, that the sacraments produce their effect *opere operato*. The Jesuits and Dominicans maintain that the sacraments have in themselves an instrumental and efficient power, by virtue of which they work in the soul (independently of its previous preparation or propensities) a disposition to receive the divine grace; and this is what is commonly called the *opus operatum* of the sacraments. Thus, according to their doctrine, neither knowledge, wisdom, humility, faith, nor devotion, are necessary to the efficacy of the sacraments, whose victorious energy nothing but a mortal sin can resist. See Dr. Courayer's Translation of Paul Sarpi's History of the Council of Trent.

[b] Arnauld published, on this occasion, his famous book concerning the practice of communicating frequently. The French title is, 'Traité de la frequente Communion.'

[c] See Journal Universel, tom. xiii. xv. xvi.

[d] The account here given of the more momentous controversies that divide the church of Rome, may be confirmed, illustrated and enlarged, by consulting a multitude of books published in the last and present centuries, especially in France and Flanders, by Jansenists, Dominicans, Jesuits, and others. All the productions, in which the doctrine and precepts of the Jesuits, and the other creatures of the pontiff, are opposed and refuted, are enumerated by Dominic Colonia, a French Jesuit, in a work published in 1735, under the following title: "Bibliotheque Janseniste, ou Catalogue Alphabetique des principaux livres Jansenistes, ou suspects de Jansenisme, avec des notes critiques." This writer is led into many absurdities by his extravagant attachment to the pope, and to the cause and tenets of his order. His book, however, is of use in pointing out the various controversies that perplex and divide the church. It was condemned by pope Benedict XIV. but was republished in a new form, with some change in the title, and a great enlargement of its contents. This new edition appeared at Antwerp in 1752, under the following title: "Dictionaire des livres Jansenistes, ou qui favorisent le Jansenisme, à Anvers, chez J. B. Verdussen." And it must be acknowledged, that it is extremely useful, in showing the intestine divisions of the church, the particular contests that divide its doctors, the religious tenets of the Jesuits, and the numerous productions that relate to the six heads of controversy here mentioned. It must be observed, at the same time, that this work abounds with the most malignant invectives against many persons of eminent learning and piety, and with the most notorious instances of partiality and injustice.*

☞ * See a particular account of this learned and scandalous work in the "Bibliotheque des Sciences et des Beaux Arts," printed at the Hague.

ticly carried on in the century of which we are now writing. The others were conducted with more secrecy and reserve, and did not come forth to public view before the following age. Nor will this appear at all surprising to those who consider that the controversies concerning grace and free-will, which had been set in motion by Luther, were neither accurately examined, nor peremptorily decided in the church of Rome, but were rather artfully suspended and hushed into silence. The sentiments of Luther were indeed condemned; but no fixed and perspicuous rule of faith, with respect to these disputed points, was substituted in their place. The decisions of St. Augustin were solemnly approved; but the points of dissimilitude, between these decisions and the sentiments of Luther, were never clearly explained. This fatal controversy originated in the zeal of Michael Baius, a doctor in the university of Louvain, equally remarkable on account of the warmth of his piety and the extent of his learning. This eminent divine, like the other followers of Augustin, had an invincible aversion to that contentious, subtle, and intricate manner of teaching theology, which had long prevailed in the schools; and under the auspicious name of that famous prelate, who was his admired guide, he had the courage or temerity to condemn and censure, in an open and public manner, the tenets commonly received in the church, in relation to the natural powers of man and the merit of good works. This bold step drew upon Baius the indignation of some of his academical colleagues, and the heavy censures of several Franciscan monks. Whether the Jesuits immediately joined in this opposition, and may be reckoned among the first accusers of Baius, is a point unknown, or uncertain; but it is unquestionably evident, that, even at the rise of this controversy, they abhorred the principal tenets of Baius, which he had taken from Augustin, and adopted as his own. In 1567, this doctor was accused at the court of Rome; and seventy-six propositions, drawn from his writings, were condemned by Pius V. in a circular letter expressly composed for that purpose. This condemnation, however, was issued in an artful and insidious manner, without any mention of the name of the author; for the fatal consequences that had arisen from the rash and inconsiderate measures employed by the court of Rome against Luther, were too fresh in the remembrance of the prudent pontiff to permit his falling into new blunders of the same nature. The thunder of excommunication was therefore suppressed by the dictates of prudence, and the person and functions of Baius were spared, while his tenets were censured. About thirteen years after this transaction, Gregory XIII. complied so far with the importunate solicitations of a Jesuit, named Francis Tolet, as to reinforce the sentence of Pius V. by a new condemnation of the opinions of the Flemish doctor. Baius submitted to this new sentence, either from an apprehension that it would be followed by more severe proceedings in case of resistance, or, which is more probable, on account of the ambiguity of the papal edict, and the vague and confused manner in which the obnoxious propositions were therein expressed. But his example, in this respect, was not followed by the other doctors who had formed their theological system upon that of Augustin;[a] and, even at this day, many divines of the Romish communion, and particularly the Jansenists, declare openly that Baius was unjustly treated, and that the two edicts of Pius and Gregory are absolutely destitute of all authority, and have never been received as laws of the church.[b]

XXXIX. Be that as it may, it is at least certain, that the doctrine of Augustin, with respect to the nature and operations of divine grace, lost none of its credit in consequence of these edicts, but was embraced and propagated, with the same zeal as formerly, throughout all the Belgic provinces, and more especially in the two flourishing universities of Louvain and Douay. This appeared very soon after, when two Jesuits, named Lessius and Hamelius, ventured to represent the doctrine of predestination in a manner different from that in which it appears in the writings of Augustin; for the sentiments of these Jesuits were publicly condemned by the doctors of Louvain in 1587, and by those of Douay in the following year. The bishops of the Low Countries were disposed to follow the example of these two universities, and had already deliberated about assembling a provincial council for this purpose, when pope Sixtus V. suspended the proceedings by the interposition of his authority, and declared, that the cognisance and decision of religious controversies belonged only to the vicar of Christ, residing at Rome. But this politic vicar, whose sagacity, prudence, and knowlege of men and things, never failed him in transactions of this nature, wisely avoided making use of the privilege he claimed with such confidence, that he might not inflame the divisions and animosities which already subsisted. And, accordingly, in 1588, this contest was finished, and the storm allayed in such a manner, that the contending parties were left in the quiet possession of their respective opinions, and solemnly prohibited from disputing, either in public or in private, upon the intricate points that had excited their divisions. Had the succeeding pontiffs, instead of assuming the character of judges in this ambiguous and difficult controversy, imitated the prudence of Sixtus, and imposed silence on the litigious doctors, who renewed afterwards the debates concerning divine grace, the tranquillity and unity of the church would not have been interrupted by such violent divisions as rage at present in its bosom.[c]

XL. The church had scarcely perceived the fruits of that calm, which the prudence of Sixtus had restored, by suppressing, instead of deciding the late controversies, when new commotions, of the same nature, but of a much more terrible aspect, arose to disturb its tranquillity. These were occasioned by the Jesuit Molina,[d] professor

[a] See, for an account of the disputes relating to Baius, the works of that author, published at Cologne in 1696, particularly the second part, or appendix, entitled, "Baiana, seu scripta, quæ controversias spectant occasione Sententiarum Baii exortas." See also Bayle's Dict., in which there is an ample and circumstantial account of these disputes;—Du-Pin, Bibliotheque des Auteurs Ecclesiastiques, tom. xvi.—Histoire de la Compagnie de Jesus, tom. iii.

[b] This is demonstrated fully by an anonymous writer in a piece entitled, "Dissertation sur les Bulles contre Baius, ou l'on montre qu'elles ne sont pas reçues par l'Eglise," published at Utrecht in 1737.

[c] See Apologie Historique des deux Censures de Louvain et de Douay, par M. Gery. The famous Pasquier Quesnel was the author of this apology, if we may give credit to the writer of a book entitled, "Catechisme Historique et Dogmatique sur les Contestations de l'Eglise," tom. i. See an account of this controversy in the "Memoires pour servir à l'Histoire des Controversies dans l'Eglise Romaine sur la Predestination et sur la Grace." This curious piece is to be found in the fourteenth tome of Le Clerc's Bibliotheque Universelle Historique.

[d] From the name of this Spanish doctor proceeded the well-known denomination of Molinists, by which those Roman Catholics are dis-

of divinity in the university of Ebora in Portugal, who, in 1588, published a book to show that the operations of divine grace were entirely consistent with the freedom of human will,[a] and who introduced a new kind of hypothesis, to remove the difficulties attending the doctrines of predestination and liberty, and to reconcile the jarring opinions of Augustinians, Thomists, Semi-Pelagians, and other contentious divines.[b] This attempt of the subtle Spanish doctor was so offensive to the Dominicans, who followed St. Thomas as their theological guide, that they sounded throughout Spain and Portugal the alarm of heresy, and accused the Jesuits of endeavouring to renew the errors of Pelagius. This alarm was followed by great commotions, and all things seemed to prognosticate a general flame, when Clement VIII., in 1594, imposed silence on the contending parties, promising that he himself would examine with care and diligence every thing relating to this new debate, in order to decide it in such a manner as might tend to promote the cause of truth, and the peace of the church.

XLI. The pontiff was persuaded that these gentle remedies would soon remove the disease, and that, through length of time, these heats and animosities would undoubtedly subside. But the event was far from being answerable to such pleasing hopes. The Dominicans, who had long fostered a deep-rooted and invincible hatred against the Jesuits, having now an opportunity of venting their indignation, exhausted their furious zeal against the doctrine of Molina, notwithstanding the pacific injunctions of the papal edict. They incessantly fatigued Philip II. of Spain, and pope Clement VIII., with their importunate clamours, until at length the latter found himself under a necessity of assembling at Rome a sort of council for the decision of this controversy. And thus commenced, about the beginning of the year 1598, those famous deliberations concerning the contest of the Jesuits and Dominicans, which took place in what was called the congregation *de auxiliis*, or of aids. This congregation was so denominated on account of the principal point in debate, which was the efficacy of the aids and succours of divine grace; and its consultations were directed by Louis Madrusi, bishop of Trent, and one of the college of cardinals, who sat as president in this assembly, which was composed besides of three bishops and seven divines chosen out of so many different orders. The remaining part of this century was wholly employed by these spiritual judges in hearing and weighing the arguments alleged in favour of their respective opinions by the contending parties.[c] The Dominicans maintained, with the greatest obstinacy, the doctrine of their patron St. Thomas, as alone conformable to truth. The Jesuits, on the other hand, though they did not adopt the religious tenets of Molina, thought the honour of their order concerned in this controversy, on account of the opposition so publicly made to one of its members, and consequently used their utmost endeavours to have the Spanish doctor acquitted of the charge of Pelagianism, and declared free from any errors of moment. In this they acted according to the true monastic spirit, which leads each order to resent the affronts that are offered to any of its members, as if they had been cast upon the whole community, and to maintain, at all adventures, the cause of every individual monk, as if the interests of the whole society were involved in it.

XLII. Notwithstanding the zealous attempts that were made, by several persons of eminent piety, to restore the institutions of public worship to their primitive simplicity a multitude of vain and useless ceremonies still remained in the church; nor did the pontiffs judge it proper to diminish that pomp and show, which gave the ministers of religion a great, though ill-acquired, influence on the minds of the people. Beside these ceremonies, many popular customs and inventions, which were multiplied by the clergy, and were either entirely absurd or grossly superstitious, called loudly for redress; and, indeed, the council of Trent seemed disposed to correct these abuses, and prevent their further growth. But this good design was never carried into execution; it was abandoned, either through the corrupt prudence of the pope and clergy, who looked upon every check given to superstition as an attempt to diminish their authority, or through their criminal negligence about every thing that tended to promote the true interests of religion. Hence it happens that in those countries where there are few protestants, and consequently where the church of Rome is in no danger of losing its credit and influence from the proximity and attempts of these pretended heretics, superstition reigns with unlimited extravagance and absurdity.

---

tinguished, who seem to incline to the doctrines of grace and free-will, maintained in opposition to those of Augustine. Many, however, who differ widely from the sentiments of Molina, are unjustly ranked in the class of Molinists.

[a] The title of this famous book is as follows: "Liberi Arbitrii Concordia cum Gratiæ donis, divinâ Præscientiâ, Providentiâ, Prædestinatione, et Reprobatione, Auctore Lud. Molina." This book was first published at Lisbon, in 1588; afterwards, with additions, at Antwerp, Lyons, Venice, and other places, in 1595. A third edition, still farther augmented, appeared at Antwerp in 1609.

☞ [b] Molina affirmed, that the decree of predestination to eternal glory was founded upon a previous knowledge and consideration of the merits of the elect; that the grace, from whose operation these merits are derived, is not efficacious by its own intrinsic power only, but also by the consent of our own will, and because it is administered in those circumstances in which the Deity, by that branch of his knowledge which is called *Scientia Media*, foresees that it will be efficacious. The kind of prescience denominated in the schools *Scientia Media*, is that fore-knowledge of future contingencies, that arises from an acquaintance with the nature and faculties of rational beings, the circumstances in which they shall be placed, the objects that shall be presented to them, and the influence that these circumstances and objects must have on their actions.

[c] The history and transactions of this Congregation are related and illustrated by several writers of different complexions, by Jesuits, Dominicans, and Jansenists. Hyacinth Serri, a Dominican, published under the feigned name of Augustin le Blanc, in 1700, at Louvain, a work with this title: Historia Congregationum de auxiliis Gratiæ divinæ; which was answered by another history of these debates, composed by Liv. de Meyer, a Jesuit, who assumed the name of Theod. Eleutherius, in order to remain concealed from public view, and whose book is entitled, Historia Controversarium de Gratiæ divinæ Auxiliis. The Dominicans also published the Acta Congregationum et Disputationum, quæ Coram Clemente VIII. et Paulo V. de Auxiliis divinæ Gratiæ sunt celebratæ, a work composed by Thomas de Lemos, a subtle monk of their order, who, in this very congregation, had defended with great applause the glory of St. Thomas against the Jesuits. Amidst these jarring accounts, a man must be endowed with a supernatural sagacity to come to the truth; for acts are opposed to acts, testimony to testimony, and narration to narration. It is therefore a matter of doubt, which the court of Rome favoured most on this occasion, the Jesuits or the Dominicans, and which of these two parties defended their cause with the greatest dexterity and success. There is also a history of these debates written in French, which was published at Louvain in 1702, under the following title: Histoire des Congregations *de Auxiliis*, par un Docteur de la Faculté de Theologie de Paris. This historian, though he be neither destitute of learning nor of elegance, being nevertheless a flaming Jansenist, discovers throughout his enmity against the Jesuits, and relates all things in a manner that favours the cause of the Dominicans.

Such is the case in Italy, Spain, and Portugal, where the feeble glimmerings of Christianity, that yet remain, are overwhelmed and obscured by an enormous multitude of ridiculous ceremonies, and absurd, fantastic, and unaccountable rites; so that a person who arrives in any one of these countries, after having passed among other nations even of the Romish communion, is immediately struck with the change, and thinks himself transported into the thickest darkness, into the most gloomy retreats of superstition.[a] Nor, indeed, are even those nations whom the neighbourhood of the protestants, and a more free and liberal turn of mind, have rendered somewhat less absurd, entirely exempt from the dominion of superstition, and the solemn fooleries that always attend it; for the religion of Rome, in its best form, and in those places where its external worship is the least shocking, is certainly loaded with rites and observances that are highly offensive to sound reason. If, from this general view of things, we descend to a more circumstantial consideration of the innumerable abuses that are established in the discipline of that church; if we attend to the pious, or rather impious, frauds which, in many places, are imposed with impunity upon the deluded multitude; if we pass in review the corruption of the clergy, the ignorance of the people, the devout farces that are acted in the ceremonies of public worship, and the insipid jargon and trifling rhetoric that prevails in the discourses of the Romish preachers; if we weigh all these things maturely, we shall find, that they have little regard to impartiality and truth, who pretend that, since the council of Trent, the religion and worship of the Roman church have been every where corrected and amended.

CHAPTER II.

The History of the Greek and Eastern Churches.

I. THE Christian society that goes under the general denomination of the eastern church, is dispersed throughout Europe, Asia, and Africa, and may be divided into three distinct communities. The first is that of the Greek Christians, who agree, in all points of doctrine and worship, with the patriarch residing at Constantinople, and reject the pretended supremacy of the Roman pontiff. The second comprehends those Christians who differ equally from the Roman pontiff and the Grecian patriarch, in their religious opinions and institutions, and who live under the government of their own bishops and rulers. The third is composed of those who are subject to the see of Rome.

II. That society which holds religious communion with the patriarch of Constantinople, is, properly speaking, the Greek (though it assumes likewise the title of the eastern) church. This society is subdivided into two branches, of which one acknowledges the supreme authority and jurisdiction of the bishop of Constantinople, while the other, though joined in communion of doctrine and worship with that prelate, obstinately refuses to receive his legates, or to obey his edicts, and is governed by its own laws and insitutions, under the jurisdiction of spiritual rulers, who are not dependent on any foreign authority.

III. That part of the Greek church which acknowledges the jurisdiction of the bishop of Constantinople, is divided, as in the early ages of Christianity, into four large districts or provinces, Constantinople, Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem; and over each of these a bishop presides with the title of Patriarch, whom the inferior bishops and monastic orders unanimously respect as their common Father. But the supreme chief of all these patriarchs, bishops and abbots, and indeed of the whole church, is the patriarch of Constantinople. This prelate has the privilege of nominating the other patriarchs, (though that dignity still continues apparently elective,) and of approving the election that is made; nor is any thing of moment undertaken or transacted in the church without his express permission, or his especial order. It is true, that, in the present decayed state of the Greek churches, whose former opulence is reduced almost to nothing, their spiritual rulers enjoy little more than the splendid title of patriarchs, without being in a condition to extend their fame, or promote their cause, by any undertaking of signal importance.

IV. The spiritual jurisdiction and dominion of the first of these patriarchs are very extensive, comprehending a considerable part of Greece, the Grecian Isles, Wallachia, Moldavia, and several of the European and Asiatic provinces subject to the Turks. The patriarch of Alexandria resides generally at Cairo, and exercises his spiritual authority in Egypt, Nubia, Libya, and part of Arabia.[b] Damascus is the principal residence of the patriarch of Antioch, whose jurisdiction extends to Mesopotamia, Syria, Cilicia, and other provinces,[c] while the patriarch of Jerusalem comprehends, within the bounds of his pontificate,

[a] It is well known that the French, who travel into Italy, employ the whole force of their wit and raillery in rendering ridiculous the monstrous superstition of the Italians. The Italians, in their turn, look upon the French that visit their country as totally destitute of all principles of religion. This is evidently the case, as we learn from the testimony of many writers, and particularly from that of Father Labat, in his Voyages en Italie et en Espagne. This agreeable Dominican lets no opportunity escape of censuring and exposing the superstition of the Spaniards and Italians; nor does he pretend to deny that his countrymen, and even he himself, passed for impious libertines in the opinion of those bigots.

[b] For an account of the patriarchate of Alexandria, and the various prelates who have filled that see, it will be proper to consult Sollerii Commentar. de Patriarchis Alexandrinis, prefixed to the fifth volume of the Acta Sanctorum Mensis Junii; as also the Oriens Christianus of Mich. Le Quien, tom. ii. p. 329. The nature of their office, the extent of their authority, and the manner of their creation, are accurately described by Eus. Renaudot, in his Dissertatio de Patriarcha Alexandrino, published in Liturg. Orient. The Grecian patriarch has, at this day, no bishops under his jurisdiction; the chorepiscopi or rural bishops alone are subject to his authority. All the bishops acknowledge as their chief the patriarch of the Monophysites, who is, in effect, the patriarch of Alexandria.

[c] The Jesuits have prefixed a particular and learned account of the patriarchs of Antioch to the fifth volume of the Acta SS. Mensis Julii, in which, however, there are some omissions and defects. Add to this the account that is given of the district or diocese of the patriarch of Antioch, by Le Quien, in his Oriens Christianus, tom. ii. and by Blasius Tertius, in his "Siria Sacra, ô Descrittione Historico-Geographica delle due Chiese Patriarchali, Antiochia, e Gierusalemme," published at Rome, in 1695. There are three bishops in Syria who claim the title and dignity of patriarch of Antioch. The first is the bishop of the Melchites,—a name given to the Christians in Syria, who follow the doctrines, institutions, and worship of the Greek church; the second is the spiritual guide of the Syrian Monophysites; and the third is the chief of the Maronites, who hold communion with the church of Rome. This last bishop pretends to be the true and lawful patriarch of Antioch, and is acknowledged as such, or at least receives this denomination from the Roman pontiff; yet it is certain, that the pope creates at Rome a patriarch of Antioch of his own choice. Thus the see of Antioch has, at this day, four patriarchs, one from the Greeks, two from the Syrians, and one created at Rome, who is patriarch *in partibus*, i. e. titular patriarch, according to the usual signification of that phrase.

Palestine, Syria,[a] Arabia, the country beyond Jordan, Cana in Galillee, and mount Sion.[b] The episcopal dominions of these three patriarchs are indeed extremely poor and inconsiderable; for the Monophysites have long since assumed the patriarchal seats of Alexandria and Antioch, and have deprived the Greek churches of the greatest part of their members in all those places where they have gained an ascendancy; and, as Jerusalem is the resort of Christians of every sect, who have their respective bishops and rulers, the jurisdiction of the Grecian patriarch is consequently confined there within narrow limits.

V. The right of electing the patriarch of Constantinople is, at this day, vested in the twelve bishops who reside nearest to that famous capital; but the Turkish emperor alone enjoys the right of confirming this election, and of enabling the new patriarch to exercise his spiritual functions. This institution, however, if it is not entirely overturned, is nevertheless, on many occasions, prostituted in a shameful manner by the corruption and avarice of the reigning ministers. Thus it happens, that many bishops, inflamed with the ambitious lust of power and preeminence, purchase by money what they cannot obtain by merit, and, seeing themselves excluded from the patriarchal dignity by the suffrages of their brethren, find an open and ready way to it by the mercenary services of men in power. What is yet more deplorable has frequently happened: prelates, who have been chosen in the lawful way to this eminent office, have even been deposed, in order to make way for others, whose only pretensions were ambition and bribery. And indeed, generally speaking, he is looked upon by the Turkish viziers as the most qualified for the office of patriarch, who surpasses his competitors in the number and value of the presents he employs on that occasion. It is true, that some accounts worthy of credit represent the present state of the Greek church as advantageously changed in this respect; and it is reported, that, as the Turkish manners have gradually assumed a milder and more humane cast, the patriarchs live under their dominion with more security and repose than they did some ages ago.[c]

The power of the patriarch among a people dispirited by oppression, and sunk, through their extreme ignorance, into the greatest superstition, may be supposed to be very considerable and extensive; and such, indeed, it is. Its extent, however, is not entirely derived from the causes now mentioned but from others that give no small weight and lustre to the patriarchal dignity. For this prelate not only calls councils by his own authority, in order to decide, by their assistance, the controversies that arise, and to make use of their prudent advice and wise deliberations in directing the affairs of the church; his prerogatives go yet farther, and, by the especial permission of the sultan, he administers justice and takes cognizance of civil causes among the members of his communion. His influence is maintained, on the one hand, by the authority of the Turkish monarch, and, on the other, by his right of excommunicating the disobedient members of the Greek church. This right gives the patriarchs a singular degree of influence and authority, as nothing has a more terrifying aspect to that people than a sentence of excommunication, which they reckon among the greatest and most tremendous evils. The revenue of this prelate is drawn particularly from the churches that are subject to his jurisdiction; and its produce varies according to the state and circumstances of the Greek Christians, whose condition is exposed to many vicissitudes.[d]

VI. The Scriptures and the decrees of the first seven general councils are acknowledged by the Greeks as the rule of their faith. It is received, however, as a maxim established by long custom, that no private person has a right to explain, for himself or others, either the declarations of Scripture, or the decisions of these councils; and that the patriarch and his brethren are alone authorized to consult these oracles, and to declare their meaning; and, accordingly, the declarations of this prelate are looked upon as sacred and infallible directions, whose authority is supreme, and which can neither be transgressed nor disregarded without the utmost impiety. The substance of the doctrine of the Greek church is contained in a treatise entitled, The orthodox Confession of the Catholic and Apostolic Eastern Church, which was drawn up by Peter Mogislaus, bishop of Kiow, in a provincial council assembled in that city. This confession was translated into Greek,[e] and publicly approved and adopted, in 1643, by Parthenius of Constantinople, and the other Grecian patriarchs. It was afterwards published in Greek and Latin, at the expense of Panagiota, the grand-signor's interpreter, a man of great opulence and liberality, who ordered it to be distributed *gratis* among the Greek Christians; and it was also enriched with a recommendatory letter composed by Nectarius, patriarch of Jerusalem.[f] It appears evidently from this confession, that the Greeks differ widely from the votaries of the Roman pontiff, whose doctrines they reject and treat with indignation in several places; but it appears, at the same time, that their religious tenets are equally remote from those of other Christian societies; so that whoever peruses this treatise with

☞ [a] Syria is here erroneously placed in the patriarchate of Jerusalem: it evidently belongs to that of Antioch, in which also Dr. Mosheim places it in the preceding part of the sentence.

[b] Blas. Tertii Siria Sacra, lib. ii. D. Papebrochii Comment. de Patriarch. Hierosolym. tom. iii. Act. Sanct. Mens. Maii.—Le Quien, tom. iii.

[c] Le Quien, tom. i. p. 145.—Elsner, Beschreibung der Griechischen in der Turckey.

[d] Cuper, a Jesuit, has given a History of the Patriarchs of Constantinople, in the Acta Sanctorum Mensis Augusti, tom. i. p. 1—257. There is also a very ample account both of the see of Constantinople and its patriarchs, in the Oriens Christianus of Le Quien, who likewise treats of the Latin patriarchs of that city. See also a brief account of the power and revenues of the present patriarch, and of the names of the several sees under his spiritual jurisdiction, in Smith, de Eccles. Græciæ Hodierno Statu.

[e] It was originally composed in the Russian language.

[f] This confession was published at Leipsic, with a Latin translation, by Laur. Normannus, in 1695. In the preface we are informed, that it had been composed by Nectarius: but this assertion is refuted by that prelate himself, in a letter which immediately follows the preface. It is also affirmed, both in the preface and title-page, that this is the first public edition which has been given of the Greek confession. But this assertion is also false, since it is well known that it was published in Holland in 1662, at the expense of Panagiota. The German translation of this confession was published at Frankfort and Leipsic, in 1727. The learned Jo. Christ. Kocher has given, with his usual accuracy and erudition, an ample account both of this and the other confessions received among the Greeks, in his Bibliotheca Theologiæ Symbol., and the laborious Dr. Hoffman, principal professor of divinity at Wittenberg, published, in 1751, a new edition of the Orthodox confession, with an historical account of it. Those who are desirous of a circumstantial account of the famous Panagiota, to whom this confession was indebted for a considerable part of its credit, and who rendered to the Greek church in general the most eminent services, will find it in Cantemir's Histoire de l'Empire Ottoman, tom. iii. p. 149.

attention, will be fully convinced, how much certain writers mistake the case, who imagine that the obstacles which prevent the union of the Greeks with this or the other Christian community, are small and inconsiderable.[a]

VII. The votaries of Rome have found this to be true on many occasions. And the Lutherans made an experiment of the same kind, when they presented a fruitless invitation to the Greek churches to embrace their doctrine and discipline, and live with them in religious communion. The first steps in this laudable attempt were taken by Melancthon, who sent to the patriarch of Constantinople a copy of the confession of Augsburg, translated into Greek by Paul Dolscius. This present was accompanied with a letter, in which the learned and humane professor represented the protestant doctrine with the utmost simplicity and faithfulness, hoping that the artless charms of truth might touch the heart of the Grecian prelate. But his hopes were disappointed; for the patriarch did not even deign to send him an answer.[b] After this the divines of Tubingen renewed, with his successor Jeremiah,[c] the correspondence which had been begun by Melancthon. They wrote frequently, during the course of several years,[d] to the new patriarch, and sent him another copy of the Confession of Augsburg, with a Compendium of Theology, composed by Heerbrand, and translated into Greek by Martin Crusius; nor did they leave unemployed any means, which a pious and well-conducted zeal could suggest as proper to gain over this prelate to their communion. The fruits, however, of this correspondence were very inconsiderable, and wholly consisted in a few letters from the Greek patriarch, written, indeed, with an amiable spirit of benevolence and cordiality, but at the same time in terms which showed the impossibility of the union so much desired by the protestants. The whole strain of these letters manifested in the Greeks an inviolable attachment to the opinions and institutions of their ancestors, and tended to demonstrate the vanity of attempting to dissolve it in the present situation and circumstances of that people.[e]

VIII. Nothing, indeed, more deplorable can be conceived than the state of the greatest part of the Greeks, since their subjection to the oppressive yoke of the Turkish emperors. Since that fatal period, almost all learning and science, human and divine, have been extinguished among them. They have neither schools, colleges, nor any of those literary establishments that ennoble human nature, by sowing in the mind the immortal seeds of knowledge and virtue. Those few who surpass the vulgar herd in intellectual acquirements have derived this advantage from the schools of learning in Sicily or Italy, where the studious Greeks usually repair in quest of knowledge, or from a perusal of the writings of the ancient doctors, and more especially of the theology of St. Thomas Aquinas, which they have translated into their native language.[f]

Such, at least, is the notion of the learning of the modern Greeks, that is entertained by all the European Christians, as well Roman Catholics as protestants; and it is built upon the clearest evidence, and supported by testimonies of every kind. Many of the Greeks deny with obstinacy this inglorious charge, and not only defend their countrymen against the imputation of such gross ignorance, but even go so far as to maintain, that all the liberal arts and sciences are in as flourishing a state in modern Greece, as they were in any period of the history of that nation. Among the writers that exalt the learning of the modern Greeks in such an extraordinary manner, the first place is due to an eminent historian,[g] who has taken much pains to demonstrate the error of those who are of a different opinion. For this purpose he has not only composed a list of the learned men who adorned that country in the last century, but also makes mention of an academy founded at Constantinople by a certain Greek, whose name was Manolax, in which all the branches of philosophy, all the liberal and useful arts and sciences, are taught with the utmost success and applause, after the manner of the ancient sages of Greece. But all this, though matter of fact, does not amount to a satisfactory proof of the point in question. It only proves, what was never doubted by any thinking person, that the populous Greek nation, in which are many ancient, noble, and opulent families, is not entirely destitute of men of learning and genius. But it does not at all demonstrate, that this nation, considered in general, is at present enriched with science either sacred or profane, or makes any shining figure in the republic of letters. In a nation which, generally speaking, is sunk in the most barbarous ignorance, some men of genius and learning may arise, and shine like meteors in a gloomy firmament. With respect to the academy founded at Constantinople, it may be observed, that a literary establishment, so necessary and yet so recent, confirms the judgment that has been almost universally formed concerning the state of erudition among the Greeks.

This ignorance, which reigns among the Greeks, has the most pernicious influence upon their morals. Licentiousness and impiety not only abound among the people, but also dishonour their leaders; and the calamities that arise from this corruption of manners, are deplorably augmented by their endless contentions and divissions. Their religion is a motley collection of ceremonies, the greatest part of which are either ridiculously trifling, or shockingly absurd. Yet they are much more zealous in retaining and observing these senseless rites, than in maintaining the doctrine, or obeying the precepts, of the religion they profess. Their misery would be extreme, were it not for the support they derive from those Greeks who perform the functions of physicians and interpreters at the emperor's court; and who, by their opulence and credit, frequently interpose to reconcile the differences, or to ward off the dangers, that so often menace their church with destruction.

---

[a] The learned Fabricius has given, in the tenth volume of his Bibliotheca Græca, an exact and ample list of the writers, whom it is proper to consult, in order to form a just notion of the state, circumstances, and doctrines of the Greek church.

[b] Leo Allatius, de perpetuâ Consensione Eccles. Orient. et Occident. lib. iii. cap. viii. sect. ii. p. 1005.

☞ [c] The name of the former patriarch was Joseph. In 1559, he had sent his deacon Demetrius to Wittenberg, to inform himself upon the spot of the genius and doctrines of the protestant religion.

[d] This correspondence commenced in 1576, and ended in 1581.

[e] All the acts and papers relating to this correspondence were published in 1584. See Christ. Matth. Pfaffii Liber de Actis et Scriptis publicis Ecclesiæ Wirtembergicæ, p. 50.—Jo. Alb. Fabricii Biblioth. Græca, vol. x.—Emman. a Schelstrate, Acta Ecclesiæ Orientalis contra Lutheri Hæresin.—Lami Deliciæ Eruditorum, tom. viii.

☞ [f] The translator has inserted the note [k] of the original into that paragraph of the English text, which begins thus: *Such, at least,* &c.

[g] See Demetrius Cantemir's Histoire de l'Empire Ottoman, tom. ii.

IX. The Russians, Georgians, and Mingrelians, adopt the doctrines and ceremonies of the Greek church, though they are entirely free from the jurisdiction and authority of the patriarch of Constantinople. It is true, indeed, that this prelate had formerly enjoyed the privilege of a spiritual supremacy over the Russians, to whom he sent a bishop whenever a vacancy happened. But, toward the conclusion of this century, this privilege ceased in consequence of the following incident. Jeremiah II., patriarch of Constantinople, undertook a journey into Moscovy, to levy pecuniary succours against his rival Metrophanes, and to drive him, by the force of money, from the patriarchal throne. On this occasion, the Moscovite monks, in compliance, no doubt, with the secret orders of the grand duke Theodore, the son of John Basilowitz, employed all the influence both of threatenings and supplications to engage Jeremiah to place at the head of the Moscovite nation an independent patriarch. The patriarch of Constantinople, unable to resist such powerful solicitations, was forced to yield; and accordingly, in a council assembled at Moscow in 1589, he nominated and proclaimed Job, archbishop of Rostow, the first patriarch of the Moscovites. This extraordinary step was, however, taken on condition that every new patriarch of the Russians should demand the consent and suffrage of the patriarch of Constantinople, and pay, at fixed periods, five hundred gold ducats. The transactions of this Moscovite council were afterwards ratified in one assembled by Jeremiah at Constantinople in 1593, to which ratification the Turkish emperor gave his solemn consent.[a] But the privileges and immunities of the patriarch of Moscow were extended about the middle of the following century, when Dionysius II., the Constantinopolitan primate, and his three patriarchal colleagues, exempted him, at the renewed solicitation of the grand duke of Moscovy, from the double obligation of paying tribute, and of depending, for the confirmation of his election and installation, on a foreign jurisdiction.[b]

X. The Georgians and Mingrelians, or, as they were anciently called, the Iberians and Colchians, have declined so remarkably since the Mohammedan dominion has been established in these countries, that they can scarcely be ranked in the number of Christians. Such, in a more especial manner, is the depraved state of the latter, who wander about the woods and mountains, and lead a savage and undisciplined life; but, among the Georgians or Iberians, there are yet some remains of religion, morals, and humanity. These nations have a pontiff at their head, whom they call the Catholic; they have also their bishops and priests; but these spiritual rulers are a dishonour to Christianity, by their ignorance, avarice, and profligacy; they surpass almost the populace in the corruption of their manners, and, grossly ignorant themselves of the truths and principles of religion, they never entertain the least thought of instructing the people. If therefore it be affirmed, that the Georgians and Mingrelians, at this day, are neither attached to the opinions of the Monophysites, nor to those of the Nestorians, but embrace the doctrine of the Greek church, this must be confirmed rather in consequence of probable conjecture, than of certain knowledge, since it is almost impossible to know, with precision, what are the sentiments of a people who seem to be involved in the thickest darkness. Any remains of religion, observable among them, are entirely comprehended in certain sacred festivals and external ceremonies, of which the former are celebrated, and the latter are performed, without the least appearance of decency; for the priests administer the sacraments of baptism and of the Lord's supper with as little respect and devotion, as if they were partaking of an ordinary repast.[c]

XI. The eastern Christians, who renounce the communion of the Greek church, and differ from it both in doctrine and worship, may be comprehended under two distinct classes. To the former belong the Monophysites, or Jacobites, so called from Jacob Albardai,[d] who declare it as their opinion, that in the Saviour of the world there is only one nature, while the latter comprehends the followers of Nestorius, frequently called *Chaldæans*, from the country where they principally reside, and who suppose that there are two distinct persons or natures in the Son of God. The Monophysites are subdivided into two sects or parties, one African, the other Asiatic. At the head of the Asiatics is the patriarch of Antioch, who resides, for the most part, in the monastery of St. Ananias, and sometimes at Merdin, his episcopal seat, or at Amida, Aleppo, and other Syrian cities.[e] The government of this prelate is too extensive, and the churches over which he presides are too numerous, to allow his performing, himself, all the duties of his high office; and therefore a part of the administration of the pontificate is given to a kind of colleague, who is called the *maphrian*, or primate of the East, and whose doctrine and discipline are said to be adopted by the eastern churches beyond the Tigris. This primate used formerly to reside at Tauris, a city on the frontiers of Armenia; but his present habitation is the monastery of St. Matthew, near Mosul, in Mesopotamia. It is farther observable, that all the patriarchs of the Jacobites assume the denomination of Ignatius.[f]

XII. The African Monophysites are under the jurisdiction of the patriarch of Alexandria, who generally resides at Grand Cairo; and they are subdivided into Copts and Abyssinians. The former denomination comprehends all those Christians who dwell in Egypt, Nubia, and the countries adjacent, and whose condition is truly deplo-

[a] See Anton. Possevini Moscovia.—Le Quien, tom. i.—The Catalogus Codicum Manuscriptorum Biblioth. Taurinens. (p. 433—469.) contains Jeremiah's account of this transaction.

[b] Le Quien, tom. i.—Nic. Bergius, de Ecclesiâ Muscoviticâ part i. sect. i. c. xviii.

[c] Clementis Galini Conciliatio Ecclesiæ Armenicæ cum Romanâ, tom. i. p. 156.—Chardin's Voyage en Perse, &c. tom. i. p. 67, where the reader will find Jos. Mar. Zampi's Relation de la Colchide et Mingrelie.—Lamberti's Relation de la Colchide ou Mingrelie, in the Recueil des Voyages au Nord, tom. vii. p. 160. Le Quien, tom. i. p. 1333.—See also Rich. Simon's Histoire Critique des Dogmes et Ceremonies des Chretiens Orientaux, ch. v. and vi. in which the learned author endeavours to remove, at least, a part of the reproach under which the Georgians and Mingrelians labour on account of their supposed ignorance and corruption. The catholics or pontiffs of Georgia and Mingrelia are, at this day, exempt from foreign jurisdiction; they are, however, obliged to pay a certain tribute to the patriarch of Constantinople.

[d] This Jacob Albardai, or Baradæus, as he is called by others, restored, in the sixth century, the sect of the Monophysites, then almost expiring, to its former vigour, and modelled it anew; hence they were called Jacobites. This denomination is commonly used in an extensive sense, as comprehending all the Monophysites, except those of Armenia; it, however, more strictly and properly belongs only to those Asiatic Monophysites, of whom Jacob Albardai was the restorer and the chief. See Simon's Histoire des Chretiens Orientaux—a work, nevertheless, that often wants correction.

[e] Assemani Dissert. de Monophysitis, tom. ii.—Biblioth. Orient. Clem. Vatican. sect. viii.—Faust. Nairon's Euoplia Fidei Catholicæ ex Syrorum Monument. par. i. p. 40.—Le Quien's Oriens Christ. tom. ii. p. 1343.

[f] Assemani Dissertat. de Monophysitis, sect. viii.

rable. Oppressed by the insatiable avarice and tyranny of the Turks, they draw out their wretched days in misery and want, and are unable to support either their patriarch or their bishops. These are not, however, left entirely destitute; since they are, in a manner, maintained by the liberality of those Copts, who, on account of their capacity in domestic affairs, and their dexterity in the exercise of several manual arts, highly useful, though entirely unknown to the Turks, have gained admittance into the principal Moslem families.[a] As to the Abyssinians, they surpass considerably the Copts, in number, power, and opulence; nor will this appear surprising, when it is considered, that they live under the dominion of a Christian emperor; they, nevertheless, consider the Alexandrian pontiff as their spiritual parent and chief; and, consequently, instead of choosing their own bishop, receive from that prelate a primate, whom they call *abuna*, and whom they acknowledge as their spiritual ruler.[b]

XIII. These Monophysites differ from other Christian societies, whether of the Greek or Latin communion, in many points, both of doctrine and worship, though the principal reason of their separation lies in the opinion they entertain concerning the nature and person of Jesus Christ. Following the doctrine of Dioscorus, Barsuma, Xenaias, Fullo, and others, whom they consider as the heads or chief ornaments of their sect, they maintain that in Christ the divine and human natures were reduced into one, and consequently reject both the decrees of the council of Chalcedon, and the famous letter of Leo the Great. That, however, they may not seem to have the least inclination toward the doctrine of Eutyches, which they profess to reject with the most ardent zeal, they propose their own system with the utmost caution and circumspection, and hold the following obscure principles: That the two natures are united in Christ without either confusion or mixture; so that though the nature of our Saviour be really one, yet it is at the same time twofold and compound.[c] By this declaration it appears, that those learned men, who look upon the difference between the Monophysites, and the Greek and Latin churches, rather as a dispute about *words* than *things*, are not so far in an error as some have imagined.[d] Be that as it may, both the Asiatic and African Monophysites of the present times are, generally speaking, so deeply sunk in ignorance, that their attachment to the doctrine by which they are distinguished from other Christian societies, is rather founded on their own obstinacy, and on the authority of their ancestors, than on any other circumstance; nor do they even pretend to appeal, in its behalf, to reason and argument.[e]

XIV. The Armenians,[f] though they agree with the other Monophysites in the main doctrine of that sect relating to the unity of the divine and human nature in Christ, differ from them, nevertheless, in many points of faith, discipline, and worship; and hence it comes to pass, that they hold no communion with that branch of the Monophysites who are Jacobites in the more limited sense of that term. The Armenian church is governed by three patriarchs.[g] The chief, whose diocese comprehends the Greater Armenia, beholds forty-two archbishops subjected to his jurisdiction, and resides in a monastery at Echmiazin. The revenues of this spiritual ruler are such as would enable him to live in the most splendid and magnificent manner;[h] but there are no marks of pomp or opulence in his external appearance, or in his regular economy. His table is frugal, his habit plain; nor is he distinguished from the monks, with whom he lives, by any other circumstance than his superior power and authority. He is, for the most part, elected to his patriarchal dignity by the suffrages of the bishops assembled at Echmiazin, and his election is confirmed by the solemn approbation of the Persian monarch. The second patriarch of the Armenians, who is called the Catholic, resides at Cis in Cilicia, rules over the churches established in Cappadocia, Cilicia, Cyprus, and Syria, and has twelve archbishops under his jurisdiction. He at present acknowledges his subordination to the patriarch of Echmiazin. The third patriarch, who has no more than eight or nine bishops under his dominion, resides in the island of Aghtamar (which is in the midst of the great lake of Varaspuracan,) and is looked upon by the other Armenians as the enemy of their church.

Beside these prelates, who are patriarchs in the true

[a] Renaudot published, in 1713, a very learned work, relative to the history of the Eastern patriarchs, under the title of "Historia Alexandrinorum Patriarcharum Jacobitarum," &c. He also gave to the world the office used in the ordination of the Jacobite patriarch, with remarks, in the first volume of his Liturg. Orient.—The internal state of the Alexandrian or Coptic church, both with respect to doctrine and worship, is described by Wansleb, in his "Histoire de l'Eglise d'Alexandrie, que nous appellons celle des Jacobites Coptes," published in 1667. Add to this another work of the same author, entitled, "Relation d'un Voyage en Egypte," in which there is a particular account of the Coptic monasteries and religious orders. See also "Nouveaux Memoires des Missions de la Compagnie de Jesus dans le Levant;" and Maillet's Description de l'Egypte, tom. ii.

[b] Job. Ludolf, Comment. in Histor. Æthiop. p. 451, 461.—Lobo, Voyage d'Abissinie, tom. ii. p. 36.—Nouveaux Memoires des Missions dans le Levant, tom. iv.—Le Quien, tom. ii.

[c] Assemani Biblioth. Orien. Clement. Vatican. tom. ii. p. 25, 34, 117, 133, 277, 297, &c.—See, in the same work, Abulpharajius' subtle vindication of the doctrine of his sect, vol. ii. p. 288. There is a complete and circumstantial account of the religion of the Abyssinians, in the Theologia Æthiopica of Gregory the Abyssinian, published by Fabricius, in his Lux Evangelii toti orbi exoriens, p. 716, where may also be found a list of all the writers who have given accounts of the Abyssinians.

[d] See La Croze, Hist. du Christianisme des Indes, p. 23. Asseman. tom. ii. p. 291, 297.—Rich. Simon, Histoire des Chretiens Orientaux, p. 119.—Jo. Joach. Schroderi Thesaurus Linguæ Armenicæ, p. 276.

☞ The truth of the matter is, that the terms used by the Monophysites are something more than equivocal; they are contradictory. It may also be farther observed, that those who pretend to hold a middle path between the doctrines of Nestorius and Eutyches, were greatly embarrassed, as it was almost impossible to oppose the one, without adopting, or at least appearing to adopt the other.

[e] The liturgies of the Copts, the Syrian Jacobites, and the Abyssinians, have been published, with learned observations, by Renaudot, in the first and second volumes of his Liturgiæ Orientales.

[f] The first writer, who gave a circumstantial account of the religion and history of the Armenians, was Clement Galani, an Italian of the order of the Theatins, whose Conciliatio Ecclesiæ Armenicæ cum Romanâ was published in 1650. The other authors, who have treated of this branch of ecclesiastical history, are enumerated by Fabricius, in his Lux Evangelii toti Orbi exoriens, ch. xxxviii.; to which must be added, Le Quien, Oriens Christianus, tom. i.—The History of Christianity in Armenia, which the learned La Croze has subjoined to his account of the progress of the Christian religion in Abyssinia, is by no means answerable to the importance and copiousness of the subject; which must be attributed to the age and infirmities of that author. For an account of the particular institutions and rites of the Armenians, see Gemelli Carreri, Voyage autour du Monde, tom. ii.

☞ Sir Paul Ricaut mentions four; but his authority, were it more respectable than it really is, cannot be compared with that of the excellent sources from which Dr. Mosheim draws his materials.

[g] R. Simon has subjoined to his Histoire des Chretiens Orient. an account of all the Armenian churches which are subject to the jurisdiction of this grand patriarch; but this account, though taken from Useanus, an Armenian bishop, is defective in many respects. For an account of the residence and manner of life of the patriarch of Echmiazin, see Paul Lucas, Voyage au Levant, tom. ii. and Gemelli Carreri, Voyage autour du Monde, tom. ii.

sense of that term, the Armenians have other spiritual leaders, who are honoured with the same appellation; but this, indeed, is no more than an empty title, unattended with the authority and prerogatives of the patriarchal dignity. Thus the archbishop of the Armenians, who lives at Constantinople, and whose authority is respected by the churches established in those provinces which form the connexion between Europe and Asia, enjoys the title of patriarch. The same denomination is given to the Armenian bishop who resides at Jerusalem, and also to the prelate of the same nation, who has his episcopal seat at Caminiec in Poland, and governs the Armenian churches that are established in Russia, Poland, and the adjacent countries. These bishops assume the title of patriarchs, on account of some peculiar privileges conferred on them by the great patriarch of Echmaizin; for, by an authority derived from this supreme head of the Armenian church, they are allowed to consecrate bishops, and to make, every third year, and distribute among their congregations, the holy *chrism*, or ointment; which, according to a constant custom among the eastern Christians, is the privilege of the patriarchs alone.[a]

XV. The Nestorians, who are also known by the denomination of Chaldeans, have fixed their habitation chiefly in Mesopotamia and the neighbouring countries. They have several doctrines, as well as some religious ceremonies and institutions, that are peculiar to themselves. But the main points that distinguish them from all other Christian societies, are, their persuasion that Nestorius was unjustly condemned by the council of Ephesus, and their firm attachment to the doctrine of that prelate, who maintained that there were not only two natures, but also two distinct persons in the Son of God. In the earlier ages of the church, this error was looked upon as of the most momentous and pernicious kind; but in our times it is deemed of less consequence, by persons of the greatest weight and authority in theological matters, even among the Roman Catholic doctors. They consider this whole controversy as a dispute about words, and the opinion of Nestorius as a nominal, rather than a real heresy; that is, as an error arising rather from the words he employed, than from his intention in the use of them. It is true, indeed, that the Chaldeans attribute to Christ two natures, and even two persons; but they correct what may seem rash in this expression, by adding, that these natures and persons are so closely and intimately united, that they have only one aspect. Now the word *barsopa*, by which they express this aspect, is precisely of the same signification with the Greek word προσωπον, which signifies a *person*;[b] and hence it is evident, that they attached to the word *aspect* the same idea that we attach to the word *person*, and that they understood by the word *person*, precisely what we understand by the term *nature*. However that may be, we must observe here, to the lasting honour of the Nestorians, that, of all the Christian societies established in the East, they have been the most careful and successful in avoiding a multitude of superstitious opinions and practices that have infected the Greek and Latin churches.[c]

XVI. In the earlier ages of Nestorianism, the various branches of that numerous and powerful sect were under the spiritual jurisdiction of the same pontiff, or *catholic*, who resided first at Bagdad, and afterwards at Mosul; but in this century the Nestorians were divided into two sects. They had chosen, in 1552, as has been already observed, two bishops at the same time, Simeon Barmama, and John Sulaka, otherwise named Siud. The latter, to strengthen his interest, and to triumph over his competitor, hastened to Rome, and acknowledged the jurisdiction, that he might be supported by the credit, of the Roman pontiff. In 1555, Simeon Denha, archbishop of Gelu, adopted the party of the fugitive patriarch, who had embraced the communion of the Latin church; and, being afterwards chosen patriarch himself, fixed his residence in the city of Ormia, in the mountainous parts of Persia. So far down as the last century, these patriarchs persevered in their communion with the church of Rome; but they seem at present to have withdrawn themselves from it.[d] The great Nestorian pontiffs, who form the opposite party, and look with a hostile eye on this little patriarch, have, since the year 1559, been distinguished by the general denomination of Elias, and reside constantly in the city of Mosul.[e] Their spiritual dominion is very extensive, takes in a considerable part of Asia, and comprehends also within its circuit the Arabian Nestorians; as also the Christians of St. Thomas, who dwell along the coast of Malabar.[f]

XVII. Beside the Christian societies now mentioned, who still retain some faint shadow at least of the system of religion delivered by Christ and his apostles, there are other sects dispersed through a great part of Asia, whose principles and doctrines are highly pernicious. These sects derive their origin from the Ebionites, Valentinians, Manicheans, Basilidians, and other separatists, who, in the early ages of Christianity, excited schisms and factions in the church. Equally abhorred by Turks and Christians, and thus suffering oppression from all quarters, they gradually declined in successive centuries, and fell at length into such barbarous superstition and ignorance, as extinguished among them every spark of true religion. Thus were they reduced to the wretched and ignominious figure they at present make, having fallen from the privileges, and almost forfeited the very name of Christians. The sectaries, who pass in the East under the denomination of Sabians, who call themselves *Mendai Ijahi*, or the disciples of John, and whom the Europeans style the Christians of St. John, because they yet retain some knowledge of the Gospel, are probably of Jewish origin, and the remains of the ancient Hemerobaptists, of whom

[a] See the Nouveaux Memoires des Missions de la Compagnie de Jesus, tom. iii. where there is an ample and circumstantial account, both of the civil and religious state of the Armenians. This account has been highly applauded by M. de la Croze, for the fidelity, accuracy, and industry with which it is drawn up; and no man was more conversant in subjects of this nature than that learned author.

[b] It is in this manner that the sentiments of the Nestorians are explained in the inscriptions which adorn the tombs of their patriarchs at Mosul.—See Assemani Biblioth. Oriental. Vatican. tom. iii. par. ii.—R. Simon, Histoire de la Creance des Chretiens Orientaux, ch. vii.—P. Strozzi, de Dogmatibus Chaldæorum, published in 1617.

[c] See the learned dissertation of Assemanus de Syris Nestorianis, which occupies entirely the fourth volume of his Biblioth. Oriental. Vatican. and which seems to have been much consulted and partly copied by Mich. Le Quien.

[d] See Jos. Sim. Assemani Biblioth. Orient. Vatican. tom. i. p. 538, and tom. ii. p. 456.

[e] A list of the Nestorian pontiffs is given by Assemanus, in his Biblioth. Orient. Vatican. tom. iii. part i. p. 711; which is corrected, however, in the same volume, part ii.—See also Le Quien, tom. iii. p. 1078.

[f] The reader will find an ample account of the Christians of St. Thomas in La Croze, Histoire du Christianisme des Indes. See also Assemani Biblioth. tom. iii. part ii. cap. ix. p. ccccxiii.

the writers of ecclesiastical history make frequent mention.[a] This, at least, is certain, that John, whom they consider as the founder of their sect, bears no sort of similitude to John the Baptist, but rather resembles the person of that name whom the ancient writers represent as the chief of the Jewish Hemerobaptists. These ambiguous Christians, whatever their origin may be, dwell in Persia and Arabia, and principally at Basra, and their religion consists in bodily washings, performed frequently, and with great solemnity,[b] and attended with certain ceremonies which the priests mingle with this superstitious service.[c]

XVIII. The Jasidians, or Jezdæans, of whose religion and manners many reports of a very doubtful nature are given by voyage-writers, are an unsettled wandering tribe, who frequent the Gordian mountains, and the deserts of Curdistan, a province of Persia; the character of whose inhabitants has something in it peculiarly fierce and intractable. The Jezdæans are divided into black and white members. The former are the priests and rulers of the sect, who go arrayed in sable garments; while the latter, who compose the multitude, are clothed in white. Their system of religion is certainly very singular, and is not hitherto sufficiently known, though it is evidently composed of some Christian doctrines, and a motley mixture of fictions drawn from a different source. They are distinguished from the other corrupt sects, that have dishonoured Christianity, by the peculiar impiety of their opinion concerning the evil genius. This malignant principle they call *Karubin*, or Cherub, i. e. one of the great ministers of the Supreme Being; and, if they do not directly address religious worship to this evil minister, they treat him at least with the utmost respect, and not only abstain, themselves, from offering him any marks of hatred or contempt, but will not suffer any contumelious treatment to be given him by others. They carry, it is said, this reverence and circumspection to such an excessive height, that no efforts of persecution, no torments, not even death itself, can engage them to conceive or express an abhorrence of this evil genius; and it is even added, that they will make no scruple to put to death such persons as express, in their presence, an aversion to him.[d]

XIX. The Duruzians, or Dursians, a fierce and warlike people that inhabit the craggy rocks and inhospitable wilds of mount Libanus, give themselves out for descendants of the Franks, who, from the eleventh century, carried on the holy war with the Mohammedans in Palestine; though this pretended origin is a matter of the greatest uncertainty. What the doctrine and discipline of this nation are at present, it is extremely difficult to know, as they are at the greatest pains imaginable to conceal their religious sentiments and principles. We find, however, both in their opinions and practice, the plainest proofs of their acquaintance with Christianity. Several learned men have imagined, that both they and the Curdi of Persia had formerly embraced the sentiments of the Manicheans, and perhaps still persist in their pernicious errors.[e]

The Chamsi, or Solares, who reside in a certain district of Mesopotamia, are supposed, by curious inquirers into these matters, to be a branch of the Samsæans, mentioned by Epiphanius.[f]

There are many other Semi-Christian sects of these kinds in the east,[g] whose principles, tenets, and institu-

---

☞ [a] The sect of Hemerobaptists among the Jews were so called from their washing themselves every day, and their performing this custom with the greatest solemnity, as a religious rite, necessary to salvation. The account of this sect given by Epiphanius, in the introduction to his book of heresies, has been treated as a fiction, in consequence of the suspicions of inaccuracy and want of veracity, under which that author too justly labours. Even the existence of the Hemerobaptists has been denied, but without reason, since they are mentioned by Justin Martyr, Eusebius, and many other ancient writers, every way worthy of credit. That the Christians of St. John descended from this sect, is rendered probable by many reasons, of which the principal and the most satisfactory may be seen in a very learned and ingenious work of Dr. Mosheim, entitled, de Rebus Christianorum ante Constantinum Magnum Commentarii.

☞ [b] The Mendæans at present perform these ablutions only once in a year.

[c] See the work of a learned Carmelite, named Ignatius a Jesu, published in 1652, under the following title: "Narratio Originis Rituum et Errorum Christianorum S. Johannis, cui adjungitur Discursus, per modum Dialogi, in quo confutantur xxxiv. Errores ejusdem Nationis." Engelb. Kæmpferi Amœnitates Exoticæ, Fascic. II. Relat. XI. p. 35.—Sale's Preface to his English Translation of the Koran, p. 15.—Assemani Biblioth. Oriental. tom. iii. par. ii. p. 609.—Thevenot, Voyages, tom. iv. p. 584.—Herbelot, Biblioth. Orient. p. 725.—The very learned Bayer had composed an historical account of these Mendæans, which contained a variety of curious and interesting facts, and of which he intended that I should be the editor; but a sudden death prevented his executing his intention. He was of opinion (as appears from the Thesaurus Epistolicus Crozianus) that these Mendæans, or disciples of St. John, were a branch of the ancient Manicheans; which opinion La Croze himself seems to have adopted, as may be seen in the work now cited, tom. iii. But there is really nothing, either in the doctrines or manners of this sect, that resembles the opinions and practice of the Manicheans. Hence several learned men conjecture, that they derive their origin from the ancient idolators who worshipped a plurality of gods, and more especially from those who payed religious adoration to the stars of heaven, and who were called, by the Arabians, Sabians or Sabeans. This opinion has been maintained with much erudition by the famous Fourmont, in a dissertation inserted in the eighteenth volume of the Memoires de l'Academie des Inscriptions et des Belles Lettres. But it is absolutely groundless, and has not even a shadow of probability, if we except the name which the Mohammedans usually give to this sect. The Mendæans, themselves, acknowledge that they are of Jewish origin, and that they were transferred from Palestine into the country which they at present inhabit. They have sacred books of a very remote antiquity; among others, one which they attribute to Adam, and another composed by John, whom they revere as the founder of their sect. As these books were some years ago added to the library of the king of France, it is to be hoped that they may contribute to give us a more authentic account of this people than we have hitherto received.

[d] See Hyde, Historia Relig. Veter. Persarum in Append. p. 549.—Otter, Voyage en Turquie et en Perse, tom. i. p. 121, tom. ii. p. 249. In the seventeeth century, Mich. Nau, a learned Jesuit, undertook to instruct this profane sect, and to give them juster notions of religion, (see D' Arvieux, Memoires ou Voyages, tom. vi. p. 362, 377,) and after him another Jesuit, whose name was Monier, embarked in the same dangerous enterprise, (see Memoires des Missions des Jesuites, tom. iii. p. 291;) but how they were received, and what success attended their ministry, is hitherto unknown. Rhenferdius (as appears from the letters of the learned Gisbert Cuper, published by Bayer) considers the Jezdæans as the descendants of the ancient Scythians. But this opinion is no less improbable than that which makes them a branch of the Manicheans; and this is sufficiently refuted by their sentiments concerning the Evil Genius. Beausobre, in his Histoire du Manicheisme, conjectures that the denomination of this sect is derived from the name of Jesus; but it seems rather to be borrowed from the word *Jazid*, or *Jezdan*, which, in the Persian language, signifies the *good God*, and is opposed to *Ahrimen*, or *Arimanius*, the Evil Principle, (see Herbelot, Biblioth. Orient. p. 484.—Cherefeddin Ali, Hist. de Timur-bec, tom. iii. p. 81.) so that the appellative term derived from the former points out that sect as the worshippers of the good, or true God. Notwithstanding the plausibility of this account of the matter, it is not impossible that the city *Jezd*, of which Otter speaks in his Voyage en Turquie et en Perse, may have given rise to the title of *Jasidians*, or *Jezdæans*.

[e] See Lucas' Voyage en Grece et Asie Mineure, tom. ii. p. 36.—Hyde's Hist. Relig. Veter. Persar. p. 491, 554.—Sir Paul Ricaut's History of the Ottoman Empire, vol. i. p. 313.

[f] Hyde, Histor. Relig. Veter. Persar. p. 555.

[g] The Jesuit Diusse (in the Lettres Edifiantes et Curieuses des Missions Etrangeres, tom. i. p. 63,) informs us of the existence of a sect of Christians, in the mountains which separate Persia from India, who imprint the sign of the cross on their bodies with a red-hot iron.

tions, are far from being unworthy of the curiosity of the learned. And those who would be at the pains to turn their researches this way, and more especially to have the religious books of these sects conveyed into Europe, would undoubtedly render eminent service to the cause of sacred literature, and obtain applause from all who have a taste for the study of Christian antiquities; for the accounts which have hitherto been given of these nations and sects are full of uncertainty and contradiction.

XX. The missionaries of Rome have never ceased to display, in these parts of the world, their dexterity in making proselytes, and accordingly have founded, though with great difficulty and expense, among the greatest part of the sects now mentioned, congregations that adopt the doctrine, and acknowledge the jurisdiction, of the Roman pontiff. It is abundantly known, that among the Greeks, who live under the empire of the Turks, and also among those who are subject to the dominion of the Venetians, the emperor of Germany, and other Christian princes, there are many who have adopted the faith and discipline of the Latin church, and are governed by their own clergy and bishops, who receive their confirmation and authority from Rome. In the latter city is a college, expressly founded with a view to multiply these apostatising societies, and to increase and strengthen the credit and authority of the Roman pontiff among the Greeks. In these colleges a certain number of Grecian students, who have given early marks of genius and capacity, are instructed in the arts and sciences, and are more especially prepossessed with the deepest sentiments of veneration and zeal for the authority of the pope. Such an institution, accompanied with the efforts and labours of the missionaries, could not fail, one would think, to gain an immense number of proselytes to Rome, considering the unhappy state of the Grecian churches. But the case is quite otherwise; for the most respectable writers, even of the Roman catholic persuasion, acknowledge fairly, that the proselytes they have drawn from the Greek churches make a wretched and despicable figure, in point of number, opulence, and dignity, when compared with those, to whom the religion, government, and the very name of Rome, are disgusting and odious. They observe farther, that the sincerity of a great part of these proselytes is of the Grecian stamp; so that, when a favourable occasion is offered them of renouncing, with advantage, their pretended conversion, they seldom fail, not only to return to the bosom of their own church, but even to recompense the good offices they received from the Romans with the most injurious treatment. The same writers mention another circumstance, much less surprising, indeed, than those now mentioned, but much more dishonourable to the church of Rome; and that circumstance is, that even those of the Greek students who are educated at Rome with such care, as might naturally attach them to its religion and government, are, nevertheless so disgusted and shocked at the corruptions of its church, clergy, and people, that they forget, more notoriously than others, the obligations with which they have been loaded, and exert themselves with peculiar obstinacy and bitterness in opposing the credit and authority of the Latin church.[a]

XXI. In their efforts to extend the papal empire over the Greek churches, the designing pontiffs did not forget the church of Russia, the chief bulwark and ornament of the Grecian faith. On the contrary, frequent deliberations were holden at Rome, about the proper methods of uniting, or rather subjecting this church to the papal hierarchy. In this century John Basilides, or Basilowitz, grand duke of the Russians, seemed to discover a propensity toward this union, by sending, in 1580, a solemn embassy to Gregory XIII. to exhort that pontiff to resume the negotiations relative to this important matter, that they might be brought to a happy and speedy conclusion. Accordingly, in the year following, Antony Possevin, a learned and artful Jesuit, was charged by the pope with the commission, and sent into Moscovy, to carry it into execution. But this dexterous missionary, though he spared no pains to obtain the purposes of his ambitious court, found by experience that all his efforts were unequal to the task he had undertaken; nor did the Russian ambassadors, who arrived at Rome soon after, bring any thing to the ardent wishes of the pontiff, but empty promises, conceived in dubious and general terms, on which little dependence could be placed.[b] And, indeed, the event abundantly showed, that Basilowitz had no other view, in all these negotiations, than to flatter the pope, and obtain his assistance, in order to bring to an advantageous conclusion the unsuccessful war which he had carried on against Poland.

The advice and exhortations of Possevin and his associates were attended with more fruit among the Russian residents in the Polish dominions, many of whom embraced the doctrine and rites of the Roman church, in consequence of an association agreed on in 1596, in a meeting at Bresty, the capital of the Palatinate of Cujavia. Those who thus submitted to the communion of Rome were called the United, while the adverse party, who adhered to the doctrine and jurisdiction of the patriarch of Constantinople, were distinguished by the title of the Non United.[c] It is likewise worthy of observation here, that there has been established at Kiow, since the fourteenth century, a Russian congregation, subject to the jurisdiction of the Roman pontiff, and ruled by its own metropolitans, who are entirely distinct from the Russian bishops resident in that city.[d]

XXII. The Roman missionaries made scarcely any spiritual conquests worthy of mention among either the Asiatic or African Monophysites. About the middle of the preceding century, a little insignificant church, that acknowledged the jurisdiction of the pope, was erected among the Nestorians, whose patriarchs, successively named Jo-

[a] See, among other authors who have treated this point of history, Urb. Cerri, Etat present de l'Eglise Romaine, in which, speaking of the Greeks, he expresses himself in the following manner: "Ils deviennent les plus violens ennemis des catholiques lorsqu'ils ont apris nos sciences, et qu'ils ont connoissance de nos imperfections:" i. e. in plain English, they (the Greeks) become the bitterest enemies of us Roman catholics, when they have been instructed in our sciences, and have acquired the knowledge of our imperfections.—Other testimonies of a like nature shall be given hereafter.—Mich. Le Quien has given us an enumeration, although a defective one, of the Greek bishops who follow the rites of the Roman church, in his Oriens Christ. tom. iii. p. 360.

[b] See the conferences between Possevin and the duke of Moscovy together with the other writings of this Jesuit, (relative to the negotiation in question,) subjoined to his work, called Moscovia.—See also La Vie du Père Possevin, par Jean Dorigny, liv. v. p. 351.

[c] Adr. Regenvolscii Histor. Eccl. Slavonicar. lib. iv. cap. ii. p. 465.

[d] See Le Quien, tom. i. p. 1274, and tom. iii. p. 1126.—Acta Sanctorum, tom. ii. Februar. p. 693.

seph,[a] resided in the city of Diarbek. Some of the Armenian provinces embraced the doctrines and discipline of Rome so early as the fourteenth century, under the pontificate of John XXIII., who, in 1318, sent them a Dominican monk to govern their church, with the title and authority of an archbishop. The episcopal seat of this spiritual ruler was first fixed at Soldania, a city in the province of Aderbijan:[b] but was afterwards transferred to Naxivan, where it still remains in the hands of the Dominicans, who alone are admitted to that spiritual dignity.[c] The Armenian churches in Poland, which have embraced the faith of Rome, have also their bishop, who resides at Lemberg.[d] The Georgians and Mingrelians, who were visited by some monks of the Theatin and Capuchin orders, disgusted these missionaries by their ferocity and ignorance, remained inattentive to their counsels, and unmoved by their admonitions; so that their ministry and labours were scarcely attended with any visible fruit.[e]

XXIII. The pompous accounts which the papal missionaries have given of the vast success of their labours among all these Grecian sects, are equally destitute of candour and truth. It is evident, from testimonies of the best and most respectable authority, that, in some of those countries, they do nothing more than administer clandestine baptism to sick infants who are committed to their care, as they appear in the fictitious character of physicians;[f] and that, in other places, the whole success of their ministry is confined to the assembling of some wretched tribes of indigent converts, whose poverty is the only bond of their attachment to the Romish church, and who, when the papal largesses are suspended or withdrawn, fall from their pretended allegiance to Rome, and return to the religion of their ancestors.[g] It happens also, from time to time, that a person of distinction, among the Greeks or Orientals, embraces the doctrine of the Latin church, promises obedience to its pontiff, and carries matters so far as to repair to Rome to testify his respectful submission to the apostolic see. But in these obsequious steps the noble converts are almost always moved by avarice or ambition; and, accordingly, upon a change of affairs, when they have obtained their purposes, and have nothing more to expect, they, in general, either suddenly abandon the church of Rome, or express their attachment to it in such ambiguous terms as are only calculated to deceive. Those who, like the Nestorian bishop of Diarbek,[h] continue in the profession of the Roman faith, and even transmit it with an appearance of zeal to their posterity, are excited to this perseverance by no other motive than the uninterrupted liberality of the Roman pontiff.

On the other hand, the bishops of Rome are extremely attentive and assiduous in employing all the methods in their power to maintain and extend their dominion among the Christians of the East. For this purpose, they treat, with the greatest lenity and indulgence, the proselytes they have made in those parts of the world, that their yoke may not appear intolerable. They even carry this indulgence so far, as to show evidently, that they are actuated more by a love of power, than by an attachment to their own doctrines and institutions; for they not only allow the Greek and other eastern proselytes the liberty of retaining the ceremonies of their ancestors (though in direct opposition to the religious service of the church of Rome,) and of living in a manner repugnant to the customs and practice of the Latin world; but, what is much more surprising, they suffer the peculiar doctrines, that distinguish the Greeks and Orientals from all other Christian societies, to remain in the public religious books of the proselytes already mentioned, and even to be reprinted at Rome in those which are sent abroad for their use.[i] The truth of the matter seems to be briefly this: at Rome, a Greek, an Armenian, or a Copt, is looked upon as an obedient child, and a worthy member of the church, if he acknowledges the supreme and unlimited power of the Roman pontiff over all the Christian world.

XXIV. The Maronites who inhabit the mounts Libanus and Anti-Libanus, date their subjection to the spiritual jurisdiction of the Roman pontiff from the time that the Latins carried their hostile arms into Palestine, with a view to make themselves masters of the Holy Land.[k] This subjection however was agreed to, with an express condition, that neither the popes nor their emis-

[a] See Assemani Biblioth. Orient. Vatican. tom. iii. par. i. p. 615.—Le Quien, tom. ii. p. 1084.

[b] Odor. Raynald. Annal. tom. xv. ad An. 1318. sect. iv.

[c] Le Quien, tom. iii. p. 1362, and 1403.—Clemens Galanus, Conciliatio Ecclesiæ Armenicæ cum Romanâ, tom. i. p. 527.

[d] Memoires des Missions de la Compagnie de Jesus, tom. iii.

[e] Urb. Cerri. Etat present de l'Eglise Romaine.

[f] Urb. Cerri, p. 164.—Gabr. de Chinon, Relations nouvelles du Levant, par. i. c. vi. This Capuchin monk delivers his opinions on many subjects with frankness and candour.

[g] See Chardin's Voyages en Perse, tom. i. ii. iii. of the last edition published in Holland, in 4to.; for, in the former editions, all the scandalous transactions of the Roman missionaries among the Armenians, Colchians, Iberians, and Persians, are entirely wanting.—See also Chinon's Relations du Levant, part ii. for the affairs of the Armenians; and Maillet's Description d'Egypte, tom. iii., for an account of the Copts.

[h] Otherwise named Amida and Caramit.

[i] Assemanus complains (in several passages of his Biblioth. Orient. Vatican.) that even the very books printed at Rome for the use of the Nestorians, Jacobites, and Armenians, were not corrected or purged from the errors peculiar to these sects; and he looks upon this negligence as the reason of the defection of many Roman converts, and of their return to the bosom of the eastern and Greek churches, to which they originally belonged.—See, on the other hand, the Lettres Choisies de R Simon, tom. ii. let. xxiii., in which the author pretends to defend this conduct of the Romanists, which some attribute to indolence and neglect, others to artifice and prudence.

[k] The Maronite doctors, and more especially those who reside at Rome, maintain, with the greatest efforts of zeal and argument, that the religion of Rome has always been preserved among them in its purity, and exempt from any mixture of heresy or error. The proof of this assertion has been attempted, with great labour and industry, by Faust. Nairon, in his Dissertatio de Origne, Nomine, ac Religione, Maronitarum, published at Rome in 1679. It was from this treatise, and some other Maronite writers, that De la Roque drew the materials of his discourses concerning the origin of the Maronites, together with the abridgment of their history, which he inserted in the second volume of his Voyage de Syrie et du Mont Liban. But neither this hypothesis, nor the authorities by which it is supported, have any weight with the most learned men of the Roman church, who maintain, that the Maronites derived their origin from the Monophysites, and adhered to the doctrine of the Monothelites,* until the twelfth century, when they embraced the communion of Rome. See R. Simon, Histoire Critique des Chretiens Orientaux, ch. xiii.—Euseb. Renaudot, Histor. Patriarch. Alexand. in Præfat. iii. 2. in Histor. p. 49. The very learned Assemanus, who was himself a Maronite, steers a middle way between these opposite accounts, in his Biblioth. Orient. Vatic. tom. i., while the matter in debate is left undecided by Mich. le Quien, in his Oriens Christianus, tom. iii., where he gives an account of the Maronite church and its spiritual rulers.—For my own part I am persuaded, that those who consider that all the Maronites have not as yet embraced the faith, or acknowledged the jurisdiction of Rome, will be little disposed to receive with credulity the assertions of certain Maronite priests, who are, after the manner of the Syrians, much addicted to boasting and exaggeration. Certain it is, that there are Maronites in Syria, who still behold the

* Those who maintained, that, notwithstanding the two natures in Christ, viz. the human and the divine, there was, nevertheless, but one will, which was the divine.

saries should pretend to change or abolish any thing which related to the ancient rites, moral precepts, or religious opinions, of this people; so that in reality, among the Maronites, there is nothing to be found that savours of popery, if we except their attachment to the Roman pontiff,[a] who is obliged to pay dearly for their friendship; for, as they live in the utmost distress of poverty, under the tyrannical yoke of infidels, the bishop of Rome is under a necessity of furnishing them with such subsidies as may gratify the rapacity of their oppressors, procure a subsistence for their bishop and clergy, provide all things requisite for the support of their churches and the uninterrupted exercise of public worship, and contribute in general to lessen their misery. Besides, the college erected at Rome by Gregory XIII. with a view of instructing the young men, frequently sent from Syria, in the various branches of useful science and sacred erudition, and prepossessing them with an early veneration and attachment for the Roman pontiff, is attended with a very considerable expense. The Maronite patriarch performs his spiritual functions at Canobin, a convent of the monks of St. Antony, on mount Libanus, which is his constant residence. He claims the title of Patriarch of Antioch, and always assumes the name of Peter, as if he seemed desirous of being considered as the successor of that apostle.[b]

church of Rome with the greatest aversion and abhorrence; and, what is still more remarkable, great numbers of that nation residing in Italy, even under the eye of the pontiff, opposed his authority during the last century, and threw the court of Rome into great perplexity. One body of these non-conforming Maronites retired into the valleys of Piedmont, where they joined the Waldenses; another, above six hundred in number, with a bishop and several ecclesiastics at their head, fled into Corsica, and implored the protection of the republic of Genoa against the violence of the inquisitors. See Urb. Cerri's Etat present de l'Eglise Romaine, p. 121. Now may it not be asked here, What could have excited the Maronites in Italy to this public and vigorous opposition to the Roman pontiff, if it be true that their opinions were in all respects conformable to the doctrines and decrees of the church of Rome? This opposition could not have arisen from any thing but a difference in point of doctrine and belief, since the church of Rome allowed, and still allows the Maronites, under its jurisdiction, to retain and perform the religious rites and institutions that have been handed down to them from their ancestors, and to follow the precepts and rules of life to which they have always been accustomed. Compare, with the authors above cited, Thesaur. Epistol. Crozian. t. i.

[a] The reader will do well to consult principally, on this subject, the observations subjoined by Rich. Simon to his French translation of the Italian Jesuit Dandini's Voyage to Mount Libanus, published in 1685. See also Euseb. Renaudot's Historia Patriarch. Alexandr. p. 548.

[b] See Petitqueux, Voyage á Canobin dans le Mont Liban, in the Nouveaux Mémoires des Missions de la Compagnie de Jesus, tom. iv. p. 252. and tom. viii. p. 355.—La Roque, Voyage de Syrie, tom. ii. p. 10.—Laur. D'Arvieux, Memoires ou Voyages, tom. ii. p. 418.

PART II.

THE HISTORY OF THE MODERN CHURCHES.

CHAPTER I.

The History of the Lutheran Church.

I. The rise and progress of the Evangelical or Lutheran church, have been already related, so far as they belong to the history of the Reformation. The former title was assumed by that church in consequence of the original design of its founder, which was to restore to its native lustre the Gospel of Christ, that had so long been covered with the darkness of superstition, or, in other words, to place in its proper and true light that important doctrine, which represents salvation as attainable by the merits of Christ alone. Nor did the church, now under consideration, discover any reluctance to an adoption of the name of the great man, whom Providence employed as the honoured instrument of its foundation and establishment. A natural sentiment of gratitude to him, by whose ministry the clouds of superstition had been chiefly dispelled, who had destroyed the claims of pride and self-sufficiency, exposed the vanity of confidence in the intercession of saints and martyrs, and pointed out the Son of God as the only proper object of trust to miserable mortals, excited his followers to assume his name, and to call their community the *Lutheran* Church.

The rise of this church must be dated from that remarkable period, when pope Leo X. drove Martin Luther, with his friends and followers, from the bosom of the Roman hierarchy, by a solemn and violent sentence of excommunication. It began to acquire a regular form, and a considerable degree of stability and consistence, from the year 1530, when the system of doctrine and morality which it had adopted was drawn up and presented to the diet of Augsburg; and it was raised to the dignity of a lawful and complete hierarchy, totally independent of the laws and jurisdiction of the Roman pontiff, in consequence of the treaty concluded at Passau, in 1552, between Charles V., and Maurice, elector of Saxony, relating to the religious affairs of the empire.

II. The great and leading principle of the Lutheran church, is, that the Scriptures are the only source from which we are to draw our religious sentiments, whether they relate to faith or practice; and that these inspired writings are, in all matters that are essential to salvation, so plain, and so easy to be thoroughly understood, that their signification may be learned, without the aid of an expositor, by every person of common sense, who has a competent knowledge of the language in which they are composed. There are, indeed, certain formularies adopted by this church, which contain the principal points of its doctrine, ranged, for the sake of method and perspicuity, in their natural order. But these books have no authority but what they derive from the scriptures of truth, whose sense and meaning they are designed to convey; nor are the Lutheran doctors permitted to interpret or explain these books so as to draw from them any propositions inconsistent with the express declarations of the word of God. The Confession of Augsburg, and the annexed Defence of it against the objections of the Roman catholic doctors, may be deemed the chief and the most respectable of these human productions.[a] In the next rank may be placed the *Articles of Smalcald*,[b] as they are commonly called, together with the shorter and larger Catechisms of Luther, calculated for the instruction of youth, and the improvement of persons of riper years. To these standard-books most churches add the *Form of Concord;* which, though not universally received, has not, on that account, occasioned any animosity or disunion, as the few points that prevent its being adopted by some churches are of an indifferent nature,[c]

☞ [a] When the confession of Augsburg had been presented to the diet of that city, the Roman catholic doctors were employed to refute the doctrines it contained; and this pretended refutation was also read to that august assembly. A reply was immediately drawn up by Melancthon, and presented to the emperor, who, under the pretext of a pacific spirit, refused to receive it. This reply was afterwards published, under the title of Apologia Confessionis Augustanæ; and is the defence of that confession, mentioned by Dr. Mosheim as annexed to it. To speak plainly, Melancthon's love of peace and concord seems to have carried him beyond what he owed to the truth, in composing this defence of the confession of Augsburg. In that edition of the Defence which some Lutherans (and Chytræus among others) look upon as the most genuine and authentic, Melancthon makes several strange concessions to the church of Rome; whether through servile fear, excessive charity, or hesitation of mind, I will not pretend to determine. He speaks of the presence of Christ's body in the eucharist in the very strongest terms that the catholics use to express the monstrous doctrine of transubstantiation, and adopts those remarkable words of Theophylact, that 'the bread was not a figure only, but was truly changed into flesh.' He approves that canon of the mass, in which the priest prays that 'the bread may be changed into the body of Christ.' It is true, that, in some subsequent editions of the defence or apology now under consideration, these obnoxious passages were omitted, and the phraseology, which had given such just offence, was considerably mitigated. There is an ample account of this whole affair, together with a history of the dissensions of the Lutheran church, in the valuable and learned work of Hospinian, entitled, 'Historiæ Sacramentariæ Pars posterior,' p. 199, et seq. These expressions, in Melancthon's Apologia, will appear still more surprising, when we recollect that, in the course of the debates concerning the manner of Christ's presence in the eucharist, he, at length, seemed to lean visibly toward the opinions of Bucer and Calvin, and that, after his death, his followers were censured and persecuted in Saxony on this account, under the denomination of Philippists. This shows either that the great man now under consideration changed his opinions, or that he had formerly been seeking union and concord at the expense of truth.

☞ [b] The articles here mentioned were drawn up at Smalcald by Luther, on occasion of a meeting of the protestant electors, princes, and states, at that place. They were principally designed to show how far the Lutherans were disposed to go, in order to avoid a final rupture, and in what sense they were willing to adopt the doctrine of Christ's presence in the eucharist. And though the terms in which these articles are expressed, be somewhat dubious, yet they are much less harsh and disgusting than those used in the Confession, the Apology, and the Form of Concord.

☞ [c] Dr. Mosheim, like an artful painter, shades those objects in the history of Lutheranism which it is impossible to expose with advantage to a full view. Of this nature was the conduct of the Lutheran doctors in the deliberations relating to the famous Form of Concord here mentioned; a conduct that discovers such an imperious and uncharitable spirit, as would have been more consistent with the genius of the court of Rome than with the principles of a protestant church. The reader who is desirous of an ample demonstration of the truth and justice of this censure, has only to consult the learned work of Rod. Hospinian, entitled, 'Concordia Discors, seu de Origine et Progressu Formulæ Concordiæ Bergensis.' The history of this remarkable production is more amply related in the thirty-ninth and following paragraphs of this first chapter, and in the notes, which the translator has taken the liberty to add there, in order to cast a proper light upon some things that are too interesting to be viewed superficially. In the mean time I shall only observe that the points in the Form of Concord, that prevented its being universally received, are not of such an indifferent

and do not, in any degree, affect the grand and fundamental principles of true religion.[a]

III. The form of public worship, and the rites and ceremonies that were proper to be admitted as a part of it, gave rise to disputes in several places, during the infancy of the Lutheran church. Some were inclined to retain a greater number of the ceremonies and customs that had been so excessively multiplied in the church of Rome, than seemed either lawful or expedient to others. The latter, after the example of the Helvetic reformers had their views entirely turned toward that simplicity and gravity which characterized the Christian worship in the primitive times; while the former were of opinion, that some indulgence was to be shown to the weakness of the multitude, and some regard paid to institutions that had acquired a certain degree of weight through long established custom. But, as these contending parties were both persuaded that the ceremonial part of religion was, generally speaking, a matter of human institution, and that consequently a diversity of external rites might be admitted among different churches professing the same religion, without any prejudice to the bonds of charity and fraternal union, these disputes could not be of any long duration. In the mean time, all those ceremonies and observances of the church of Rome, whether of a public or private nature, that carried palpable marks of error and superstition, were every where rejected without hesitation; and wise precautions were used to regulate the forms of public worship in such a manner, that the genuine fruits of piety should not be choked by a multitude of insignificant rites. Besides, every church was allowed to retain so much of the ancient form of worship as might be still observed without giving offence, and as seemed suited to the character of the people, the genius of the government, and the nature and circumstances of the place where it was founded. Hence it has happened, that, even so far down as the present times, the Lutheran churches differ considerably one from another, with respect both to the number and nature of their religious ceremonies; a circumstance so far from tending to their dishonour, that it is, on the contrary, a very striking proof of their wisdom and moderation.[b]

IV. The supreme civil rulers of every Lutheran state are clothed also with the dignity, and perform the functions of supremacy in the church. The very essence of civil government seems manifestly to point out the necessity of investing the sovereign with this spiritual supremacy,[c] and the tacit consent of the Lutheran churches has confirmed the dictates of wise policy in this respect. It must not, however, be imagined, that the ancient rights and privileges of the people in ecclesiastical affairs have been totally abolished by this constitution of things, since it is certain, that the vestiges of the authority exercised by them in the primitive times, though more striking in one place than in another, are yet more or less visible every where. Besides, it must be carefully remembered, that all civil rulers of the Lutheran persuasion are effectually restrained, by the fundamental principles of the doctrine they profess, from any attempts to change or destroy the established rule of faith and manners, to make any alteration in the essential doctrines of their religion, or in any thing that is intimately connected with them, or to impose their particular opinions upon their subjects in a despotic and arbitrary manner.

The councils, or societies, appointed by the sovereign to watch over the interests of the church, and to govern and direct its affairs, are composed of persons conversant both in civil and ecclesiastical law, and, according to a very ancient denomination, are called *Consistories*. The internal government of the Lutheran church seems equally removed from episcopacy on the one hand, and from presbyterianism on the other, if we except the kingdoms of Sweden and Denmark, which retain the form of ecclesiastical government that preceded the reformation, purged, indeed, from the superstitions and abuses that rendered it so odious.[d] This constitution of the hierarchy of the Lutherans will not seem surprising, when their sentiments with respect to ecclesiastical polity are duly considered. On the one hand, they are persuaded that there is no law, of divine authority, which points out a distinction between the ministers of the Gospel, in rank, dignity, or prerogatives; and therefore they recede from episcopacy. But, on the other hand, they are of opinion, that a certain subordination, a diversity in point of rank and privileges among the clergy, are not only highly useful, but also necessary to the perfection of church communion, by connecting more closely, in consequence of a mutual dependence, the members of the same body; and thus they avoid the uniformity of the presbyterian government. They do not, however, agree with respect to the extent of this subordination, and the degrees of superiority and precedence that ought to distinguish their doctors; for, in some places, this is regulated with much more regard to the ancient rules of church-government, than is discovered in others. As the divine law is silent on this head, different opinions may be entertained, and different forms of ecclesiastical polity adopted, without a breach of Christian charity and fraternal union.

V. Every country has its own liturgies, which are the rules of proceeding in every thing that relates to external worship and the public exercise of religion. These rules, however, are not of an immutable nature, like those institutions which bear the stamp of a divine authority, but may be augmented, corrected, or illustrated, by the order of the sovereign, when such changes evidently appear to be necessary or expedient. The liturgies used in the dif

nature as Dr. Mosheim seems to imagine. To maintain the ubiquity or omnipresence of Christ's body, together with its real and peculiar presence in the eucharist, and to exclude from their communion the protestants, who denied these palpable absurdities, was the plan of the Lutheran doctors in composing and recommending the Form of Concord; and this plan can neither be looked upon as a matter of pure indifference, nor as a mark of Christian charity.

[a] See, for an account of the Lutheran confessions of faith, Christ. Locheri Biblioth. Theologiæ Symbolicæ, p. 114.

[b] See Balth. Meisnerus, Lib. de Legibus, lib. iv. art. iv. quæst. iv.—Jo. Adam Scherzerus, Breviar. Hulsemann. Enulc. p. 1313—1321.

[c] Since nothing is more inconsistent with that subordination and concord, which are among the great ends of civil government, than *imperium in imperio*, i. e. two independent sovereignties in the same body politic, the genius of government, equally with the spirit of genuine Christianity, proclaims the equity of that constitution, which makes the head of the state the supreme visible ruler of the church.

[d] In these two kingdoms the church is ruled by bishops and superintendants, under the inspection and authority of the sovereign. The archbishop of Upsal is primate of Sweden, and the only archbishop among the Lutherans. The luxury and licentiousness that too commonly flow from the opulence of the Roman catholic clergy are unknown in these two northern states, since the revenues of the prelate now mentioned do not amount to more than 400 pounds yearly, while those of the bishops are proportionally small.

ferent countries that have embraced the system of Luther, agree perfectly in all the essential branches of religion, in all matters that can be looked upon as of real moment and importance; but they differ widely in many things of an indifferent nature, concerning which the Scriptures are silent, and which compose that part of the public religion that derives its authority from the wisdom and appointment of men. Assemblies for the celebration of divine worship meet every where at stated times. Here the Scriptures are read publicly, prayers and hymns are addressed to the Deity, the sacraments are administered, and the people are instructed in the knowledge of religion, and excited to the practice of virtue by the discourses of their ministers. The wisest methods are used for the religious education of youth, who are not only carefully instructed in the elements of Christianity in the public schools, but are also examined by the pastors of the churches to which they belong, in a public manner, in order to the progressive extension of their knowledge, and the more vigorous exertion of their faculties in the study of divine truth. Hence, in almost every province, catechisms, containing the essential truths of religion and the main precepts of morality, are published and recommended by the authority of the sovereign, as rules to be followed by the masters of schools, and by the ministers of the church, both in their private and public instructions. But, as Luther left behind him an accurate and judicious production of this kind, in which the fundamental principles of religion and morality are explained and confirmed with the greatest perspicuity and force, both of evidence and expression, this compendious catechism of that eminent reformer is universally adopted as the first introduction to religious knowledge, and is one of the standard-books of that church which bears his name; and, indeed, all the provincial catechisms are no more than illustrations and enlargements of this excellent abridgment of faith and practice.

VI. Among the days deemed sacred in the Lutheran church, (beside that which is celebrated every week in memory of Christ's resurrection from the dead,) we may reckon all such as were signalised by those glorious and important events that proclaimed the celestial mission of the Saviour, and the divine authority of his holy religion.[a] For these sacred festivals, the grateful and well-grounded piety of ancient times had always professed the highest veneration. But the Lutheran church has gone yet farther; and, to avoid giving offence to weak brethren, has retained several which seemed to have derived the respect that is paid to them, rather from the suggestions of superstition than from the dictates of true religion. There are some churches that carry the desire of multiplying festivals so far, as to observe religiously the days formerly set apart for celebrating the memory of the twelve apostles.

It is well known, that the power of *excommunication*, i. e. of banishing from its bosom obstinate and scandalous transgressors, was a privilege enjoyed and exercised by the church from the remotest antiquity; and it is no less certain, that this privilege was often perverted to the most iniquitous and odious purposes. The founders of the Lutheran church, therefore, undertook to remove the abuses and corruptions under which this branch of ecclesiastical discipline laboured, and to restore it to its primitive purity and vigour. At first their attempt seemed to be crowned with success, since it is plain, that, during the sixteenth century, no opposition of any moment was made to the wise and moderate exercise of this spiritual authority. But, in process of time, this privilege fell imperceptibly into contempt; the terror of excommunication lost its force; and ecclesiastical discipline was reduced to such a shadow, that, in most places, there are scarcely any remains or traces of it at this day. This change may be partly attributed to the corrupt propensities of mankind, who are naturally desirous of destroying the influence of every institution that is designed to curb their licentious passions. It must, however, be acknowledged, that the relaxation of ecclesiastical discipline was not owing to this cause alone; other circumstances concurred to diminish the respect and submission that had been paid to the spiritual tribunal. On one hand, the clergy abused this important privilege in various ways; some misapplying the severity of excommunication through ignorance or imprudence, while others impiously perverted an institution, in itself exceedingly useful, to satisfy their private resentments, and to avenge themselves upon those who had dared to offend them. On the other hand, the counsels of certain persons in power, who considered the privilege of excommunicating in the hands of the clergy as derogatory from the majesty of the sovereign, and detrimental to the interests of civil society, had no small influence in bringing this branch of spiritual jurisdiction into disrepute. It is however certain, that whatever causes may have contributed to produce this effect, the effect itself was much to be lamented, as it removed one of the most powerful restraints upon iniquity. Nor will it appear surprising, when this is duly considered, that the manners of the Lutherans are so remarkably depraved, and that, in a church which is almost deprived of all authority and discipline, multitudes affront the public by their audacious irregularities, and transgress, with a shameless impudence, through the prospect of impunity.

VII. The prosperous and unfavourable events which belong to the history of the Lutheran church, since the happy establishment of its liberty and independence, are neither numerous nor remarkable, and may consequently be mentioned in a few words. The rise and progress of this church, before its final and permanent establishment, have been already related; but that very religious peace, which was the instrument of its stability and independence, set bounds, at the same time, to its progress in the empire, and prevented it effectually from extending its limits.[b] Near the close of this century, Gebhard, archbishop of Cologne, evinced a wish to enter into its communion, and, having contracted the bonds of matrimony, formed the design of introducing the reformation into his dominions. But this arduous attempt, which was in direct contradiction to the famous ecclesiastical reservation[c] stipulated in the articles of the peace of religion concluded

[a] Such (for example) are the nativity, death, resurrection, and ascension of the Son of God; the descent of the Holy Spirit upon the apostles on the day of Pentecost, &c.

[b] The reason of this will be seen in the following note.

[c] In the diet of Augsburg, which was assembled in 1555, in order to execute the treaty of Passau, those states which had already embraced the Lutheran religion, were confirmed in the full enjoyment of their religious liberty. To prevent, however, as far as was possible, the progress of the reformation, Charles V. stipulated for the catholics the famous ecclesiastical reservation, by which it was decreed, that if any

at Augsburg, proved abortive; and the prelate was obliged to resign his dignity, and to abandon his country.[a] On the other hand, it is certain, that the adversaries of the Lutheran church were not permitted to disturb its tranquillity, or to hurt, in any essential point, its liberty, prosperity, and independence. Their intentions, indeed, were malignant enough; and it appeared evident, from many striking circumstances, that they were secretly projecting a new attack upon the protestants with a view to annul the treaty of Passau, and to have them declared public enemies to the empire. Such was undoubtedly the unjust and seditious design of Francis Burckhard, in composing the famous book *de Autonomiâ*, which was published in 1586; and also of Pistorius, in drawing up the reasons, which the margrave of Baden alleged in vindication of his returning from Lutheranism into the bosom of popery.[b] These writers, and, others of the same stamp, treated the Religious Peace, negociated at Passau, and ratified at Augsburg, as unjust, because it was obtained by force of arms, and as null, because concluded without the knowledge and consent of the Roman pontiff. They pretended also to prove, that by the changes and interpolations, which they affirmed to have been made by Melancthon, in the confession of Augsburg, after it had been presented to the diet, the protestants forfeited all the privileges and advantages derived from the treaty now mentioned. The latter accusation gave rise to long and warm debates during this and the following century. Many learned and ingenious productions were published on that occasion, in which the Lutheran divines proved, with the utmost perspicuity and force of argument, that the Confession was preserved in their church in its original state, uncorrupted by any mixture, and that none of their brethren had ever departed in any instance from the doctrines contained in it.[c] They who felt most sensibly the bitter and implacable hatred of the papists against the doctrine and worship of the Lutheran Church (which they disdainfully called the *new religion*,) were such members of that church as lived in the territories of Roman Catholic princes. This is more especially true of the protestant subjects of the house of Austria,[d] who experienced, in the most affecting manner, the dire effect of bigotry and superstition seated on a throne, and who lost the greatest part of their liberty before the conclusion of this century.

VIII. While the votaries of Rome were thus meditating the ruin of the Lutheran church, and exerting, for this purpose, all the powers of secret artifice and open violence, the followers of Luther were assiduously bent on defeating their efforts, and left no means unemployed, that seemed proper to maintain their own doctrine, and to strengthen their cause. The calamities which they had suffered were fresh in their remembrance; and hence they were admonished to use all possible precautions to prevent their falling again into the like unhappy circumstances. Add to this, the zeal of princes and men in power for the advancement of true religion, which, it must be acknowledged, was much greater in this century, than it is in the times in which we live. Hence the original confederacy that had been formed among the German princes for the maintenance of Lutheranism, and of which the elector of Saxony was the chief, gradually acquired new strength; and foreign sovereigns, particularly those of Sweden and Denmark, were invited to enter into this grand alliance; and, as it was universally agreed, that the stability and lustre of the rising church depended much on the learning of its ministers, and the progress of the sciences, among those in general who professed its doctrines, so the greatest part of the confederate princes promoted, with the utmost zeal, the culture of letters, and banished, wherever their salutary influence could extend, that baneful ignorance which is the parent of superstition. The academical institutions founded by the Lutherans, at Jena, Helmstadt, and Altorf, and by the Calvinists at Franeker, Leyden, and other places; the ancient universities reformed and accommodated to the constitution and exigencies of a purer church than that under whose influence they had been at first established; the great number of schools that were opened in almost every city; the ample rewards, together with the distinguished honours and privileges that were bestowed on men of learning and genius; all these circumstances bear honourable testimony to the generous zeal of the German princes for the advancement of useful knowledge. These noble establishments were undoubtedly expensive, and required large funds for their support. These were principally drawn from the revenues and possessions, which the piety or superstition of ancient times had consecrated to the multiplication of convents, the erection or embellishment of churches, and other religious uses.

IX. These generous and zealous efforts in the cause of learning were attended with remarkable success. Almost all the liberal arts and sciences were cultivated with emulation, and brought to greater degrees of perfection. All those, whose views were turned to the service of the church, were obliged to apply themselves, with diligence and assiduity, to the study of Greek, Hebrew, and Latin literature, in order to qualify them for performing, with dignity and success, the duties of the sacred function; and it is well known that in these branches of erudition several Lutheran doctors excelled in such a manner, as to require a deathless name in the republic of letters. Melancthon, Cario, Chytræus, Reineccius, and others, were eminent for their knowledge of history. More particularly Matthias Flacius, one of the authors of the Centuriæ Magdeburgenses,* (an immortal work that restored to the light of evi-

archbishop, prelate, bishop, or other ecclesiastic, should, in time to come, renounce the faith of Rome, his dignity and benefice should be forfeited, and his place be filled by that chapter or college which possessed the power of election.

[a] See Jo. Dav. Koleri Dissertatio de Gebhardo Truchsessio.—Jo. Pet. à Ludewig Reliquiæ Manuscriptorum omnis Ævi, tom. v. p. 383.—See also a German work entitled Unschuldige Nachritchten, An. 1748. p. 484.

[b] See Chr. Aug. Salig. Histor. August. Confessionis, tom. i. lib. iv. cap. iii. p. 767.

[c] See Salig. Hist. August. Confessionis, tom i.—It cannot indeed be denied, that Melancthon corrected and altered some passages of the Confession of Augsburg. It is certain, that, in 1555, he made use of the extraordinary credit and influence he then had, to introduce among the Saxon churches an edition of that confession, which was so far corrected as to be, upon the whole, very different from the original one. But his conduct in this step, which was extremely audacious, or at least highly imprudent, never received the approbation of the Lutheran church, nor was the Augsburg Confession, in this new shape, ever admitted as one of the standard-books of its faith and doctrine.

[d] See the Austria Evangelica of the learned Raupachius, tom. i. p. 152. tom. ii. p. 287.

☞ * The joint authors of this famous work (beside Flacius Illyricus) were Nicolaus Gallus, Johannes Wigandus, and Matthias Judex, all ministers of Magdeburg; and they were assisted by Caspar Nidpruckius, an Imperial counsellor, Johannes Baptista Heincelius, an Augustinian, Basil Faber, and others.

dence and truth the facts relating to the rise and progress of the Christian church, which had been covered with great darkness, and corrupted by innumerable fables,) may be deservedly considered as the parent of ecclesiastical history. Nor should we omit mentioning the learned Martin Chumnitz, to whose Examination of the Decrees of the Council of Trent, the history of religion is more indebted, than many, at this day, are apt to imagine. While so many branches of learning were cultivated with zeal, some, it must be confessed, were too little pursued. Among these we may place the history of literature and philosophy, the important science of criticism, the study of antiquities, and other objects of erudition connected with them. It is, however, to be observed, that, notwithstanding the neglect with which these branches of science seemed too generally to be treated, the foundations of their culture and improvement in future ages were really laid in this century. On the other hand, it is remarkable that Latin eloquence and poetry were carried to a very high degree of improvement, and exhibited orators and poets of the first order; from which circumstance alone it may be fairly concluded, that, if all the branches of literature and philosophy were not brought to that pitch of perfection, of which they were susceptible, this was not owing to the want of industry or genius, but rather to the restraints imposed upon genius by the infelicity of the times. All the votaries of science, whom a noble emulation excited to the pursuit of literary fame, were greatly animated by the example, the influence, and the instructions of Melancthon, who was deservedly considered as the great and leading doctor of the Lutheran church, and whose sentiments, relating both to sacred and profane erudition, were so generally respected, that scarcely any had the courage to oppose them. In the next rank to this eminent reformer may be mentioned Joachim Camerarius of Leipsic, a shining ornament to the republic of letters in this century, who, by his zeal and application, contributed much to promote the cause of universal learning, and more especially the study of elegant literature.

X. The revolutions of philosophy among the Lutheran doctors were many and various. Luther and Melancthon seemed to set out with a resolution to banish every species of philosophy[a] from the church; and, though it is impossible to justify entirely this part of their conduct, they are less to be blamed than those scholastic doctors whose barbarous method of teaching philosophy was extremely disgusting, and who, by a miserable abuse of the subtle precepts of Aristotle, had perverted the dictates of common sense, and introduced the greatest obscurity and confusion both into philosophy and religion. But, though these abuses led the two great men now mentioned too far, and were carrying them into the opposite extreme, their own recollection suspended their precipitation, and they both perceived, before it was too late, that true philosophy was necessary to restrain the licentious flights of mere genius and fancy, and to guard the sanctuary of religion against the inroads of superstition and enthusiasm.[b] It was in consequence of this persuasion that Melancthon composed, in a plain and familiar style, abridgments of almost all the branches of philosophy, which, during many years, were explained publicly to the studious youth in all the Lutheran academies and schools of learning. This celebrated reformer may not improperly be considered as an *eclectic;* for, though in many points he followed Aristotle, and retained some degree of propensity to the ancient philosophy of the schools, yet he drew many things from the fecundity of his own genius, and often had recourse also to the doctrines of the Platonists and Stoics.

XI. This method of teaching philosophy, however recommendable on account of its simplicity and perspicuity, did not long enjoy, alone and unrivalled, the great credit and authority which it had obtained. Certain acute and subtle doctors, having perceived that Melancthon, in composing his Abridgments, had discovered a peculiar and predominant attachment to the philosophy of Aristotle, thought it was better to go to the source, than to drink at the stream, and therefore read and explained to their disciples the words of the Stagirite. On the other hand, it was observed, that the Jesuits, and other votaries of Rome, artfully made use of the ambiguous terms and the intricate sophistry of the ancient schoolmen, in order to puzzle the protestants, and to reduce them to silence, when they particularly wished for such arguments as were calculated to produce conviction; and, therefore, many protestant doctors thought it might be advantageous to their cause to have the studious youth instructed in the mysteries of the Aristotelian philosophy, as it was taught in the schools, that thus they might be qualified to defend themselves with the same weapons with which they were attacked. Hence there arose, in the latter part of this century, three philosophical sects, the Melancthonian, the Aristotelian, and the Scholastic. The first declined gradually, and soon disappeared: but the other two imperceptibly grew into one, acquired new vigour by this coalition, increased daily in reputation and influence, and were adopted in all the schools of learning. It is true, that the followers of Ramus made violent inroads, in several places, upon the territories of these combined sects, and sometimes with a certain appearance of success; but their hopes were transitory; for after various struggles they were obliged to yield, and were at length entirely banished from the schools.[c]

XII. Such also was the fate of the disciples of Paracelsus, who, from the grand principle of their physical system, were called *Fire-Philosophers,*[d] and who aimed at nothing less than the total subversion of the peripatetic philosophy, and the introduction of their own reve-

[a] See Christ. Aug. Heumanni Acta Philosophor. art. ii. part x. p. 579.—Jo. Herm. ab Elswich, Dissertat. de Variâ Aristotelis Fortunâ in Scholis Protestantium, which Launoy has prefixed to his book, de Fortunâ Aristotelis in Academiâ Parisiensi. sect. viii. xiii.

☞ [b] Some writers, either through malignity, or for want of better information, have pretended that Luther rejected the scholastic philosophy through a total ignorance of its nature and precepts. Those who have ventured upon such an assertion must have been as ignorant of the history of literature in general, as of the industry and erudition of Luther in particular. For a demonstrative proof of this, see Brucker's Historia Critica Philosophiæ, tom. iv. part i.

[c] Jo. Herm. ab. Elswich, de Fatis Aristot. in Scholis Protest. sect. xxi.—Jo. Georg. Walchius, Historia Logices, lib. ii. cap. i.—Otto Fred. Schutzius, de Vitâ Chytræi, lib. iv. sect. iv.

☞ [d] This fanatical sect of philosophers had several denominations. They were called Theo-Sophists, from their declaiming against human reason as a dangerous and deceitful guide, and their representing a divine and supernatural illumination as the only means of arriving at truth. They were called *Philosophi per ignem*, i. e. Fire-Philosophers, from their maintaining that the intimate essences of natural things were only to be known by the trying efforts of fire, directed in a chemical process. They were, lastly, denominated Paracelsists, from the eminent physician and chemist of that name, who was the chief ornament and leader of that extraordinary sect.

ries into the public schools. Toward the close of this century, the Paracelsists really made a figure in almost all the countries of Europe, as their sect was patronised and supported by the genius and eloquence of several great men, who exerted themselves, with the utmost zeal and assiduity, in its cause, and endeavoured, both by their writings and their transactions, to augment its credit. In England it found an eminent defender in Robert Flood, or Fludd, a man of a very singular genius,[a] who illustrated, or at least attempted to illustrate, the philosophy of Paracelsus, in a great number of treatises, which, even in our times, are not entirely destitute of readers and admirers. The same philosophy found some votaries in France, and was propagated with zeal at Paris by Rivier, in opposition to the sentiments and efforts of the university of that city.[b] Its cause was industriously promoted in Denmark, by Severinus;[c] in Germany, by Kunrath, an eminent physician at Dresden, who died in 1605;[d] and in other countries by a considerable number of warm votaries, who were by no means unsuccessful in augmenting its reputation, and multiplying its followers. As all these heralds of the new philosophy accompanied their instructions with a striking air of piety and devotion, and seemed, in propagating their strange system, to propose to themselves no other end than the advancement of the divine glory, and the restoration of peace and concord to a divided church, a motive which, in appearance, was so generous and noble, could not fail to procure friends and protectors. Accordingly, we find, that, near the close of this century, several persons, eminent for their piety, and distinguished by their zeal for the advancement of true religion, joined themselves to this sect. Of this number were the Lutheran doctors Weigelius, Arndius, and others, who were led into the snare by their ill-grounded notions of human reason, and who apprehended that controversy and argumentation might lead men to substitute anew the pompous and intricate jargon of the schools in the place of solid and sincere piety.

XIII. Among those who manifested a propensity toward the system of the Paracelsists, or Theosophists, was the celebrated Daniel Hoffman, professor of divinity in the university of Helmstadt, who, from the year 1598, had declared open war against philosophy, and who continued to oppose it with the greatest obstinacy and violence. Alleging the weight and authority of some opinions of Luther, and of various passages in the writings of that great man, he extravagantly maintained, that philosophy was the mortal enemy of religion; that truth was divisible into two branches, one philosophical and the other theological; and that what was true in philosophy, was false in theology. These absurd and pernicious tenets naturally alarmed the judicious doctors of the university, and excited a warm controversy between Hoffman and his colleagues Owen Guntherus, Cornelius Martin, John Caselius, and Duncan Liddle; a controversy also of too much consequence, to be confined within such narrow bounds, and which accordingly was carried on in other countries with the same fervour. The tumults which it excited in Germany were appeased by the interposition of Henry, duke of Brunswick, who, having made a careful inquiry into the nature of this debate, and consulted the professors of the academy of Rostoch on that subject, commanded Hoffman to retract publicly the invectives he had thrown out against philosophy in his writings and in his academical lectures, and to acknowledge, in the most open manner, the harmony and union of sound philosophy with true and genuine theology.[e]

XIV. The theological system that now prevails in the Lutheran academies, is not of the same tenor or spirit with that which was adopted in the infancy of the Reformation. As time and experience are necessary to bring all things to perfection, so the doctrine of the Lutheran church changed, imperceptibly and by degrees, its original form, and was improved and perfected in many respects. This will appear both evident and striking to those who are acquainted with the history of the doctrines relating to free-will, predestination, and other points, and who compare the Lutheran systems of divinity of an earlier date, with those which have been composed in modern times. The case could not well be otherwise. The glorious defenders of religious liberty, to whom we owe the various blessings of the Reformation, as they were conducted only by the suggestions of their natural sagacity, whose advances in the pursuit of knowledge are gradual and progressive, could not at once behold the truth in all its lustre, and in all its extent; but, as usually happens to persons who have been long accustomed to the darkness of ignorance, their approaches toward knowledge were slow, and their views of things very imperfect. The Lutherans were greatly assisted both in correcting and illustrating the articles of their faith, partly by the controversies which they were obliged to carry on with the Roman Catholic doctors and the disciples of Zuingle and Calvin, and partly by the intestine divisions that prevailed among themselves, of which an account shall be given in this chapter. They have been absurdly reproached, on account of this variation in their doctrine, by Bossuet and other papal writers, who did not consider that the founders of the Lutheran church never pretended to divine inspiration, and that it is by discovering first the errors of others, that the wise generally prepare themselves for the investigation of truth.

XV. The first and principal object that drew the attention and employed the industry of the reformers, was the exposition and illustration of the sacred writings, which, according to the doctrine of the Lutheran church, contain all the treasures of celestial wisdom, all things that relate to faith and practice. Hence it happened, that the number of commentators and expositors among the Lutherans equalled that of the eminent and learned doctors who adorned that communion. At the head of all, Luther and Melancthon are undoubtedly to be placed;

☞ [a] The person here mentioned by Dr. Mosheim is not the famous Dominican monk of that name, who, from his ardent pursuit of mathematical knowledge, was called the Seeker, and who, from his passion for chemistry, was suspected of magic, but a famous physician born in Kent, in 1574, who was very remarkable for his attachment to the alchemists. See Wood's Athen. Oxoniens. vol. i. p. 610, and his Hist. et Antiq. Acad. Oxoniens. lib. ii. p. 390; also P. Gassendi, Examen Philosoph. Fluddanæ, tom. iii. op.

[b] Boulay, Histor. Acad. Paris. tom. vi.

[c] Jo. Molleri Cimbria Literata, tom. i. p. 623.

[d] Cimb. Lit. tom. ii. p. 440.

[e] There is an accurate account of this controversy, with an enumeration of the writings published on both sides of the question, in the life of Owen Guntherus, inserted by Mollerus in his Cimbria Literata, tom. i. p. 225.—See also Jo. Herm. ab Elswich, de Fatis Aristotelis in Scholis Protestant. sect. xxvii., and a German work, by Gottfried Arnold, upon the affairs of the church and the progress of heresy, entitled, Kirchen und Ketzer Historie, p. 947.

the former, on account of the sagacity and learning, discovered in his explications of several portions of Scripture, and particularly of the books of Moses, and the latter, in consequence of his commentaries on the Epistles of St. Paul, and other learned labours of that kind, which are abundantly known. A second class of expositors, of the same communion, obtained also great applause in the learned world, by their successful application to the study of the Scriptures. In this class we may rank Matthias Flacius, who composed a Glossary and Key to the sacred Writings,[a] very useful in unfolding the meaning of the inspired penmen; John Bugenhagius, Justus Jonas, Andrew Osiander, and Martin Chemnitz, whose Harmonies of the Evangelists are not destitute of merit; and to these we may add Victor Strigelius and Joachim Camerarius; of whom the latter, in his Commentary on the New Testament, expounds the Scriptures in a grammatical and critical manner only, and, laying aside all debated points of doctrine and religious controversy, unfolds the sense of each term, and the spirit of each phrase, by the rules of criticism and the genius of the ancient languages, in which he was a very uncommon proficient.

XVI. All these expositors and commentators abandoned the method of the ancient interpreters, who, neglecting the plain and evident purport of the words of Scripture, were perpetually torturing their imaginations, in order to find out a mysterious sense in each word or sentence, or were hunting after insipid allusions and chimerical applications of particular passages to objects which never entered into the views of the inspired writers. On the contrary, their principal zeal and industry were employed in investigating the natural force and signification of each expression, in consequence of that golden rule of interpretation which Luther inculcated, '*that there is only one sense annexed to the words of Scripture throughout all the books of the Old and New Testament.*'[b] It must, however, be acknowledged, that the examples exhibited by these judicious expositors were far from being universally followed. Many, labouring under the inveterate disease of an irregular fancy and a scanty judgment, were still seeking hidden significations and double meanings in the expressions of holy writ. They were perpetually busied in twisting all the prophecies of the Old Testament into an intimate connexion with the life, sufferings, and transactions of Jesus Christ; and were over-sagacious in pretending to find out, in the history of the patriarchal and Jewish churches, the types and figures of the events that have happened in modern, and which may yet happen in future times. In all this they discovered more imagination than judgment, more wit than wisdom. Be that as it may, all the expositors of this age may, I think, be properly divided into two classes, with Luther at the head of the one, and Melancthon presiding in the other. Some commentators followed the example of the former, who, after a familiar explication of the sense of Scripture, applied its decisions to the settlement of controverted points, and to the illustration of the doctrines and duties of religion. Others discovered a greater propensity to the method of the latter, who first divided the discourses of the sacred writers into several parts, explained them according to the rules of rhetoric, and afterwards proceeded to a more strict and almost a literal exposition of each part, taken separately, applying the result, as rarely as was possible, to points of doctrine or matters of controversy.

XVII. Complete systems of theology were far from being numerous in this century. Melancthon, the most eminent of all the Lutheran doctors, collected and digested the doctrines of the church, which he so eminently adorned, into a body of divinity, under the vague title of *Loci Communes*, i. e. a Common-Place-Book of Theology. This compilation, which was at different times reviewed, corrected, and enlarged by its author, was in such high repute during this century, and even in succeeding times, that it was considered as a model of doctrine for all those, who either instructed the people by their public discourses, or promoted the knowledge of religion by their writings.[c] The title prefixed to this performance, indicates sufficiently the method, or rather the irregularity that reigns in the arrangement of its material; and shows, that it was not the design of Melancthon to place the various truths of religion in that systematic concatenation, and that scientific order and connexion, which are observed by the philosophers in their demonstrations and discourses, but to propose them with freedom and simplicity, as they presented themselves to his view. Accordingly, in the earlier editions of the book under consideration, the method observed, both in delineating and illustrating these important truths, is exceedingly plain, and not loaded with the terms, the definitions, or the distinctions that abound in the writings of the philosophers. Thus did the Lutheran doctors, in the first period of the rising church, renounce and avoid, in imitation of the great reformer whose name they bore, all the abstruse reasoning, and subtle discussions, of the scholastic disputants and writers. But the sophistry of their adversaries, and their perpetual debates with the artful champions of the church of Rome, engaged them by degrees, as has been already observed, to change their language and their methods of reasoning; so that, in process of time, the simplicity that had reigned in their theological systems, and in their manner of explaining the truths of religion, almost totally disappeared. Even Melancthon himself fell imperceptibly into the new method, or rather into the old method revived and enlarged the subsequent editions of his *Loci Communes*, by the addition of several philosophical illustrations, calculated to expose the fallacious reasonings of the Romish doctors. As yet, however, the discussions of philosophy were sparingly used, and the unintelligible jargon of the schoolmen was kept at a certain distance, and seldom borrowed. But when the founders of the Lutheran church were removed by death, and the Jesuits attacked the principles of the Reformation with redoubled animosity, armed with the intricate and perplexing dialect of the schools, the scene was changed, and theology assumed another aspect. The stratagem employed by the Jesuits corrupted our doctors, induced them to revive that intricate and abstruse manner of defending and illustrating religious truth, which Luther and his associates had rejected, and to introduce, into the plain and artless paths of theology, all the thorns and thistles, all the dark and devious labyrinths of the scholastic philosophy. This unhappy change was deeply lamented by several divines of

[a] The Latin titles are *Glossa Scripturæ Sacræ*, and *Clavis Scripturæ Sacræ*.

[b] This golden rule will be found often defective and false, unless several prophetical, parabolical, and figurative expressions be excepted in its application.

[c] See Jo. Franc. Buddeus, Isagoge ad Theolo. lib. ii. c. i. § xiii. t. i. p. 381.

eminent piety and learning about the commencement of the seventeenth century, who regretted the loss of that amiable simplicity which is the attendant on divine truth; but they could not prevail upon the professors, in the different universities, to sacrifice the jargon of the schools to the dictates of common sense, or to return to the plain, serious, and unaffected method of teaching theology, that had been introduced by Luther. These obstinate doctors pleaded necessity in behalf of their scholastic divinity, and looked upon this pretended necessity as superior to all authorities, and all examples, however respectable.

XVIII. Those who are sensible of the intimate connexion between faith and practice, between the truths and duties of religion, will easily perceive the necessity that existed for a reformation of the corrupt morality, as well as of the superstitious doctrines, of the church of Rome. It is therefore natural, that the same persons, who had spirit enough to do the one, should think themselves obliged to attempt the other. This they accordingly attempted, and not without a certain degree of success; for it may be affirmed with truth, that more genuine piety and more excellent rules of conduct are observable in the few practical productions of Luther, Melancthon, Weller, and Rivius, than are to be found in the innumerable volumes of all the ancient Casuists and Moralisers,[a] as they are called in the barbarous language of those remote periods. It is not, however, meant even to insinuate, that the notions of these great men concerning the important science of morality were either sufficiently accurate or extensive. It appears, on the contrary, from various debates which were carried on during this century, concerning the duties and obligations of Christians, and from the answers that were given by famous casuists to persons perplexed with religious scruples, that the true *principles* of morality were not yet fixed with perspicuity and precision, the agreement or difference between the laws of nature and the precepts of Christianity not sufficiently examined and determined, nor the proper distinctions made between those parts of the gospel dispensation, which are agreeable to right reason, and such as are beyond its reach and comprehension. Had not the number of adversaries, with whom the Lutheran doctors were obliged to contend, given them perpetual employment in the field of controversy, and robbed them of that precious leisure which they might have consecrated to the advancement of real piety and virtue, they would certainly have been free from the defects now mentioned, and would, perhaps, have equalled the best moral writers of modern times. This consideration will also diminish our wonder at a circumstance, which otherwise might seem surprising, that none of the famous Lutheran doctors attempted to give a regular system of morality. Melancthon himself, whose exquisite judgment rendered him peculiarly capable of reducing into a compendious system the elements of every science, never seems to have thought of treating morals in this manner; but has inserted, on the contrary, all his practical rules and instructions under the theological articles that relate to the law, sin, free-will, faith, hope, and charity.

XIX. All the divines of this century were educated in the school of controversy, and so trained up to spiritual war, that an eminent theologian, and a bold and vehement disputant, were considered as synonymous terms. It could scarcely, indeed, be otherwise, in an age when foreign quarrels and intestine divisions of a religious nature threw all the countries of Europe into a state of agitation, and obliged the doctors of the contending churches to be perpetually in action, or at least in a posture of defence. These champions of the Reformation were not, however, all animated with the same spirit, nor did they attack and defend with the same arms. Such of them as were contemporary with Luther, or lived near his time, were remarkable for the simplicity of their reasoning, and attacked their adversaries with no other arguments than those which they drew from the declarations of the inspired writers, and the decisions of the ancient fathers. In the latter part of the century this method was considerably changed; and we see those doctors, who were its chief ornaments, reinforcing their cause with the succours of the Aristotelian philosophy, and thus losing, in point of perspicuity and evidence, what they gained in point of subtilty and imagined science. It is true, as has been already observed more than once, that they were too naturally, though inconsiderately, led to adopt this method of disputing by the example of their adversaries the Roman catholics. The latter, having learned, by a disagreeable and discouraging experience, that their cause was unable to support that plain and perspicuous method of reasoning, which is the proper test of religious and moral truth, had recourse to stratagem, when evidence failed, and involved both their arguments and their opinions in the dark and intricate mazes of the scholastic philosophy; and it was this that engaged the protestant doctors to change their weapons, and to employ methods of defence unworthy of the glorious cause in which they had embarked.

The spirit of zeal, that animated the Lutheran divines, was, in general, very far from being tempered by a spirit of charity. If we except Melancthon, in whom a predominant mildness and sweetness of natural temper triumphed over the contagious ferocity of the times, all the disputants of this century discovered too much bitterness and animosity in their transactions and in their writings. Luther himself appears at the head of this sanguine tribe, whom he far surpassed in invectives and abuse, treating his adversaries with the most brutal asperity, and sparing neither rank nor condition, however elevated or respectable they might be. It must indeed be confessed, that the criminal nature of this vehemence will be much alleviated, when it is considered in one point of view with the genius of those barbarous times, and the odious cruelty and injustice of the virulent enemies, whom the oppressed reformers were called to encounter. When the impartial inquirer considers the abominable calumnies that were lavished on the authors and instruments of the Reformation; when he reflects upon the horrors of fire and sword employed, by bigoted and blood-thirsty tyrants, to extirpate those good men whom they wanted arguments to convince; will not his heart burn with a generous indignation? and will he not think it in some measure just, that such horrid proceedings should be represented in their proper colours, and be stigmatised by such expressions as are suited to their demerit?

XX. In order to form a just idea of the internal state

☞ [a] The moral writers of this century were called *Moralisantes*, a barbarous term, to which the English word *Moralisers* bears some resemblance.

of the Lutheran Church, and of the revolutions and changes which have happened in it, with their true springs and real causes, it is necessary to consider the history of that church under three periods. The first extends from the commencement of the Reformation to the death of Luther, which happened in 1546: the second takes in the time which elapsed between the death of Luther and that of Melancthon, and consequently terminates in 1560; and the remainder of the century is comprehended in the third period.

THE FIRST PERIOD.

DURING this period, all things were transacted in the Lutheran church in a manner conformable to the sentiments, counsels, and orders of Luther. This eminent reformer, whose undaunted resolution, and amazing credit and authority, rendered him equal to the most arduous attempts, easily suppressed the commotions and dissensions which arose from time to time in the church, and did not suffer the sects, that several had attempted to form in its bosom, to gather strength, or to arrive at any considerable degree of consistence and maturity. The natural consequence of this was, that, during the life of that great man, the internal state of the Lutheran church was a state of tolerable tranquillity and repose; and all such as attempted to foment divisions, or to introduce any essential changes, were either speedily reduced to silence, or obliged to retire from the new community.

XXI. The infancy of this church was troubled by an impetuous rabble of wrong-headed fanatics, who introduced the utmost confusion wherever they endeavoured to diffuse their pestilential errors, and who pretended that they had received a divine inspiration, authorizing them to erect a new kingdom of Christ, in which sin and corruption were to have no place. The leaders of this turbulent and riotous sect were Munzer, Storck, Stubner, and others, either Swiss or Germans, who kindled the flame of discord and rebellion in several parts of Europe, but chiefly in Germany, and excited among the ignorant multitude tumults and commotions, which, though less violent in some places than in others, were, nevertheless, formidable wherever they appeared.[a] The history of this seditious band is full of obscurity and confusion. A regular, full, and accurate account of it, neither has been, nor could well be, committed to writing; since, on one hand, the opinions and actions of these fanatics were a motley chaos of inconsistencies and contradictions, and, on the other, the age, in which they lived, produced few writers who had either the leisure or the capacity to observe with diligence, or to relate with accuracy, commotions and tumults of this extraordinary kind. It is however certain, that, from the most profligate and abandoned part of this enthusiastical multitude, those seditious armies were formed, which kindled in Germany the war of the peasants, and afterwards seized the city of Munster, involving the whole province of Westphalia in the most dreadful calamities. It is also well known, that the better part of this motley tribe, terrified by the unhappy and deserved fate of their unworthy associates, whom they saw massacred with the most unrelenting severity, saved themselves from the ruin of their sect, and, at length, embraced the communion of those who are called Mennonites.[b] The zeal, vigilance, and resolution of Luther, happily prevented the divisions, which the odious disciples of Munzer attempted to excite in the church he had founded, and preserved the giddy and credulous multitude from their seductions; and it may be safely affirmed, that, had it not been for the vigour and fortitude of this active and undaunted reformer, the Lutheran church would, in its infancy, have fallen a miserable prey to the enthusiastic fury of these detestable fanatics.[c]

XXII. Fanatics and enthusiasts of the kind now described, while they met with the warmest opposition from Luther, found, on the contrary, in his colleague Carlostadt, such a credulous attention to their seductions, as naturally flattered them with the hopes of his patronage and favour. This divine, who was a native of Franconia, was not destitute of learning or of merit; but imprudence and precipitation were the distinguished lines of his warm and violent character. Of these he gave the most evident marks, in 1523, when, during the absence of Luther, he excited no small tumult at Wittenberg, by ordering the images to be taken out of the churches, and by other enterprises of a rash and dangerous nature.[d] This tumult was appeased by the sudden return of Luther, whose presence and exhortations calmed the troubled spirits of the people; and here we must look for the origin of the rupture between him and Carlostadt; for the latter immediately retired from Wittenberg to Orlamund, where he not only opposed the sentiments of Luther concerning the eucharist,[e] but also

[a] John Baptist Ottius, in his Annales Anabaptist. has collected a considerable number of facts relating to these fanatical commotions, which are likewise mentioned by all the writers of the history of the Reformation.

☞ [b] The tumults of the anabaptists in Germany have already been mentioned in a cursory manner, sect. i. chap. ii. sect. xxii. For an ample account of the origin, doctrine, and progress of the Mennonites, see the third chapter of the second part of this third section, cent. xvi.

☞ [c] The danger that threatened the Lutheran church in these tumults of the German anabaptists, was so much the greater on account of the inclination which Munzer and Storck discovered at first for the sentiments of Luther, and the favourable disposition which Carlostadt seemed for some time to entertain with respect to these fanatics.

☞ [d] The reader may perhaps imagine, from Dr. Mosheim's account of this matter, that Carlostadt introduced these changes merely by his own authority; but this was far from being the case; the suppression of private masses, the removal of images out of the churches, the abolition of the law which imposed celibacy upon the clergy, which are the changes hinted at by our historian as rash and perilous, were effected by Carlostadt, in conjunction with Bugenhagius, Melancthon, Jonas Amsdorff, and others, and were confirmed by the authority of the elector of Saxony; so that there is some reason to apprehend that one of the principal causes of Luther's displeasure at these changes, was their being introduced in his absence; unless we suppose that he had not so far shaken off the fetters of superstition, as to be sensible of the absurdity and the pernicious consequences of the use of images, &c. As to the abolition of the law that imposed celibacy on the clergy, it is well known that it was the object of his warmest approbation. This appears from the following expressions in his letter to Amsdorff: "Carlostadii nuptiæ mire placent: novi puellam: comfortet eum Dominus in bonum exemplum inhibendæ et minuendæ papisticæ libidinis." He soon afterwards confirmed this approbation by his own example.

☞ [e] This difference of opinion between Carlostadt and Luther concerning the eucharist, was the true cause of the violent rupture between those two eminent men, and it tended very little to the honour of the latter; for, however the explication, which the former gave of the words of the institution of the Lord's Supper, may appear forced, yet the sentiments he entertained of that ordinance as a commemoration of Christ's death, and not as a celebration of his bodily presence, in consequence of a consubstantiation with the bread and wine, are infinitely more rational than the doctrine of Luther, which is loaded with some of the most palpable absurdities of transubstantiation; and if it be supposed that Carlostadt strained the rule of interpretation too far, when he alleged, that Christ pronounced the pronoun *this*, (in the words *This is my body*) pointing to his body, and not to the bread, what shall we think of Luther's explaining the nonsensical doctrine of consubstantiation by the similitude of a red-hot iron, in which two elements are united, as the body of Christ is with the bread in the eucharist?

betrayed, in several instances, a fanatical turn of mind.[a] He was therefore commanded to leave the territories of the elector of Saxony, which he did accordingly, and repaired to Switzerland, where he propagated his doctrines, and taught with success, first at Zurich, and afterwards at Basil, retaining however, as long as he lived, a favourable disposition toward the sects of the Anabaptists, and, in general, to all enthusiastic teachers, who pretended to a divine inspiration.[b] Thus then did Luther, in a short time, allay this new storm which the precipitation of Carlostadt had raised in the church.

XXIII. The reforming spirit of Carlostadt, with respect to the doctrine of Christ's presence in the eucharist, was not extinguished, by his exile, in the Lutheran church. It was revived, on the contrary, by a man nearly of the same turn of mind, a Silesian knight, and counsellor to the duke of Lignitz, whose name was Caspar Schwenckfeld. This nobleman, seconded by Valentine Crautwald, a man of eminent learning, who lived at the court of the prince now mentioned, took notice of many things, which he deemed erroneous and defective, in the opinions and rites established by Luther; and, had not the latter been extremely vigilant, as well as vigorously supported by his friends and adherents, would have undoubtedly brought about a considerable schism in the church. Every circumstance, in Schwenckfeld's conduct and appearance, was adapted to give him credit and influence. His morals were pure, and his life, in all respects, exemplary. His exhortations in favour of true and solid piety were warm and persuasive, and his principal zeal was employed in promoting it among the people. He thus acquired the esteem and friendship of many learned and pious men, both in the Lutheran and Helvetic churches, who favoured his sentiments, and undertook to defend him against all his adversaries.[c] Notwithstanding all this, he was banished by his sovereign both from the court and from his country, in 1528, only because Zuingle had approved his opinions concerning the eucharist, and declared that they did not differ essentially from his own. From that time the persecuted knight wandered from place to place, under various turns of fortune, until death, in 1561, put an end to his trials.[d] He had founded, in Silesia, a small congregation, the members of which were persecuted and ejected by the popish possessors of that country; but they were restored to their former habitations and privileges, civil and religious, by that prince who began, in 1740, to reign over Prussia.[e]

XXIV. The upright intentions of Schwenckfeld, and his zeal for the advancement of true piety, deserve, no doubt, the highest commendation; but the same thing cannot be said of his prudence and judgment. The good man had a natural propensity toward fanaticism, and fondly imagained that he had received a divine commission to propagate his opinions. He differed from Luther, and the other friends of the reformation, in three points, which it is proper to select from others of less consequence. The first of these points related to the doctrine concerning the eucharist. Schwenckfeld inverted the words of Christ, 'This is my body,' and insisted on their being thus understood: "*My body is this*, i. e. such as this bread which is broken and consumed; a true and real food, which nourishes, satisfies, and delights the soul. *My blood is this*, that is, such in its effects as the wine, which strengthens and refreshes the heart." The poor man imagined that this *wonderful* doctrine had been revealed to him from heaven; which circumstance alone is a sufficient demonstration of his folly.

The second point in which he differed from Luther, was in his hypothesis relating to the efficacy of the divine word. He denied, for example, that the external word, which is committed to writing in the Scriptures, was endowed with the power of healing, illuminating, and renewing the mind; and he ascribed this power to the internal word, which, according to his notion, was Christ himself. His discourses, however, concerning this internal word, were, as usually happens to persons of his turn, so full of confusion, obscurity, and contradiction, that it was difficult to find out what his doctrine really was, and whether it resembled that of the Mystics and Quakers, or was borrowed from a different source.

His doctrine concerning the human nature of Christ, formed the third subject of debate between him and the Lutherans. He would not allow Christ's human nature, in its exalted state, to be called a *creature*, or a created substance, as such denomination appeared to him infinitely below its majestic dignity, united as it is, in that glorious state, with the divine essence. This notion of Schwenckfeld bears a remarkable affinity to the doctrine

☞ [a] This censure is with too much truth applicable to Carlostadt. Though he did not adopt the impious and abominable doctrines of Munzer and his band, (as Dr. Mosheim permits the uninstructed reader to imagine by mentioning him, as being a friend to these fanatics *in general*,) yet he certainly was chargeable with some extravagances that were observable in the tenets of that wrong-headed tribe. He was for abolishing the civil law, with the municipal laws and constitutions of the German empire, and proposed substituting the law of Moses in their place. He distinguished himself by railing at the universities, declaiming against human learning, and other follies.

"Great wits to madness nearly are allied."

See Val. Ern. Loscheri Historia Motuum inter Lutheranos et Reformat. par. i. cap. i.—Dan. Gerdes, Vita Carolostadii, in Miscell. Groningens. novis.

☞ [b] This affirmation of Dr. Mosheim wants much to be modified. In the original it stands thus: "Dum vixit vero anabaptistarum hominumque divina visa jactantium partibus amicum sese ostendit,"—i. e. as long as he lived, he showed himself a friend to the anabaptists, and other enthusiasts who pretended to divine inspiration. But how could our historian assert this without restriction, since it is well known that Carlostadt, after his banishment from Saxony, composed a treatise against enthusiasm in general, and against the extravagant tenets and the violent proceedings of the anabaptists in particular? This treatise was even addressed to Luther, who was so affected by it, that, repenting of his unworthy treatment of Carlostadt, he pleaded his cause, and obtained from the elector a permission for him to return into Saxony. See Gerdes, Vita Carolostadii. After this reconciliation with Luther, he composed a treatise on the eucharist, which breathes the most amiable spirit of moderation and humility; and, having perused the writings of Zuingle, where he saw his own sentiments on that subject maintained with the greatest perspicuity and force of evidence, he repaired a second time to Zurich, and thence to Basil, where he was admitted to the offices of pastor and professor of divinity, and where, after having lived in the exemplary and constant practice of every Christian virtue, he died, amidst the warmest effusions of piety and resignation, on the 25th of December, 1541. All this is testified solemnly in a letter of the learned and pious Grynæus of Basil, toPitiscus, chaplain to the Elector Palatine, and shows how little credit ought to be given to the assertions of the ignorant Moreri, or to the insinuations of the insidious Bossuet.

[c] See Jo. Conr. Fueslini Centuria I. Epistolar. à Reformatoribus Helveticis scriptar. p. 169, 175, 225. Museum Helvetic. tom. iv. p. 445.

[d] Jo. Wigandi Schwenckfeldianismus.—Conr. Schlusselburgi Catalog. Hæreticor. lib. x.—The most accurate accounts of this nobleman have been given by Chr. Aug. Salig, in his Histor. August. Confessionis tom. iii. lib. xi. and by Gottfried Arnold, in his Kirchen und Ketzer Historie, p. 720, both of which authors have pleaded the cause of Schwenckfeld.

[e] See an account of Schwenckfeld's Confession of Faith, in Kocher's Bibliotheca Theologiæ Symbolicæ, p. 457.

of Eutyches, which, however, he professed to reject; and, in his turn, he accused those of Nestorianism, who gave the denomination of a creature to the human nature of Christ.

XXV. An intemperate zeal, by straining certain truths too far turns them into falsehood, or, at least, often renders them the occasion of the most pernicious abuses. A striking instance of this happened during the ministry of Luther. While he was insisting upon the necessity of imprinting deeply in the minds of the people that doctrine of the Gospel, which represents Christ's merits as the source of man's salvation, and while he was eagerly employed in censuring and refuting the popish doctors, who mixed the law and the Gospel together, and represented eternal happiness as the fruit of legal obedience, a fanatic arose, who abused his doctrine, by over-straining it, and thus opened a field for the most dangerous errors. This new teacher was John Agricola, a native of Eisleben, and an eminent doctor of the Lutheran church, though chargeable with vanity, presumption, and artifice. He first began to make a noise in 1538, when, from the doctrine of Luther now mentioned, he took occasion to declaim against the law, maintaining, that it was neither fit to be proposed to the people as a rule of manners, nor to be used in the church as a mean of instruction; and that the Gospel alone was to be inculcated and explained, both in the churches and in the schools of learning. The followers of Agricola were called *Antinomians*, i. e. enemies of the law. But the fortitude, vigilance, and credit of Luther, suppressed this sect in its very infancy; and Agricola, intimidated by the opposition of such a respectable adversary, acknowledged and renounced his pernicious system. But this recantation does not seem to have been sincere, since it is said, that when his fears were dispelled by the death of Luther, he returned to his errors, and gained proselytes to his extravagant doctrine.[a]

XXVI. The tenets of the Antinomians, if their adversaries are to be believed, were of the most noxious nature and tendency; for they are supposed to have taught the most dissolute doctrine in point of morals, and to have maintained that it was allowable to follow the impulse of every passion, and to transgress without reluctance the divine law, provided that the transgressor took hold of Christ, and embraced his merits by a lively faith. Such, at least, is the representation that is generally given of their doctrine; but it ought not to be received with implicit credulity; for whoever looks into this matter with attention and impartiality, will soon be persuaded, that such an absurd and impious doctrine is unjustly laid to the charge of Agricola, and that the principal fault of this presumptuous man lay in some harsh and inaccurate expressions, which were susceptible of dangerous and pernicious interpretations. By the term *law*, he understood the ten Commandments, promulgated under the Mosaic dispensation; and he considered this law as enacted for the Jews, and not for Christians. He, at the same time, explained the term *Gospel* (which he considered as substituted for the law) in its true and extensive sense, as comprehending not only the doctrine of the merits of Christ rendered salutary by faith, but also the sublime precepts of holiness and virtue, delivered by the divine Saviour, as rules of obedience. If, therefore, we follow the intention of Agricola, without interpreting, in a rigorous manner, the uncouth phrases and improper expressions which he so frequently and so injudiciously employed, his doctrine will plainly amount to this: "That the ten Commandments, published during the ministry of Moses, were chiefly designed for the Jews, and on that account might be lawfully neglected and laid aside by Christians: and that it was sufficient to explain with perspicuity, and to enforce with zeal, what Christ and his apostles had taught in the New Testament, both with respect to the means of grace and salvation, and the obligations of repentance and virtue." The greatest part of the doctors of this century are chargeable with a want of precision and consistency in expressing their ideas: hence their real sentiments have been misunderstood, and opinions have been imputed to them which they never entertained.

THE SECOND PERIOD.

XXVII. AFTER the death of Luther, which happened in the year 1546, Philip Melancthon was placed at the head of the Lutheran doctors. The merit, genius, and talents of this new chief were, undoubtedly, great and illustrious, though it must, at the same time, be confessed, that he was inferior to Luther in many respects,[b] and more especially in courage, firmness, and personal authority. His natural temper was soft and flexible; his love of peace almost excessive, and his apprehensions of the displeasure and resentment of men in power were such as betrayed a pusillanimous spirit. He was ambitious of the esteem and friendship of all with whom he had any intercourse, and was absolutely incapable of employing the force of threatenings, or the restraints of fear, to suppress the efforts of religious faction, to keep within due bounds the irregular love of novelty and change, and to secure to the church the obedience of its members. It is also to be observed, that his sentiments, on some points of moment, differed considerably from those of Luther; and it may not be improper to point out the principal subjects on which they adopted different ways of thinking.

In the first place, Melancthon was of opinion, that, for the sake of peace and concord, many things might be connived at and tolerated in the church of Rome, which Luther considered as absolutely insupportable. The former carried so far the spirit of toleration and indulgence, as to discover no reluctance against retaining the ancient form of ecclesiastical government, and submitting to the dominion of the Roman pontiff, on certain conditions, and in such a manner, as might be without prejudice to the obligation and authority of all those truths which are clearly revealed in the holy scriptures.

A second occasion of a diversity of sentiment, between these great men, was furnished by the tenets which Luther maintained in opposition to the doctrines of the church of Rome. Such were his ideas concerning faith, as the *only* cause of salvation, concerning the necessity of good works to our final happiness, and man's natural incapacity

[a] See Caspar Sagittarius, Introd. ad Histor. Ecclesiast. tom. i. p. 838.—Bayle's Dictionarie, tom. ii. at the article Islebius.—Conr. Schlusselburg, Catalog. Hær. lib. iv.—G. Arnold, Kirchen und Ketzer Hist. p. 813.

☞ [b] It would certainly be very difficult to point out the *many respects* in which Dr. Mosheim affirms that Luther was superior to Melancthon; for, if the single article of courage and firmness of mind be excepted, I know no other respect in which Melancthon is not superior, or at least equal, to Luther. He was certainly his equal in piety and virtue, and much his superior in learning, judgment, meekness, and humanity.

of promoting his own conversion. In avoiding the corrupt notions which were embraced by the Roman-catholic doctors on these important points of theology, Luther seemed, in the judgment of Melancthon, to lean too much toward the opposite extreme.[a] Hence the latter was inclined to think, that the sentiments and expressions of his colleague required to be in some degree mitigated, lest they should give a handle to dangerous abuses, and be perverted to the propagation of pernicious errors.

It may be observed, thirdly, that though Melancthon adopted the sentiments of Luther in relation to the eucharist,[b] yet he did not consider the controversy with the divines of Switzerland on that subject, as a matter of sufficient moment to occasion a breach of church communion and fraternal concord between the contending parties. He thought that this happy concord might be easily preserved by expressing the doctrine of the eucharist, and Christ's presence in that ordinance, in general and ambiguous terms, which the two churches might explain according to their respective systems.

Such were the sentiments of Melancthon, which, though they were not entirely concealed during the life of Luther, he delivered, nevertheless, with great circumspection and modesty, yielding always to the authority of his colleague, for whom he had a sincere friendship, and of whom also he stood in awe. But no sooner were the eyes of Luther closed, than he inculcated, with the greatest plainness and freedom, what he had before only hinted with timidity and caution. The eminent rank which he held among the Lutheran doctors rendered this bold manner of proceeding extremely disagreeable to many. His doctrine accordingly was censured and opposed; and thus the church was deprived of the tranquillity which it had enjoyed under Luther, and exhibited an unhappy scene of animosity, contention, and discord.

XXVIII. The rise of these unhappy divisions must be dated from the year 1548, when Charles V. attempted to impose upon the Germans the famous edict, called the *Interim*. Maurice, the new elector of Saxony, desirous of knowing how far such an edict ought to be respected in his dominions, assembled the doctors of Wittenberg and Leipsic in the last-mentioned city, and proposed this nice and critical subject to their serious examination. Upon this occasion Melancthon, complying with the suggestions of that lenity and moderation which were the great and leading principles in the whole course of his conduct and actions, declared it as his opinion, that, in matters of an indifferent nature, compliance was due to the imperial edicts.[c] But, in the class of matters indifferent, this great man and his associates placed many things which had appeared of the highest importance to Luther, and consequently could not be considered as indifferent by his true disciples;[d] for he regarded, as such, the doctrine of justification by faith alone, the necessity of good works to eternal salvation, the number of the sacraments, the jurisdiction claimed by the pope and the bishops, extreme unction, the observance of certain religious festivals, and several superstitious rites and ceremonies. Hence arose that warm contest[e] which divided the church during many years, and proved highly detrimental to the progress of the Reformation. The defenders of the primitive doctrines of Lutheranism, with Flacius at their head, attacked with incredible bitterness and fury the doctors of Wittenberg and Leipsic, (particularly Melancthon, by whose counsel and influence every thing relating to the *Interim* had been conducted,) and accused them of apostacy from the true religion. Melancthon, on the other hand, seconded by the zeal of his friends and disciples, justified his conduct with the utmost spirit and vigour.[f] In this unfortunate debate the two following questions were principally discussed: first, whether the points that seemed indifferent to Melancthon were so in reality?—this his adversaries obstinately denied:[g]—secondly, whether in things of an indifferent nature, and in which the interests of religion are not essentially concerned, it be lawful to yield to the enemies of the truth?

XXIX. This debate became, as might have been expected, a fruitful source of other controversies, which were equally detrimental to the tranquillity of the church, and to the cause of the Reformation. The first to which it gave rise was the warm dispute concerning the necessity of good works, that was carried on with such spirit against the rigid Lutherans, by George Major, an eminent teacher of theology at Wittenberg. Melancthon had long been of opinion, that the necessity of good works, in order to the attainment of everlasting salvation, might be asserted and taught, as conformable to the truths revealed in the Gospel; and both he and his colleagues declared this to be their opinion, when they were assembled at Leipsic, in 1548, to examine the famous edict already

---

☞ [a] It is certain, that Luther carried the doctrine of Justification by Faith to such an excessive length, as seemed, though perhaps contrary to his intention, to derogate not only from the necessity of good works, but even from their obligation and importance. He would not allow them to be considered either as the *conditions* or *means* of salvation, or even as a preparation for receiving it.

☞ [b] It is somewhat surprising to hear Dr. Mosheim affirming that Melancthon adopted the sentiments of his friend with regard to the eucharist, when the contrary is well known. It is true, that in his writings, published before the year 1529 or 1530, there are passages, which show that he had not yet thoroughly examined the controversy relating to the nature of Christ's presence in the eucharist. It is also true, that during the disputes carried on between Westphal and Calvin, after the death of Luther, concerning the *real presence*, he did not declare himself in an open manner for either side, (which however is a presumptive argument of his leaning to that of Calvin,) but expressed his sorrow at these divisions, and at the spirit of animosity by which they were inflamed. But whoever will be at the pains to read his letters to Calvin upon this subject, or those extracts of them which are collected by Hospinian, in the second volume of his Historia Sacramentaria, will be persuaded that he looked upon the doctrine of Consubstantiation not only as erroneous, but even as idolatrous; and that nothing but the fear of inflaming the present divisions, and of not being seconded, prevented him from declaring his sentiments openly. See Bayle's Life of Melancthon, in his Dictionary.

[c] The piece in which Melancthon and his associates delivered their sentiments relating to things indifferent, is commonly called in the German language *Das Leipziger Interim*, and was republished at Leipsic in 1721, by Bieckius, in a work entitled, Das Dreyfache Interim.

☞ [d] If they only are the true disciples of Luther, who submit to his judgment, and adopt his sentiments in theological matters, many doctors of that communion, and our historian among the rest, must certainly be supposed to have forfeited that title, as will abundantly appear hereafter. Be that as it may, Melancthon can scarcely, if at all, be justified in placing in the class of things indifferent the doctrines relating to faith and good works, which are the fundamental points of the Christian religion, and, if I may use such an expression, the very *hinges* on which the Gospel turns.

☞ [e] This controversy was called *Adiaphoristic*, and Melancthon and his followers *Adiaphorists*, from the Greek word ἀδιάφορος, which signifies *indifferent*.

[f] Schlusselburg's Catalog. Hæreticor. lib. xiii.—Arnold's Kirchen und Ketzer Historie, lib. xvi. cap. xxvi. p. 816.—Salig's Histor. Aug. Confess. vol. i. p. 611.—The German work, entitled Unschuldige Nachrichten, An. 1702.—Luc. Osiandri Epitome Histor. Eccles. Centur. XVI. p. 502.

☞ [g] See above, note [d]

mentioned.[a] This declaration was severely censured by the rigid disciples of Luther, as contrary to the doctrine and sentiments of their chief, and as conformable both to the tenets and interests of the church of Rome; but it found an able defender in Major, who, in 1552, maintained the necessity of good works, against the extravagant assertions of Amsdorf. Hence arose a new controversy between the rigid and moderate Lutherans, which was carried on with the keenness and animosity that were peculiar to all debates of a religious nature during this century. In the course of this warm debate, Amsdorf was so far transported and infatuated by his excessive zeal for the doctrine of Luther, as to maintain, that good works were an impediment to salvation; from which imprudent and odious expression, the flame of controversy received new fuel, and broke forth with redoubled fury. On the other hand, Major complained of the malice or ignorance of his adversaries, who explained his doctrine in a manner quite different from that in which he intended it should be understood; and, at length, he renounced it entirely, that he might not appear fond of wrangling, or be looked upon as a disturber of the peace of the church. This step did not, however, put an end to the debate, which was still carried on, until it was terminated at last by the *Form of Concord*.[b]

XXX. From the same source that produced the dispute concerning the necessity of good works, arose the *synergistical* controversy. The Synergists,[c] whose doctrine was almost the same with that of the Semi-Pelagians, denied that God was the *only* agent in the conversion of sinful man; and affirmed, that man *co-operated* with divine grace in the accomplishment of this salutary purpose. Here also Melancthon renounced the doctrine of Luther; at least, the terms he employs in expressing his sentiments concerning this intricate subject, are such as Luther would have rejected with horror; for, in the conference at Leipsic, the former of these great men did not scruple to affirm, that "God drew to himself and converted adult persons in such a manner, that the powerful impression of his grace was accompanied with a certain correspondent action of their will." The friends and disciples of Melancthon adopted this manner of speaking, and used the expressions of their master to describe the nature of the divine agency in man's conversion. But this representation of the matter was far from being agreeable to the rigid Lutherans. They looked upon it as subversive of the true and genuine doctrine of Luther, relating to the absolute servitude of the human will,[d] and the total inability of man to do any good action, or to bear any part in his own conversion; and hence they oppose the Synergists with the utmost animosity and bitterness. The principal champions in this theological conflict were Strigelius, who defended the sentiments of Melancthon with singular dexterity and perspicuity, and Flacius, who maintained the ancient doctrine of Luther: of these doctors, as also the subject of their debate, a farther account will soon be given.[e]

XXXI. During these dissensions, a new university was founded at Jena by the dukes of Saxe-Weimar, the sons of the famous John Frederic, whose unsuccessful wars with the emperor Charles V. had involved him in so many calamities, and deprived him of his electoral dominions. The noble founders of this university, having designed it for the bulwark of the protestant religion, as it was taught and inculcated by Luther, were particularly careful in choosing such professors and divines as were remarkable for their attachment to the genuine doctrine of that great reformer, and their aversion to the sentiments of those moderate Lutherans, who had attempted, by certain modifications and corrections, to render it less harsh and disgusting; and, as none of the Lutheran doctors were so much distinguished by their uncharitable and intemperate zeal for this ancient doctrine, as Matthias Flacius, the virulent enemy of Melancthon and all the Philippists, he was appointed, in 1557, professor of divinity at Jena. The consequences of this nomination were, indeed, deplorable. This turbulent and impetuous man, whom nature had formed with an uncommon propensity to foment divisions and propagate discord, not only revived all the ancient controversies that had distracted the church, but also excited new debates; and sowed, with such avidity and success, the seeds of contention between the divines of Weimar and those of the electorate of Saxony, that a fatal schism in the Lutheran church was apprehended by many of its wisest members.[f] And indeed this schism would have been inevitable, if the machinations and intrigues of Flacius had produced the desired effect; for, in 1559, he persuaded the dukes of Saxe-Weimar to order a refutation of the errors that had crept into the Lutheran church, and particularly of those which were imputed to the followers of Melancthon, to be drawn up with care, promulgated by authority, and placed among the other religious edicts and articles of faith that were in force in their dominions. But this pernicious design of dividing the church proved abortive; for the other Lutheran princes, who acted from the true and genuine principles of the Reformation, disapproved this seditious book, from a just apprehension of its tendency to increase the present troubles, and to augment, instead of diminishing, the calamities of the church.[g]

XXXII. This theological incendiary kindled the flame of discord and persecution even in the church of Saxe-Weimar, and in the university of Jena, to which he belonged, by venting his fury against Strigelius,[h] the friend and disciple of Melancthon. This moderate divine adopted, in many things, the sentiments of his master, and maintained, particularly, in his public lectures, that the human will, when under the influence of the divine grace leading it to repentance, was not totally inactive, but bore a certain part in the salutary work of its conversion.

---

[a] The *Interim* of Charles V.

[b] Schlusselburg, lib. vii. Catal. Hæreticor.—G. Arnold's Kirchen Hist. lib. xvi. cap. xxvii. p. 822.—Jo. Musæi Prælect. in Form. Concord. p. 181.—Arn. Grevii Memoria Jo. Westphali, p. 166.

☞ [c] As this controversy turned upon the *co-operation* of the human will with the divine grace, the persons who maintained this joint agency, were called *Synergists*, from a Greek word (συνεργεια,) which signifies *co-operation*.

☞ [d] The doctrines of absolute predestination, irresistible grace, and human impotence, were never carried to a more excessive length, or maintained with a more virulent obstinacy, by any divine, than they were by Luther. But in these times he has very few followers in this respect, even among those who bear his name.

[e] See Schlusselburg's Catal. Hæreticor. lib. v.—G. Arnold, Histor. Eccles. lib. xvi. cap. xxviii. p. 826.—Bayle's Dict.—Salig's Histor. August. Confess. vol. iii.—Musæi Prælect.

[f] See the remarkable letter of Augustus, elector of Saxony, concerning Flacius and his malignant attempts; published by Arn. Grevius in his Memoria Joh. Westphali.

[g] Salig's Hist. Aug. Confess. vol. iii. p. 476. [h] See Bayle's Dict.

In consequence of this doctrine, he was accused by Flacius of Synergism at the court of Saxe-Weimar; and, by the duke's order, was cast into prison, where he was treated with severity and rigour. He was at length delivered from this confinement in 1562, and allowed to resume his former vocation, after he had made a declaration of his real sentiments, which, as he alleged, had been greatly misrepresented. This declaration, however, did not either decide or terminate the controversy, since Strigelius seemed rather to conceal his erroneous sentiments[a] under ambiguous expressions, than to renounce them entirely; and indeed he was so conscious of this himself, that, to avoid being involved in new calamities and persecutions, he retired from Jena to Leipsic, and thence to Heidelberg, where he spent the remainder of his days; and appeared so unsettled in his religious opinions, that it is doubtful whether he ought to be placed among the followers of Luther or Calvin.

XXXIII. The issue of this warm controversy, which Flacius had kindled with such an intemperate zeal, proved highly detrimental to his own reputation and influence in particular, as well as to the interests of the Lutheran church in general; for, while this vehement disputant was assailing his adversary with an inconsiderate ardour, he exaggerated so excessively the sentiments, which he looked upon as orthodox, as to maintain an opinion of the most monstrous and detestable kind; an opinion which made him appear, even in the judgment of his warmest friends, an odious heretic, and a corruptor of the true religion. In 1560, a public dispute was holden at Weimar, between him and Strigelius, concerning the natural powers and faculties of the human mind, and their influence in the conversion and conduct of the true Christian. In this conference the latter seemed to attribute to unassisted nature too much, and the former too little. The one looked upon the fall of man as an event that extinguished, in the human mind, every virtuous tendency, every noble faculty, and left nothing behind it but universal darkness and corruption. The other maintained, that this degradation of the powers of nature was by no means universal or entire; that the will still retained some propensity to worthy pursuits, and a certain degree of activity that rendered it capable of attainments in virtue. Strigelius, who was well acquainted with the wiles of a captious philosophy, proposed to defeat his adversary by puzzling him, and, with that view, addressed to him the following question: "Whether original sin, or the corrupt habit which the human soul contracted by the fall, ought to be placed in the class of substances or accidents?" Flacius answered, with unparalleled imprudence and temerity, that it belonged to the former; and maintained, to his dying hour, this most extravagant and dangerous proposition, that original sin is the very substance of human nature. So invincible was the obstinacy with which he persevered in this strange doctrine, that he chose to renounce all worldly honours and advantages rather than depart from it. It was condemned by the greatest and soundest part of the Lutheran church, as a doctrine that bore no small affinity to that of the Manichæans. But, on the other hand, the merit, erudition, and credit of Flacius, procured him many respectable patrons as well as able defenders among the most learned doctors of the church, who embraced his sentiments and maintained his cause with the greatest spirit and zeal; of whom the most eminent were Cyriac Spangenberg, Christopher Irenæus, and Cælestine.[b]

XXXIV. It is scarcely possible to imagine how much the Lutheran church suffered from this new dispute in all those places where its contagion had reached, and how detrimental it was to the progress of Lutheranism, among those who still adhered to the religion of Rome; for the flame of discord spread to a great extent; it was communicated even to those churches which were erected in popish countries, and particularly in the Austrian territories, under the gloomy shade of a dubious toleration; and it so animated the Lutheran pastors, though surrounded by their cruel adversaries, that they could neither be restrained by the dictates of prudence, nor by the sense of danger.[c] Many are of opinion, that an ignorance of philosophical distinctions and definitions threw Flacius inconsiderately into the extravagant hypothesis which he maintained with such obstinacy, and that his greatest heresy was no more then a foolish attachment to an unusual term. But Flacius seems to have fully refuted this plea in his behalf, by declaring boldly, in several parts of his writings, that he knew perfectly well the philosophical signification and the whole energy of the word *substance*, and was by no means ignorant of the consequences that might be drawn from the doctrine he had embraced.[d] Be that as it may, we cannot but wonder at the senseless and excessive obstinacy of this turbulent man, who chose rather to sacrifice his fortune, and disturb the tranquillity of the church, than to abandon a word, which was entirely foreign to the subject in debate, and renounce an hypothesis, that was composed of the most palpable contradictions.

XXXV. The last controversy that we shall mention, of those which were occasioned by the excessive lenity of Melancthon, was set on foot by Osiander, in 1549, and produced much animosity in the church. Had its founder been yet alive, his influence and authority would have suppressed in their birth these wretched disputes; nor would Osiander, who despised the moderation of Melancthon, have dared either to publish or defend his crude and chimerical opinions within the reach of Luther. Arrogance and singularity were the principal lines in Osiander's character; he loved to strike out new notions; but his views seemed always involved in an intricate obscurity. The disputes that arose concerning the *Interim*, induced him to retire from Nuremberg, where he had exercised the pastoral charge, to Konigsberg, where he was chosen professor of divinity. In this new station he began his academical functions by propagating notions con-

☞ [a] The sentiments of Strigelius were not, I have reason to believe, very *erroneous* in the judgment of Dr. Mosheim, nor are they such in the estimation of the greatest part of the Lutheran doctors at this day.

[b] Schlusselburg, Catalog. Hæret. lib. ii.—The Life of Flacius, written in German by Ritter.—Salig. Histor. Aug. Confessionis, vol. iii. p. 593.—Arnold's Kirchen Hist. lib. xvi. cap. xxix. p. 829.—Musæi Prælect. in Formul. Concordiæ, p. 29.—Jo. Georgii Leuckfeldii Hist. Spangenbergensis.—For a particular account of the dispute, that was holden publicly at Weimar, see the work entitled Unschuldige Nachichten, p. 383.

[c] See Bern. Raupach's Zwiefache Zugabe zu dem Evangelisch. Oesterrich. The same author speaks of the friends of Flacius in Austria, and particularly of Irenæus, in his Presbyterol. Austriac.—For an account of Cælestine, see the Unschuldige Nachrichten.

[d] This will appear evident to such as will be at the pains to consult the letters which Westphal wrote to his friend Flacius, in order to persuade him to abstain from the use of the word *substance*, with the answers of the latter. These letters and answers were published by Arnold Grevius, in his Mem. J. Westphali.

cerning the divine Image, and the nature of repentance, very different from the doctrine that Luther had taught on these interesting subjects; and, not content with this deviation from the common course, he thought proper, in the year 1550, to introduce considerable alterations and corrections into the doctrine that had been generally received in the Lutheran church, with respect to the means of our *justification* before God. When we examine his discussion of this important point, we shall find it much more easy to perceive the opinions he rejected, than to understand the system he had invented or adopted; for, as was too usual in this age, he not only expressed his notions in an obscure manner, but seemed very frequently to speak and write in contradiction to himself. His doctrine, when carefully examined, will appear to amount to the following propositions; "Christ, considered in his *human nature only*, could not, by his obedience to the divine law, obtain justification and pardon for sinners; nor can we be justified before God by embracing and applying to ourselves, through faith, the righteousness and obedience of the *man* Christ. It is only through that eternal and essential righteousness, which dwells in Christ *considered as God*, and which resides in his divine nature, that is united to the human, that mankind can obtain complete justification. Man becomes a partaker of this divine righteousness by faith, since it is in consequence of this uniting principle that Christ dwells in the heart of man, with his divine righteousness; now, wherever this divine righteousness dwells, *there* God can behold no sin, and therefore, when it is present with Christ in the hearts of the regenerate, they are, on its account, considered by the Deity as righteous, although they may be sinners. Moreover, this divine and justifying righteousness of Christ, excites the faithful to the pursuit of holiness and to the practice of virtue." This doctrine was zealously opposed by the most eminent doctors of the Lutheran church, and, in a more especial manner, by Melancthon and his colleagues. On the other hand, Osiander and his sentiments were supported by persons of considerable weight. But, upon the death of this rigid and fanciful divine, the flame of controversy was cooled, and dwindled by degrees into nothing.[a]

XXXVI. The doctrine of Osiander, concerning the method of being justified before God, appeared so absurd to Stancarus, professor of Hebrew at Konigsberg, that he undertook to refute it. But while this turbulent and impetuous doctor was exerting all the vehemence of his zeal against the opinion of his colleague, he was hurried by his violence into the opposite extreme, and fell into an hypothesis, that appeared equally groundless, and not less dangerous in its tendency and consequences. Osiander had maintained that the man Christ, in his character of moral agent, was obliged to obey, for *himself*, the divine law, and therefore could not, by the imputation of this obedience, obtain righteousness or justification for *others*. Hence he concluded, that the Saviour of the world had been empowered, not by his character as *man*, but by his nature as *God*, to make expiation for our sins, and reconcile us to the favour of an offended Deity. Stancarus, on the other hand, excluded entirely Christ's divine nature from all concern in the satisfaction he made, and in the redemption he procured for offending mortals, and maintained, that the sacred office of a mediator between God and man belonged to Jesus, considered in his human nature alone. Having perceived, however, that this doctrine exposed him to the enmity of many divines, and even rendered him the object of popular resentment and indignation, he retired from Konigsberg into Germany, and at length into Poland, where, after having excited no small commotions,[b] he concluded his days in 1574.[c]

XXXVII. All those who had the cause of virtue, and the advancement of the Reformation really at heart, looked with an impatient ardour for an end to these bitter and uncharitable contentions; and their desires of peace and concord in the church were still increased, by their perceiving the great assiduity with which Rome turned these unhappy divisions to the advancement of her interests. But during the life of Melancthon, who was principally concerned in these warm debates, no effectual method could be found to bring them to a conclusion. The death of this great man, which happened in 1560, changed, indeed, the face of affairs, and enabled those who were disposed to terminate the present contests, to act with more resolution, and a surer prospect of success than had accompanied their former efforts. Hence it was, that after several vain attempts, Augustus, elector of Saxony, and John William, duke of Saxe-Weimar, summoned the most eminent doctors of both the contending parties to meet at Altenburg, in 1568, and there to propose, in an amicable manner, and with a charitable spirit, their respective opinions, that thus it might be seen how far a reconciliation was possible, and what was the most probable method of bringing it about. But the intemperate zeal and warmth of the disputants, with other inauspicious circumstances, blasted the fruits that were expected from this conference.[d] Another method of restoring tranquillity and union among the members of the Lutheran church was therefore proposed; and this was, that a certain number of wise and moderate divines should be employed in composing a form of doctrine, in which all the controversies that divided the church should be terminated and decided; and that this new compilation, as soon as it should be approved by the Lutheran princes and consistories, should be invested with ecclesiastical authority, and

[a] See Schlusselburgii Catalogus Hæreticor. lib. vi.—Arnoldi Kirchen Hist. lib. xvi. cap. xxiv. p. 804.—Christ. Hartknoch's Preussische Kirchen Historie, p. 309.—Salig's Historia August. Confessionis, tom. ii. p. 922. The judgment that was formed of this controversy by the divines of Wittenberg, may be seen in the Unschuldige Nachrichten, and that of the doctors of Copenhagen, in the Danischen Bibliothec. part vii. p. 150, where may be found an ample list of the writings published on this subject.—To form a just idea of the insolence and arrogance of Osiander, those who understand the German language will do well to consult Hirschius, Nuremburg Interims-Historie.

[b] See Hartknoch's Preussische Kirchen Hist.—Schlusselburg, liv. ix.—Bayle's Dict.—Before the arrival of Stancarus at Konigsberg, in 1548, he had lived for some time in Switzerland, where also he had occasioned religious disputes; for he adopted several doctrines of Luther, particularly that concerning the virtue and efficacy of the sacraments, which were rejected by the Swiss and Grisons. See the Museum Helveticum, tom. v. page 484, 490. For an account of the disturbances he occasioned in Poland, in 1556, see Bullinger, in Jo. Conr. Fueslini Cent. I. Epistolarum à Reformatoribus Helveticis scriptarum.

☞ [c] The main argument alleged by Stancarus, in favour of his hypothesis, was this,—that, if Christ was mediator by his divine nature only, it followed evidently, that even considered as God he was inferior to the Father; and thus, according to him, the doctrine of his adversary Osiander led directly to the Unitarian system. This difficulty, which was presented with great subtlety, engaged many to strike into a middle road, and to maintain, that both the divine and human natures of Christ were immediately concerned in the work of redemption.

[d] Casp. Sagittarii Introductio ad Histor. Ecclesiasticam, p. ii. p. 1542.

added to the symbolical[a] or standard books of the Lutheran church. James Andreas, professor at Tubingen, whose theological abilities had procured him the most eminent and shining reputation, had been employed, so early as in the year 1569, in this critical and difficult undertaking, by the special command of the dukes of Wirtemberg and Brunswick. The elector of Saxony,[b] with several persons of distinction, embarked with these two princes in the project they had formed; so that Andreas, under the shade of such a powerful protection and patronage, exerted all his zeal, travelled through different parts of Germany, negotiating alternately with courts and synods, and took all the measures which prudence could suggest, to render the form, that he was composing, universally acceptable.

XXXVIII. The persons embarked in this conciliatory design, were persuaded that no time ought to be lost in carrying it into execution, when they perceived the imprudence and temerity of the disciples of Melancthon, and the changes they were attempting to introduce into the doctrine of the church; for his son-in-law, Peucer,[c] who was a physician and professor of natural philosophy at Wittenberg, together with the divines of that city and of Leipsic, encouraged by the approbation, and relying on the credit, of Cracovius, chancellor of Dresden, and of several ecclesiastics and persons of distinction at the Saxon court, aimed at nothing less than abolishing the doctrines of Luther, concerning the eucharist and the person of Christ, with a view of substituting the sentiments of Calvin in its place. This new reformation was attempted in Saxony in 1570; and a great variety of clandestine arts and stratagems were employed, in order to bring it to a happy and successful issue. What the sentiments of Melancthon concerning the eucharist were toward the conclusion of his days, appears to be extremely doubtful. It is however certain, that he had a strong inclination to form a coalition between the Saxons and Calvinists, though he was prevented, by the irresolution and timidity of his natural character, from attempting openly this much desired union. Peucer, and the other disciples of Melancthon already mentioned, made a public profession of the doctrine of Calvin; and though they had much more spirit and courage than their soft and yielding master, yet they wanted his circumspection and prudence, which were not less necessary to the accomplishment of their designs. Accordingly in 1571, they published, in the German language, a work entitled *Stereoma*,[d] and other writings, in which they openly declared their dissent from the doctrine of Luther concerning the eucharist and the *person of Christ*;[e] and, that they might execute their purposes with greater facility, they introduced into the schools a Catechism, compiled by Pezelius, which was favourable to the sentiments of Calvin. As this bold step excited great commotions and debates in the church, Augustus held at Dresden, in the same year, a solemn convocation of the Saxon divines, and of other persons concerned in the administration of ecclesiastical affairs, and commanded them to adopt *his* opinion in relation to the eucharist.[f] The assembled doctors complied with this order in appearance; but their compliance was feigned;[g] for, on their return to the places of their abode, they resumed their original design, pursued it with assiduity and zeal, and by their writings, as also by their public and private instructions, endeavoured to abolish the ancient doctrine of the Saxons, relating to the presence of Christ's body in that holy sacrament. The elector, informed of these proceedings, convened anew the Saxon doctors, and held, in 1574, the famous convocation of Torgaw,[h] where, after a strict inquiry into the doctrines of those who, from their *secret* attachment to the sentiments of the Swiss divines, were called *Crypto*-Calvinists,[i] he committed some of them to prison, sent others into banishment, and engaged a certain number by the force of the secular arm to change their sentiments. Peucer, who had been principally concerned in moderating the rigour of some of Luther's doctrines, felt, in a more especial man-

☞ [a] The Lutherans call *symbolical* (from a Greek word that signifies *collection* or *compilation*) the books which contain their articles of faith and rules of discipline.

[b] Augustus.

☞ [c] This Peucer, whom Dr. Mosheim mentions without any mark of distinction, was one of the wisest, most amiable, and most learned men that adorned the annals of German literature during this century, as the well-known history of his life, and the considerable number of his medical, mathematical, moral, and theological writings, abundantly testify. Nor was he more remarkable for his merit than for his sufferings. After his genius and virtues had rendered him the favourite of the elector of Saxony, and placed him at the head of the university of Wittenberg, he felt, in a terrible manner, the effects of the bigotry and barbarity of the rigid Lutherans, who, on account of his denying the corporal presence of Christ in the eucharist, united, with success, their efforts to deprive him of the favour of his sovereign, and procured his imprisonment. His confinement, which lasted ten years, was accompanied with inhuman severity. See Melchior Adam's Vit. Medicor. Germanor.

☞ [d] A term which signifies *foundation*.

☞ [e] The learned historian seems to deviate here from his usual accuracy. The authors of the Stereoma did not declare their dissent from the doctrine of Luther, but from the extravagant inventions of some of his successors. This great man, in his controversy with Zuingle, had indeed thrown out some unguarded expressions, that seemed to imply a belief of the omnipresence of the body of Christ; but he became sensible afterwards that this opinion was attended with great difficulties, and particularly, that it ought not to be brought forward as a proof of Christ's corporal presence in the eucharist.* Yet this absurd hypothesis was renewed after the death of Luther, by Tinman and Westphal, and was dressed up in a still more specious and plausible form, by Brentius, Chemnitz, and Andreas, who maintained the communication of the properties of Christ's divinity to his human nature, as it was afterwards adopted by the Lutheran church. This strange system gave occasion to the Stereoma, in which the doctrine of Luther was respected, and the inventions alone of his successors were renounced, and in which the authors declared plainly, that they did not adopt the sentiments of Zuingle or Calvin, but that they admitted the real and substantial presence of Christ's body and blood in the eucharist.

☞ [f] In this passage, compared with what follows, Dr. Mosheim seems to maintain, that the opinion of Augustus, which he imposed upon the assembled divines, was in favour of the adversaries of Melancthon, and in direct opposition to the authors of the Stereoma. But here he has committed a palpable oversight. The convocation of Dresden, in 1571, instead of approving or maintaining the doctrine of the rigid Lutherans, drew up, on the contrary, a form of agreement (*formula consensus*) in which the omnipresence or *ubiquity* of Christ's body was denied; and which was, indeed, an abridgment of the Stereoma; so that the transactions at Dresden were entirely favourable to the moderate Lutherans, who embraced openly and sincerely (and not by a feigned consent (*subdole*) as our historian remarks) the sentiment of the elector Augustus, who at that time patronised the disciples of Melancthon. This prince, it is true, seduced by the crafty and artful insinuations of the Ubiquitarians, or rigid Lutherans, who made him believe that the ancient doctrines of the church were in danger, changed sides soon after, and was pushed on to the most violent and persecuting measures, of which the convocation of Torgaw was the first step, and the *Form of Concord* the unhappy issue.

☞ [g] The compliance was sincere; but the order was very different from that mentioned by our author, as appears from the preceding note.

☞ [h] It is to be observed, that not more than fifteen of the Saxon doctors were convened at Torgaw by the elector—a small number this to give law to the Lutheran church. For an account of the declaration drawn up by this assembly on the points relating to the presence of Christ's body in the eucharist, the omnipresence of that body, and the oral manducation of the flesh and blood of the divine Saviour, see Hospiniani Concordia Discors.

☞ [i] i. e. Hidden, or disguised Calvinists.

* See Lutheri op. tom. viii. p. 375, Edit. Janiens.

ner, the severe effects of the elector's displeasure; for he was confined to a comfortless prison, where he lay in the most affecting circumstances of distress until the year 1585, when, having obtained his liberty through the intercession of the prince of Anhalt, who had given his daughter in marriage to Augustus, he retired to Zerbst, where he ended his days in peace.[a]

XXXIX. The schemes of the Crypto-Calvinists being thus disconcerted, the elector of Saxony, and those princes who had entered into his views, redoubled their zeal and diligence in promoting the Form of Concord, already mentioned. Accordingly, various conferences were holden, preparatory to this important undertaking; and, in 1576, while the Saxon divines were convened at Torgaw by the order of Augustus, a treatise was composed by James Andreas, with a view of healing the divisions of the Lutheran church, and as a preservative against the opinions of the *reformed* doctors.[b] When this production, which was styled the Book of Torgaw, had been carefully examined, reviewed, and corrected, by the greatest part of the Lutheran doctors in Germany, the affair was again proposed to the deliberation of a select number of divines, who met at Berg, a Benedictine monastery in the neighbourhood of Magdeburg.[c] Here all points relating to the intended project were accurately weighed, the opinions of the assembled doctors carefully discussed, and the result of all was the famous *Form of Concord.* The persons who assisted Andreas in the composition of this celebrated work, or at least in the revision of it at Berg, were Martin Chemnitz, Nicholas Selneccer, Andrew Musculus, Christopher Cornerus, and David Chytræus.[d] This new confession of the Lutheran faith was adopted first by the Saxons in consequence of the strict order of Augustus; and their example was followed by the greatest part of the Lutheran churches, by some sooner, by others later.[e] The authority of this confession, as is sufficiently known, was employed for the following purposes: first, to terminate the controversies which divided the Lutheran church, more especially after the death of its founder; and, secondly, to preserve that church against the opinions of the Reformed in relation to the eucharist.

XL. This very form, however, which was designed to restore peace and concord in the church, and had actually produced this effect in several places, became a source of new tumults, and furnished matter for the most violent dissensions and contests. It immediately met with a warm opposition from the Reformed, and also from all those who were either secretly attached to their doctrine, or who, at least, were desirous of living in concord and communion with them, from a laudable zeal for the common interest of the Protestant cause. Nor was their opposition at all unaccountable, since they plainly perceived that this form removed all the flattering hopes they had entertained, of seeing the divisions that reigned among the friends of religious liberty happily healed, and entirely excluded the Reformed from the communion of the Lutheran church. Hence they were filled with indignation against the authors of this new confession of faith, and exposed their uncharitable proceedings in writings full of spirit and vehemence. The Swiss doctors, with Hospinian at their head, the Belgic divines,[f] those of the Palatinate,[g] together with the principalities of Anhalt and Baden, declared war against the form; and accordingly from this period the Lutheran, and more especially the Saxon doctors, were charged with the disagreeable task of defending this new creed and its compilers, in many laborious productions.[h]

XLI. Nor were the followers of Zuingle and Calvin the only opposers of this form: it found adversaries, even in the very bosom of Lutheranism, and several of the most eminent churches of that communion rejected it with such firmness and resolution, that no arguments or entreaties could engage them to admit it as a rule of faith, or even as a mean of instruction. It was rejected by the church of Nuremberg, by those of Hesse, Pomerania, Holstein, Silesia, Denmark, Brunswick, and others.[i] But

[a] See Schlusselburgii Theologia Calvinistica, lib. ii. iii. iv.—Hutteri Concordia Concors, cap. i.–viii.—Arnoldi Histor. Ecclesiast. lib. xvi. cap. xxxii.—Loscheri Historia Motuum inter Lutheranos et Reformat. par. ii. iii.—All these are writers favourable to the rigid Lutherans; see therefore, on the other side, Casp. Peuceri Hist. Carcerum et Liberationis Divinæ, published at Zurich, in 1605, by Pezelius.

[b] The term *Reformed* was used to distinguish the other protestants of various denominations from the Lutherans: and it was equally applied to the friends of episcopacy and presbyterianism. See the following chapter.

[c] The book that was composed by Andreas and his associates at Torgaw, was sent by the elector to almost all the Lutheran princes, with a view of its being examined, approved, and received by them. It was, however, rejected by several princes, and censured and refuted by various doctors. These censures engaged the compilers to review and correct it; and it was from this book, thus changed and new-modelled, that the *form* published at Berg was entirely drawn.

[d] The Form of Concord, composed at Torgaw, and reviewed at Berg, consists of two parts. In the first is contained a system of doctrine, drawn up according to the fancy of the six doctors here mentioned. In the second is exhibited one of the strongest instances of that persecuting and tyrannical spirit, of which the protestants complained in the church of Rome, even a formal condemnation of all those who differed from these six doctors, particularly in their strange opinions concerning the majesty and omnipresence of Christ's body, and the real manducation of his flesh and blood in the eucharist. This condemnation branded with the denomination of heretics, and excluded from the communion of the church, all Christians, of all nations, who refused to subscribe these doctrines. More particularly in Germany, the terrors of the sword were solicited against these pretended heretics, as may be seen in the famous testament of Brentius. For a full account of the Confession of Torgaw and Berg, see Hospinian's Concordia Discors, where the reader will find large extracts from this confession, with an ample account of the censures it underwent, the opposition that was made to it, and the arguments which were used by its learned adversaries.

[e] A list of the writers who have treated of this *form*, may be found in Jo. Georgii Walchii Introduct. in Libros Symbolicos, lib. i. cap. vii. p. 707, and Kocheri Biblioth. Theol. Symbolicæ, p. 188. There are also several unpublished documents relative to this famous confession, of which there is an account in the German work entitled, Unsch. Nachricht.—The principal writers who have given the history of the *form* and the transactions relating to it, are Hospinian and Hutter, already mentioned. These two historians have written on opposite sides; and whoever will be at the pains of comparing their accounts with attention and impartiality, will easily perceive where the truth lies, and receive satisfactory information with respect to the true state of these controversies, and the motives that animated the contending parties.

[f] See Petri Villerii Epistola Apologetica Reformatarum in Belgio Ecclesiarum ad et contra Auctores Libri Bergensis, dicti "Concordiæ."—This work was published a second time, with the annotations of Lud. Gerard a Renesse, by the learned Dr. Gerdes of Groningen, in his Scrinium Antiquarium, seu Miscellan. Groningens. Nov. tom. i. Add to these the Unschuldige Nachricht.

[g] John Casimir, prince Palatine, convoked an assembly of the reformed divines at Francfort, in 1577, in order to reject and annul this form. See Hen. Altingii Histor. Eccles. Palatin. sect. clxxix.

[h] See Jo. Georg. Walchii Introd. in Libros Symbolicos Lutheranor. lib. i. cap. vii.

[i] For an account of the ill success of this form in the dutchy of Holstein, see the Danische Bibliothec. vol. iv. p. 212, vol. v. p. 355, vol. viii. p. 333—461, vol. ix. p. 1.—Muhlii Dissert. Histor. Theol. Diss. i. de Reformat. Holsat. p. 108.—Arn. Grevii Memoria Pauli ab Eitzen. The transactions in Denmark, in relation to this form, and the particular reasons for which it was rejected there, may be seen in the Danish Library above quoted, vol. iv. p. 222—282, and also in Pontoppidan's Annal. Eccles. Danicæ Diplomatici, tom. iii. p. 456. The last author

though they all united in opposing it, their opposition was founded on different reasons, nor did they all act in this affair from the same motives or the same principles. A warm and affectionate veneration for the memory of Melancthon was, with some, the only, or at least the predominant, motive, that induced them to declare against the form in question; they could not behold, without the utmost abhorrence, a production in which the sentiments of this great and excellent man were so rudely treated. In this class we may rank the Lutherans of Holstein. Others were not only animated in their opposition by a regard for Melancthon, but also by a persuasion, that the opinions, condemned in the new creed, were more conformable to truth, than to those which were substituted in their place. A secret attachment to the sentiments of the Helvetic doctors prevented some from approving the form under consideration; the hopes of uniting the Reformed and Lutheran churches engaged many to declare against it; and a considerable number refused their assent to it from an apprehension, whether real or pretended, that the addition of a new creed to the ancient confessions of faith would be really a source of disturbance and discord in the Lutheran church. It would be endless to enumerate the different reasons alleged by the different individuals or communities, who declared their dissent from the Form of Concord.

XLII. This form was patronised in a more especial manner by Julius, duke of Brunswick, to whom, in a great measure, it owed its existence, who had employed both his authority and munificence in order to encourage those who had undertaken to compose it, and had commanded all the ecclesiastics, within his dominions, to receive and subscribe it as a rule of faith. But scarcely was it published, when the zealous prince, changing his mind, suffered the form to be publicly opposed by Heshusius, and other divines of his university of Helmstadt, and to be excluded from the number of the creeds and confessions received by his subjects. The reasons alleged by the Lutherans of Brunswick, in behalf of this step, were, 1st, That the Form of Concord, when printed, differed in several places from the manuscript copy to which they had given their approbation; 2dly, That the doctrine relating to the freedom of the human will was expressed in it without a sufficient degree of accuracy and precision, and was also inculcated in the harsh and improper terms that Luther had employed in treating that subject: 3dly, That the ubiquity, or universal and indefinite presence of Christ's human nature, was therein positively maintained, although the Lutheran church had never adopted any such doctrine. Besides these reasons, which were publicly avowed, some perhaps of a secret nature, contributed to the remarkable change, which was visible in the sentiments and proceedings of the duke of Brunswick. Various methods and negotiations were employed to remove the dislike which this prince, and the divines who lived in his territories, had conceived against the Creed of Berg. Particularly, in 1583, a convocation of divines from Saxony, Brandenburg, Brunswick, and the Palatinate, was holden at Quedlinburg for this purpose. But Julius persisted steadfastly in his opposition, and proposed that the form should be examined, and its authority discussed in a general assembly or synod of the Lutheran church.[a]

XLIII. This form was not only opposed from abroad, but had likewise adversaries in the very country which gave it birth; for even in Saxony many, who had been obliged to subscribe it, beheld it with aversion, in consequence of their attachment to the doctrine of Melancthon. During the life of Augustus, they were forced to suppress their sentiments; but, as soon as he had paid the last tribute to nature, and was succeeded by Christian I., the moderate Lutherans and the secret Calvinists resumed their courage. The new elector had been accustomed, from his tender years, to the moderate sentiments of Melancthon, and is also said to have evinced a propensity to the doctrine of the Helvetic church. Under his government, therefore, an opportunity was offered to the persons above mentioned of declaring their sentiments and executing their designs; and the attempts to abolish the form now seemed to be renewed, with a view of opening a door for the entrance of Calvinism into Saxony. The persons who had embarked in this design, were greatly encouraged by the protection which they received from several noblemen of the first rank at the Saxon court, and, particularly, from Crellius, the first minister of Christian. Under the auspicious influence of such patrons it was natural to expect success; yet they conducted their affairs with circumspection and prudence. Certain laws were previously enacted, in order to prepare the minds of the people for the intended revolution in the doctrine of the church; and, some time after,[b] the form of exorcism was omitted in the administration of baptism.[c] These measures were followed by others still more alarming to the rigid Lutherans; for not only a new German catechism, favourable to the purpose of the secret Calvinists, was industriously distributed among the people, but also a new edition of the Bible, in the same language, enriched with the observations of Henry Salmouth, which were artfully accommodated to this purpose, was, in 1591, published at Dresden. The consequences of these vigorous measures were violent tumults and seditions among the people, which the magistrates endeavoured to suppress, by punishing with severity such of the clergy as distinguished themselves by their opposition to the views of the court. But the whole plan of this religious revolution was overturned by the unexpected death of Christian, which happened in the year 1591. Affairs then assumed their former aspect. The doctors, who had been principally concerned in the execution of this unsuccessful project, were committed to

evidently proves (p. 476,) a fact which Herman ab Elswich, and other authors, have endeavoured to represent as dubious,—that Frederic II. king of Denmark, as soon as he received a copy of the form, threw it into the fire, and saw it consumed before his eyes. The opposition that was made to it by the Hessians, may be seen in Tielemanni Vitæ Theologor. Marpugens. p. 99.—Danischen Bibliothec. vol. vii. p. 273—364. t. ix. p. 1—87.—The ill fate of this famous Confession, in the principalities of Lignitz and Brieg, is amply related in the Unsch. Nachricht.

[a] See Leon. Hutteri Concordia Concors, cap. xlv.—Phil. Jul. Richtmeyeri Braunschweig Kirchen Hist. part iii. cap. viii.—See also the authors mentioned by Christ. Matth. Pfaffius, in his Acta et Scripta Ecclesiæ Wirtembergensis, p. 62, et Histor. Literar. Theologiæ, part ii. p. 423.—For an account of the convocation of Quedlinburg, and the acts that passed in that assembly, see the Danische Bibliothec. part viii.

[b] In the year 1591.

[c] The custom of *exorcising*, or casting out evil spirits, was used in the fourth century at the admission of catechumens, and was afterwards absurdly applied in the baptism of infants. This application of it was retained by the greatest part of the Lutheran churches. It was indeed abolished by the elector, Christian I., but was restored after his death; and the opposition that had been made to it by Crellius was the chief reason of his unhappy end. See Justi H. Bohmeri Jus Ecclesiast Protestant. tom. iii.; as also a German work of Melchior Kraft, entitled Geschichte des Exorcismi.

prison, or sent into banishment, after the death of the elector; and its chief encourager and patron, Crellius, suffered death in 1601, as the fruit of his temerity.[a]

XLIV. Towards the conclusion of this century, a new controversy was imprudently set on foot at Wittenberg, by a Swiss named Samuel Huber, professor of divinity in that university. The Calvinistical tenets of absolute predestination and unconditional decrees were extremely offensive to this adventurous theologian, and even excited his warmest indignation. Accordingly he affirmed, and taught publicly, that all mankind were elected from eternity by the Supreme Being to everlasting salvation, and accused his colleagues in particular, and the Lutheran divines in general, of a propensity to the doctrine of Calvin, on account of their asserting, that the divine election was confined to those, whose *faith*, *foreseen* by an omniscient God, rendered them the proper objects of his redeeming mercy. The opinion of Huber, as is now acknowledged by many learned men, differed more in words than in reality, from the doctrine of the Lutheran church; for he did no more than explain in a new method, and with a different turn of phrase, what that church had always taught concerning the unlimited extent of the love of God, as embracing the whole human race, and excluding none by an *absolute* decree from everlasting salvation. However, as a disagreeable experience and repeated examples had abundantly shown, that new methods of explaining or proving even received doctrines were as much adapted to excite divisions and contests, as the introduction of new errors, Huber was exhorted to adhere to the ancient method of proposing the doctrine of *election*, and, instead of his own peculiar forms of expression, to make use of those which were received and authorized by the church. To this compliance he refused to submit, alleging that it was contrary to the dictates of his conscience, while his patrons and disciples, in many places, gave several indications of a turbulent and seditious zeal for his cause. These considerations engaged the magistrates of Wittenberg to depose him from his office, and to send him into banishment.[b]

XLV. The controversies, of which a succinct account has now been given, and others of inferior moment, which it is needless to mention, were highly detrimental to the true interests of the Lutheran church, as is abundantly known by all who are acquainted with the history of this century. It must also be acknowledged, that the manner of conducting and deciding these debates, the spirit of the disputants, and the proceedings of the judges, if we form our estimate of them by the sentiments that prevail among the wiser sort of men in modern times, must be considered as inconsistent with equity, moderation, and charity. It betrays, nevertheless, a want, both of candour and justice, to inveigh indiscriminately against the authors of these misfortunes, and to represent them as totally destitute of rational sentiments and virtuous principles; and it is still more unjust to throw the whole blame upon the triumphant party, while the suffering side are all fondly represented as men of unblemished virtue, and worthy of a better fate. It ought not certainly to be a matter of surprise, that persons long accustomed to a state of darkness, and suddenly transported from it into the blaze of day, did not, at first, behold the objects that were presented to their view with that distinctness and precision which are natural to those who have long enjoyed the light; and such really was the case of the first protestant doctors, who were delivered from the gloom of papal superstition and tyranny. Besides, there was something gross and indelicate in the reigning spirit of this age, which made the people not only tolerate, but even applaud, many things relating both to the conduct of life and the management of controversy, which the more polished manners of modern times cannot relish, and which, indeed, are by no means worthy of imitation. As to the particular motives or intentions that guided each individual in this troubled scene of controversy, whether they acted from the suggestions of malice and resentment, or from an upright and sincere attachment to what they considered as truth, or how far these two springs of action were jointly concerned in their conduct, all this must be left to the decision of Him alone, whose privilege it is to search the heart, and to discern its most hidden intentions and its most secret motives.

XLVI. The Lutheran church furnished, during this century, a long list of distinguished men, who illustrated, in their writings, the various branches of theological science. After Luther and Melancthon, who stand foremost in this list, on account of their superior genius and erudition, we may select the following writers as the most eminent, and as persons whose names are worthy of being preserved in the annals of literature; viz. Weller, Chemnitz, Brentius, Flacius, Regius, Major, Amsdorf, Sarcerius, Matthesius, Wigandus, Lambertus, Andreas, Chytræus, Selneccer, Bucer, Fagius, Cruciger, Strigelius, Spangenberg, Judex, Heshusius, Westphal, Æpinus, Osiander, and others.[c]

CHAPTER II.

History of the Reformed[d] Church.

I. THE reformed church, founded by Zuingle and Calvin, differs considerably, in its nature and constitution, from all other ecclesiastical communities. Every other Christian church hath some common centre of union, and its members are connected by some common bond of doctrine and discipline. But this is far from being the case of the *Reformed* church,[e] whose several branches

[a] See Arnold's Kirchen und Ketzer Historie, part ii. book xvi. cap. xxxii.; as also the authors mentioned by Herm. Ascan. Engelcken, in his Dissertat. de Nic. Crellio, ejusque Supplicio.

[b] For an account of the writers that appeared in this controversy, see Christ. Matth. Pfaffii Introductio in Histor. Liter. Theologiæ, par. ii. lib. iii. p. 431.

[c] For an ample account of these Lutheran doctors, see Melchior Adam's Vitæ Theologorum, and Du-Pin's Bibliotheque des Auteurs separés de la Communion de l'Eglise Romaine au XVII. Siecle. The lives of several of these divines have been also composed by different authors of the present times; for example, that of Weller by Læmelius, that of Flacius by Ritter, those of Heshusius and Spangenberg by Leuckfeldt, that of Fagius by Fervelin, that of Chytræus by Schutz, that of Bucer by Verportenius, those of Westphal and Æpinus by Arn. Grevius, &c.

[d] It has already been observed, that the denomination of *Reformed* was given to those protestant churches which did not embrace the doctrine and discipline of Luther. The title was first assumed by the French protestants, and afterwards became the common denomination of all the Calvinistical churches on the continent;—I say, on the continent; since in England the term *Reformed* is generally used as standing in opposition to popery alone. Be that as it may, this part of Dr. Mosheim's work would have been, perhaps, with greater propriety entitled, 'The History of the Reformed *Churches*,' than that of the 'Reformed *Church*.' This will appear still more evident from the following note.

☞ [e] This, and the following observations, are designed to give the

are neither united by the same system of doctrine, nor by the same mode of worship, nor yet by the same form of government. It is farther to be observed, that this church does not require, from its ministers, either uniformity in their private sentiments, or in their public doctrine, but permits them to explain, in different ways, several doctrines of no small moment, provided that the great and fundamental principles of Christianity, and the practical precepts of that divine religion, be maintained in their original purity. This great community, therefore, may be properly considered as an ecclesiastical body composed of many churches, that vary from each other in their form and constitution, but which are preserved from anarchy and schism, by a general spirit of equity and toleration, that runs through the whole system, and renders variety of opinion consistent with fraternal union.

II. This indeed was not the original state and constitution of the reformed church, but was the result of a certain combination of events and circumstances, that threw it, by a sort of necessity, into this ambiguous form. The divines of Switzerland, from whom it derived its origin, and Calvin, who was one of its principal founders, employed all their credit, and exerted their most vigourous efforts, in order to reduce all the churches, which embraced their sentiments, under one rule of faith, and the same form of ecclesiastical government. And although they considered the Lutherans as their brethren, yet they showed no marks of indulgence to those who openly favoured the opinions of Luther, concerning the eucharist, the person of Christ, or predestination; nor would they permit the other protestant churches that embraced their communion, to deviate from their example in this respect. A new scene, however, which was exhibited in Britain, contributed much to enlarge this narrow and contracted system of church communion; for, when the violent contest concerning the form of ecclesiastical government, and the nature and number of those ceremonies which were proper to be admitted into the public worship, arose between the abettors of episcopacy and the puritans,[a] it was judged necessary to extend the borders of the reformed church, and rank, in the class of its true members, even those who departed, in some respects, from the ecclesiastical polity and doctrines established at Geneva. This spirit of toleration and indulgence became still more forbearing and comprehensive after the famous synod of Dordrecht; for, though the sentiments and doctrines of the Arminians were rejected and condemned in that numerous assembly, yet they gained ground privately, and insinuated themselves into the minds of many. The church of England, in the reign of Charles I., publicly renounced the opinions of Calvin relating to the divine decrees, and made several attempts to model its doctrine and institutions after the laws, tenets, and customs, that were observed by the primitive Christians.[b] On the other hand, several Lutheran congregations in Germany entertained a strong propensity to the doctrines and discipline of the church of Geneva, though they were restrained from declaring themselves fully and openly on this head, by their apprehensions of forfeiting the privileges which they derived from their adherence to the confession of Augsburg. The French refugees also, who had long been accustomed to a moderate way of thinking in religious matters, and whose national turn led them to a certain freedom of inquiry, being dispersed abroad in all parts of the protestant world, rendered themselves so agreeable, by their wit and eloquence, that their example excited a kind of emulation in favour of religious liberty. All these circumstances, accompanied with others, whose influence was less palpable, though equally real, gradually instilled such a spirit of lenity and forbearance into the minds of protestants, that at this day, all Christians, if we except Roman Catholics, Socinians, Quakers, and Anabaptists, may claim a place among the members of the reformed church. It is true, that great reluctance was discovered by many against this comprehensive scheme of church communion; and, even in the times in which we live, the ancient and less charitable manner of proceeding hath several patrons, who would be glad to see the doctrines and institutions of Calvin universally adopted and rigourously observed. These zealots, however, are not very numerous, nor is their influence considerable; and it may be affirmed with truth, that, both in point of number and authority, they are much inferior to the friends of moderation, who reduce within a narrow compass the fundamental doctrines of Christianity, on the belief of which salvation depends, exercise forbearance and fraternal charity toward those who explain certain doctrines in a manner peculiar to themselves, and desire to see the enclosure (if I may use that expression) of the reformed church rendered as large and comprehensive as is possible.[c]

III. The founder of the reformed church was Ulric Zuingle, a native of Switzerland, and a man of uncommon

---

Lutheran church an air of unity, which is not to be found in the reformed. But there is a real fallacy in this specious representation of things. The *reformed* church, when considered in the true extent of the term, comprehends all those religious communities which separated themselves from the church of Rome; and, in this sense, it includes the Lutheran church, as well as the others. And even when this epithet is used in opposition to the community founded by Luther, it represents not a single church, as the episcopal, presbyterian, or independent, but rather a collection of churches; which, though they may be invisibly united by a belief and profession of the fundamental doctrines of Christianity, maintain separate places of worship, and have each a visible centre of external union peculiar to themselves, which is formed by certain peculiarities in their respective rules of public worship and ecclesiastical government.* An attentive examination of the discipline, polity, and worship of the churches of England, Scotland, Holland, and Switzerland, will set this matter in the clearest light. The first of these churches, being governed by bishops, and not admitting the validity of presbyterian ordination, differs from the other three more than any of these differ from each other. There are, however, peculiarities of government and worship that distinguish the church of Holland from that of Scotland. The institution of deacons, the use of forms for the celebration of the sacraments, an ordinary form of prayer, the observance of the festivals of Christmas, Easter, Ascension-day, and Whitsuntide, are established in the Dutch church; and it is well known that the church of Scotland greatly differs from it in these respects.—But, after all, to what does the pretended uniformity among the Lutherans amount? Are not some of the Lutheran churches governed by bishops, while others are ruled by elders? It shall moreover be shown in its proper place, that even in point of doctrine, the Lutheran churches are not so very remarkable for their uniformity.

☞ [a] The *Puritans*, who inclined to the presbyterian form of church government, of which Knox was one of the earliest abettors in Britain, derived this denomination from their pretending to a *purer* method of worship than that which had been established by Edward VI. and queen Elizabeth.

☞ [b] This assertion is equivocal. Many members of the church of England, with Archbishop Laud at their head, did, indeed, propagate the doctrines of Arminius, both in their pulpits and in their writings. But it is not accurate to say that the church of England renounced publicly, in that reign, the opinions of Calvin. See this matter farther discussed in the note , cent. xvii. sect. ii. p. ii. ch. ii. paragraph xx.

[c] The annals of theology have not yet been enriched with a full and accurate history of the Reformed Church. This task was indeed undertaken by Scultet, and even carried down so far as his own time, in his

* See the general sketch of the state of the church in the eighteenth century, paragraph xxi. and the notes annexed.

penetration and acuteness, accompanied with an ardent zeal for truth. This great man was for removing out of the churches, and abolishing, in the ceremonies and appendages of public worship, many things which Luther was disposed to treat with toleration and indulgence, such as images, altars, wax-tapers, the form of exorcism, and private confession. He aimed at nothing so much as establishing, in his country, a form of divine worship remarkable for its simplicity, and as far remote as could be from every thing that might have the smallest tendency to nourish a spirit of superstition.[a] Nor were these the only circumstances in which he differed from the Saxon reformer; for his sentiments concerning several points of theology, and more especially his opinions relating to the sacrament of the Lord's supper, varied widely from those of Luther. The greatest part of these sentiments and opinions were adopted in Switzerland, by those who had joined themselves to Zuingle in promoting the cause of the Reformation, and were by them transmitted to all the Helvetic churches that threw off the yoke of Rome. From Switzerland these opinions were propagated among the neighbouring nations, by the ministerial labours and the theological writings of the friends and disciples of Zuingle: and thus the primitive reformed church, that was founded by this eminent ecclesiastic, and whose extent at first was not very considerable, gathered strength by degrees, and daily made new acquisitions.

IV. The separation, between the Lutheran and Swiss churches, was chiefly occasioned by the doctrine of Zuingle, concerning the sacrament of the Lord's supper. Luther maintained, that the body and blood of Christ were really, though in a manner far beyond human comprehension, present in the eucharist, and were exhibited together with the bread and wine. On the contrary, the Swiss reformer looked upon the bread and wine in no other light than as the signs and symbols of the absent body and blood of Christ; and, from the year 1524, he propagated this doctrine in a public manner by his writings, having entertained and taught it privately before that period.[b] In a little time after this,[c] his example was followed by Œcolampadius, a divine of Basil, and one of the most learned men of that century.[d] But they were both opposed with obstinacy and spirit by Luther and his associates, particularly those of the circle of Suabia. In the mean time, Philip, landgrave of Hesse, apprehending the pernicious effects that these debates might have upon the affairs of the protestants, which were, as yet, in the fluctuating and unsettled state that marks the infancy of all great revolutions, was desirous of putting an end to these differences, and, for that purpose, appointed a conference at Marpurg, between Zuingle, Luther, and other doctors of both parties.[e] This meeting, however, only covered the flame instead of extinguishing it; and the pacific prince, seeing it impossible to bring about a definite treaty of peace and concord between these jarring divines, was obliged to rest satisfied with having engaged them to consent to a truce. Luther and Zuingle came to an agreement about several points; but the principal matter in debate,—that which regarded Christ's presence in the eucharist,—was left undecided; each party appealing to the Fountain of wisdom to terminate this controversy, and expressing a hope that time and impartial reflection might discover and confirm the truth.[f]

V. The reformed Church had scarcely been founded in Switzerland by Zuingle, when the Christian hero fell in a battle that was fought, in 1530, between the protestants of Zurich, and their Roman catholic compatriots, who drew the sword in defence of popery. It was not indeed to perform the sanguinary office of a soldier that Zuingle was present at this engagement, but with a view to encourage and animate, by his counsel and exhortations, the valiant defenders of the protestant cause.[g] After his death, several Lutheran doctors of the more moderate sort, and particularly Martin Bucer, used their utmost endeavours to bring about some kind of reconciliation between the contending parties. For this purpose they exhorted the jarring theologians to concord, interpreted the points in dispute with a prudent regard to the prejudices of both

Annales Evangelii Renovatii; but the greatest part of this work is lost. Theod. Hasæus, who proposed to give the annals of that church, was prevented by death from fulfilling his purpose. The famous work of James Basnage, published in 1725, under the title of Histoire de la Religione des Eglises Reformées, instead of giving a regular history of the reformed church, is only designed to show that its peculiar and distinguishing doctrines are not new inventions, but were taught and embraced in the earliest ages of the church. Maimbourg's Histoire du Calvinisme is remarkable for nothing but the partiality of its author, and the wilful errors with which it abounds.

☞ [a] The design of Zuingle was certainly excellent; but in the execution of it perhaps he went too far, and consulted rather the dictates of reason than the real exigencies of human nature in its present state. The existing union between soul and body, which operate together in the actions of moral agents, even in those who appear the most abstracted and refined, renders it necessary to consult the external senses, as well as the intellectual powers, in the institution of public worship. Besides, between a worship purely and philosophically rational, and a service grossly and palpably superstitious, there are many intermediate steps and circumstances, by which a rational service may be rendered more affecting and awakening, without becoming superstitious. A noble edifice, solemn music, a well-ordered set of external gestures, though they do not, in themselves, render our prayers more acceptable to the Deity, than if they were offered up without any of these circumstances, produce, nevertheless, a good effect. They elevate the mind, they give it a composed and solemn frame, and thus contribute to the fervour of its devotion.

[b] Zuingle certainly taught this doctrine in private before the year 1524, as appears from Gerdes' Historia Renovati Evangelii, tom. i.

[c] In the year 1525.

[d] Jo. Conr. Fueslini Centuria i. Epistol. Theolog. Reformat.—☞ Œcolampadius was not less remarkable for his extraordinary modesty, his charitable, forbearing, and pacific spirit, and his zeal for the progress of vital and practical religion, than for his profound erudition, which he seemed rather studious to conceal, than to display.

☞ [e] Zuingle was accompanied by Œcolampadius, Bucer, and Hideon. Luther had with him Melancthon and Justus Jonas from Saxony, and also Osiander, Brentius, and Agricola.

[f] Ruchat, Histoire de la Reformation de la Suisse, vol. i. ii.—Hottinger, Helvetische Kirchen-Geschichte, part iii.—Loscher, Historia Motuum, par. i. cap. ii. iii. vi.—Fueslini Beytrage zur Schweizer Reformation, tom. iv.

[g] The Lutherans, who consider this unhappy fate of Zuingle as a reproach upon that great man in particular, and upon the reformed church in general, discover a gross ignorance of the genius and manners of the Swiss nation in this century; for, as all the inhabitants of that country are at present trained to arms, and obliged to take the field when the defence of their country requires it, so in the time of Zuingle this obligation was so general, that neither the ministers of the Gospel, nor the professors of theology, was exempted from this military service. Accordingly, in the same battle in which Zuingle fell, Jerome Pontanus, one of the theological doctors of Basil, also lost his life. See Fueslini Centuria i. Epistolar. Theol. Reformator. ☞ Erasmus also spoke in a very unfriendly manner of the death of Zuingle and his friend Œcolampadius. See Jortin's Life of Erasmus, vol. i. It is not therefore surprising to find the bigoted Sir Thomas More insulting (with the barbarity that superstition seldom fails to produce in a narrow and peevish mind) the memory of these two eminent reformers, in a letter to the furious and turbulent Cochlæus; of which the following words show the spirit of the writer: "Postrema ea fuit, quam de Zuinglio et Œcolampadio, scriptam misisti, quorum nunciata mors mihi lætitiam attulit.—Sublatos e medio esse tam immanes fidei Christianæ hostes, tam intentos ubique in omnem perimendæ pietatis occasionem, jure gaudere possum." Jortin, vol. ii.

sides, admonished them of the pernicious consequences that must attend the prolongation of these unhappy contests, and even went so far as to express the respective sentiments of the contending doctors in terms of considerable ambiguity and latitude, that thus the desired union might be the more easily effected. There is no doubt, that the intentions and designs of these zealous intercessors were pious and upright ;[a] but it will be difficult to decide, whether the means they employed were adapted to promote the end they had in view. Be that as it may, these specific counsels of Bucer excited divisions in Switzerland : for some persevered obstinately in the doctrine of Zuingle, while others adopted the explications and modifications of his doctrine, offered by Bucer.[b] But these divisions and commotions had not the least effect on that reconciliation with Luther, which was earnestly desired by the pious and moderate doctors of both parties. The efforts of Bucer were more successful out of Switzerland, and particularly among those divines in the upper parts of Germany, who inclined to the sentiments of the Helvetic church ; for they retired from the communion of that church, and joined themselves to Luther by a public act, which was sent to Wittenberg, in 1536, by a solemn deputation appointed for that purpose.[c] The Swiss divines could not be brought to so great a length. There was, however, still some prospect of a reconciliation even between them and the Lutherans. But this fair prospect entirely disappeared in 1544, when Luther published his confession of faith in relation to the sacrament of the Lord's supper, which was directly opposite to the doctrine of Zuingle and his followers on that head. The doctors of Zurich pleaded their cause publicly against the Saxon reformer in the following year ; and thus the purposes of the advocates of peace were totally defeated.[d]

VI. The death of Luther, which happened in the year 546, was an event that seemed adapted to calm these commotions, and to revive, in the breast of the moderate and pacific, the hopes of a reconciliation between the contending parties. For this union, between the Lutherans and Zuinglians, was so ardently desired by Melancthon and his followers, that this great man left no means unemployed to effect it, and seemed resolved, rather to submit to a dubious and forced peace, than to see those flaming discords perpetuated, which reflected such dishonour on the protestant cause. At the same time, this salutary work seemed to be facilitated by the theological system that was adopted by John Calvin, a native of Noyon in France, who was pastor and professor of divinity at Geneva, and whose genius, learning, eloquence, and talents, rendered him respectable, even in the eyes of his enemies. This great man, whose particular friendship for Melancthon was an incidental circumstance highly favourable to the intended reconciliation, proposed an explication of the point in debate, that modified the crude hypothesis of Zuingle, and made use of all his credit and authority among the Swiss, and more particularly at Zurich, where he was held in the highest veneration, in order to obtain their assent to it.[e] The explication he proposed was not, indeed, favourable to the doctrine of Christ's bodily presence in the eucharist, which he persisted in denying ; he supposed, however, that a certain *divine* virtue, or efficacy, was communicated by Christ, with the bread and wine, to those who approached this holy sacrament with a lively faith, and with upright hearts ; and to render this notion still more satisfactory, he expressed it in almost the same terms which the Lutherans employed in inculcating their doctrine of Christ's real presence in the eucharist.[f] Indeed the great and common error of all those, who, from a desire of peace, assumed the character of arbitrators in this controversy, lay in this, that they aimed rather at an uniformity of terms than of sentiments, and seemed satisfied when they had engaged the contending parties to use the same words and phrases, though their real difference in opinion remained the same, and each explained these ambiguous or figurative terms in a manner agreeable to their respective systems.

The concord, so much desired, did not, however, seem to advance much. Melancthon, although he stood foremost in the rank of those who longed impatiently for it, had not courage enough to embark openly in the execution of such a perilous project. Besides, after the death of Luther, his enemies attacked him with redoubled fury, and gave him so much disagreeable occupation, that he had neither that leisure, nor that tranquillity of mind, which were necessary to prepare his measures properly for such an arduous undertaking. A new obstacle to the execution of this pacific project was also presented, by the intemperate zeal of Joachim Westphal, pastor at Hamburg, who, in 1552, renewed, with greater vehemence than ever, this deplorable controversy, which had been for some time suspended ; and who, after Flacius, was the most obstinate defender of the opinions of Luther. This violent theologian, with a spirit of acrimonious vehemence, like that which too remarkably appeared in the polemic writings of Luther, attacked the act of uniformity, by which the churches of Geneva and Zurich declared their agreement concerning the doctrine of the eucharist. In the book which he published with this view,[g] he censured, with the utmost severity, the variety of sentiments concerning the sacrament of the Lord's supper, observable in the reformed church, and maintained, with his usual warmth and obstinacy, the opinion of Luther on that subject. This engaged Calvin to enter the lists with Westphal, whom he treated with as little lenity and forbearance, as the rigid Lutherans had shown toward the Helvetic churches. The consequences of this debate were, that Calvin and Westphal had, respectively, their zealous defenders and patrons : thus the breach was widened, the spirits were heated, and the flame of controversy was kindled anew with such violence and fury, that to extinguish it entirely seem-

[a] See Alb. Menon. Verpoorten, Comment. de Mart. Bucero, et ejus Sententiâ de Cœnâ Domini, sect. ix. p. 23, published in 8vo. at Coburg, in the year 1709.—Loscheri Hist. Motuum, par. i. lib. ii. and par. i. lib. iii.

[b] Fueslini Centur. i. Epistolar. Theolog.

[c] Loscheri Hist. cap. ii. p. 205.—Ruchat, Histoire de la Reformat. de Suisse, tom. v. p. 535.—Hottingeri Histor. Eccles. Helvet. tom. iii. lib. vi. p. 702.

[d] Loscheri Hist. par. i. lib. ii. cap. iv. p. 341.

[e] Salig, Hist. Aug. Confessionis, tom. ii. lib. vii.

☞ [f] Calvin went certainly too far in this matter ; and, in his explication of the benefits that arise from a worthy commemoration of Christ's death in the eucharist, he dwelt too grossly upon the allegorical expressions of Scripture, which the papists had so egregiously abused, and talked of really eating by faith the body, and drinking the blood of Christ.

☞ [g] This book, which abounds with senseless and extravagant tenets that Luther never so much as thought of, and breathes the most virulent spirit of persecution, is entitled, "Farrago Confusanearum et inter se dissidentium de S. Cœnâ Opinionum ex Sacramentariorum Libris congesta."

ed to be a task beyond the reach of human wisdom or power.[a]

VII. These disputes were unhappily augmented by that famous controversy concerning the decrees of God, with respect to the eternal condition of men, which was set on foot by Calvin, and became an inexhaustible source of intricate researches, and abstruse, subtle, and inexplicable questions. The most ancient Helvetic doctors were far from adopting the doctrine of those, who represent the Deity as assigning from all eternity, by an absolute, arbitrary, and unconditional decree, to some everlasting happiness, and to others endless misery, without any previous regard to the moral characters and circumstances of either. Their sentiments seemed to differ very little from those of the Pelagians; nor did they hesitate in declaring, after the example of Zuingle, that the kingdom of heaven was open to all who lived according to the dictates of right reason.[b] Calvin had adopted a quite different system with respect to the divine decrees. He maintained, that the everlasting condition of mankind in a future world was determined from all eternity, by the unchangeable order of the Deity, and that this absolute determination of his will and good pleasure, was the only source of happiness or misery to every individual. This opinion was in a very short time propagated through all the reformed churches, by the writings of Calvin, and by the ministry of his disciples; and, in some places, it was inserted in the national creeds and confessions, and thus made a public article of faith. The unhappy controversy, which took its rise from this doctrine, was opened at Strasburg, in 1560, by Jerome Zanchius, an Italian ecclesiastic, who was particularly attached to the sentiments of Calvin; and it was afterwards carried on by others with such zeal and assiduity, that it drew, in an extraordinary manner, the attention of the public, and tended as much to exasperate the passions, and foment the discord of the contending parties, as the dispute about the eucharist had already done.[c]

VIII. The Helvetic doctors had no prospect left of calming the troubled spirits, and tempering, at least, the vehemence of these deplorable feuds, but the moderation of the Saxon divines, who were the disciples of Melancthon, and who, breathing the pacific spirit of their master, seemed, after his death, to have nothing so much at heart as the restoration of concord and union to the protestant church. Their designs, however, were not carried on with that caution and circumspection, with that prudent foresight, or that wise attention to the nature of the times, which always distinguished the transactions of Melancthon, and which the critical nature of the cause they were engaged in, indispensably required. And hence they had already taken a step, which threatened to render ineffectual all the remedies they could apply to the healing of the present disorders; for, by dispersing artful and insidious writings, with a design to seduce the ministers of the church, and the studious youth, into the sentiments of the Swiss divines, or, at least, to engage them to treat these sentiments with toleration and forbearance, they drew upon themselves the indignation of their adversaries, and ruined the pacific cause in which they had embarked. It was this conduct that gave occasion to the composition of that famous *Form of Concord*, which condemned the sentiments of the reformed churches in relation to the person of Christ, and the sacrament of the Lord's supper; and, as this form is received by the greatest part of the Lutherans, as one of the articles of their religion, hence arises an insuperable obstacle to all schemes of reconciliation and concord.

IX. So much did it seem necessary to premise concerning the causes, rise, and progress of the controversy, which formed the separation that still subsists between the Lutheran and reformed churches. Thence it will be proper to proceed to an account of the internal state of the latter, and to the history of its progress and revolutions. The history of the reformed church, during this century, comprehends two distinct periods. The first commences with the year 1519, when Zuingle withdrew from the communion of Rome, and began to form a christian church beyond the bounds of the pope's jurisdiction; and it extends to the time of Calvin's settlement at Geneva, where he required the greatest reputation and authority. The second period takes in the rest of this century.

During the first of these periods, the Helvetic church, which assumed the title of *Reformed* after the example of the French protestants in its neighbourhood, who had chosen this denomination, in order to distinguish themselves from the catholics, as very considerable in its extent, and was confined to the cantons of Switzerland. It was indeed augmented by the accession of some small states in Suabia and Alsace; but, in 1526, these states changed sides, through the suggestions and influence of Bucer, returned to the communion of the Saxon church, and thus made their peace with Luther. The other religious communities, which had abandoned the church of Rome, either openly embraced the doctrine of Luther, or consisted of persons who did not agree in their theological opinions, and who really seemed to stand in a kind of neutrality between the contending parties. All things being duly considered, it appears probable enough that the church founded by Zuingle, would have remained still confined to its original limits, had not Calvin arisen, to augment its extent, authority, and lustre; for the natural and political character of the Swiss, neither bent toward the lust of conquest, nor the grasping views of ambition, discovered itself in their religious transactions; and, as a spirit of contentment with what they had, prevented their aiming at an augmentation of their territory, so did a similar spirit hinder them from being extremely solicitous about enlarging the borders of their church.

X. In this infant state of the reformed church, the only point that prevented its union with the followers of Lu-

[a] Loscheri Historia Motuum, par. ii. lib. iii. cap. viii. p. 83.—Molleri Cimbria Literata, tom. iii. p. 642.—Arn. Grevii Memoria Joac. Westphali.

[b] For the proof of this assertion, see Dallæi Apologia pro duabus Ecclesiarum Gallicar. Synodis adversus Fred. Spanheim, part iv. p. 946.—Jo. Alphons. Turretini Epistol. ad Antistitem Cantuariensem, inserted in the Bibliotheque Germanique, tom. xiii.—Simon, Bibliotheque Critique, published under the fictitious name of Sanior, tom. iii. ch. xxviii., and also a book, entitled, Observationes Gallicæ in Formul. Consensus Helveticam. The very learned Dr. Gerdes, instead of being persuaded by these testimonies, maintains, on the contrary, (in his Miscellan. Groningens.) that the sentiments of Calvin were the same with those of the ancient Swiss doctors; but this excellent author may be refuted, even from his own account of the tumults which were occasioned in Switzerland, by the opinion that Calvin had propagated in relation to the divine decrees.

[c] Loscheri Historia Motuum, part iii. lib. v. cap. ii.—Salig. Hist. August. Confessionis, tom. i. lib. ii. cap. xiii.

ther, was the doctrine they taught with respect to the sacrament of the Lord's supper. This first controversy, indeed, soon produced a second, relating to the *person* of Jesus Christ; which, nevertheless, concerned only a part of the Lutheran Church.[a] The Lutheran divines of Suabia, in the course of their debates with those of Switzerland, drew an argument in favour of the *real* presence of Christ's body and blood in the eucharist, from the following proposition: that "all the *properties* of the divine nature, and consequently its *omnipresence* were communicated to the human nature of Christ by the hypostatic union." The Swiss doctors, in order to destroy the force of this argument, denied this communication of the divine attributes to Christ's human nature; and denied, more especially, the 'ubiquity or omnipresence of the man Jesus;' and hence arose that most intricate and abstruse controversy concerning ubiquity, and the communication of properties, which produced so many learned and unintelligible treatises, so many subtle disputes, and occasioned such a multitude of accusations and invectives.

It is proper to observe, that, at this time, the Helvetic church universally embraced the doctrine of Zuingle concerning the eucharist. This doctrine, which differed considerably from that of Calvin, amounted to the following propositions: That the bread and wine were no more than a representation of the body and blood of Christ; or, in other words, the signs appointed to denote the benefits that were conferred upon mankind, in consequence of the death of Christ; that, therefore, Christians derived no other fruit from the participation of the Lord's supper, than a mere commemoration and remembrance of the merits of Christ, which, according to an expression common in the mouths of the advocates of this doctrine, was the 'only thing that was properly meant by the Lord's supper.'[b] Bucer, whose leading principles was the desire of peace and concord, endeavoured to correct and modify this doctrine in such a manner, as to give it a certain degree of conformity to the hypothesis of Luther; but the memory of Zuingle was too fresh in the minds of the Swiss, to permit their acceptance of these corrections and modifications, or to suffer them to depart, in any respect, from the doctrine of that eminent man, who had founded their church, and had been the instrument of their deliverance from the tyranny and superstition of Rome.

XI. In the year 1541, John Calvin, who surpassed almost all the doctors of this age in laborious application, constancy of mind, force of eloquence, and extent of genius, returned to Geneva, whence the opposition of his enemies had obliged him to retire. On his settlement in that city, the affairs of the new church were committed to his direction;[c] and he acquired also a high degree of influence in the political administration of that republic. This event changed entirely the face of affairs, and gave a new aspect to the reformed church. The views and projects of this great man were grand and extensive; for he not only undertook to give strength and vigour to the rising church, by framing the wisest laws and the most salutary institutions for the maintenance of order, and the advancement of true piety, but even proposed to render Geneva the mother, the seminary of all the reformed churches, as Wittenberg was of all the Lutheran communities. He formed the scheme of sending forth from this little republic the succours and ministers that were to promote and propagate the protestant cause through the most distant nations, and aimed at nothing less than rendering the government, discipline, and doctrine of Geneva, the model and rule of strict imitation to all the reformed churches in the world. The undertaking was certainly great, and worthy of the extensive genius and capacity of this eminent man; and, great and arduous as it was, it was executed in part, and even carried on to a very considerable length, by his indefatigable assiduity and inextinguishable zeal. It was with this view, that, by the fame of his learning, as well as by his epistolary solicitations and encouragements of various kinds, he engaged many persons of rank and fortune, in France, Italy, and other countries, to leave the places of their nativity, and to settle at Geneva; while others repaired thither merely out of curiosity to see a man, whose talents and exploits had rendered him so famous, and to hear the discourses which he delivered in public. Another circumstance, that contributed much to the success of his designs, was the establishment of an university at Geneva, which the senate of that city founded at his request; and in which he himself, with his colleague, Theodore Beza, and other divines of eminent learning and abilities, taught the sciences with the greatest reputation. In effect, the lustre which these great men reflected upon this infant seminary of learning, spread its fame through the distant nations with such amazing rapidity, that all who were ambitious of a distinguished progress either in sacred or profane erudition, repaired to Geneva, and that England, Scotland, France, Italy, and Germany, seemed to vie with each other in the numbers of their studious youth, that were incessantly repairing to the new university. By these means, and by the ministry of these his disciples, Calvin enlarged considerably the borders of the reformed church, propagated his doctrine, and gained proselytes and patrons to his theological system, in several countries of Europe. In the midst of this glorious career, he ended his days, in the year 1564; but the salutary institutions and wise regulations, of which he had been the author, were both respected and maintained after his death. In a more especial manner, the university of Geneva flourished as much under Beza, as it had done during the life of its founder.[d]

XII. The plan of doctrine and discipline that had been formed by Zuingle, was altered and corrected by Calvin,

☞ [a] It was only a certain number of those Lutherans, who were much more rigid in their doctrine than Luther himself, that believed the ubiquity or omnipresence of Christ's person, considered as a man. By this we may see that the Lutherans have their divisions as well as the reformed, of which several instances may be yet given in the course of this History.

[b] Nihil esse in Cœnâ quam memoriam Christi. That this was the real opinion of Zuingle, appears evidently from various testimonies, which may be seen in the Museum Helveticum, tom. i. p. 485, 490. tom. iii. p. 631. This is also confirmed by the following sentence in his book concerning baptism; (tom. ii. op. p. 85.) "Cœna Dominica non aliud quam Commemorationis nomen meretur." Compare, with all this, Fueslini Cent. I. Epist. Theol. Reform.

[c] Calvin, in reality, enjoyed the power and authority of a bishop at Geneva; for, as long as he lived, he presided in the assembly of the clergy, and in the consistory, or ecclesiastical judicatory. But, when he was at the point of death, he advised the clergy not to appoint a successor, and proved to them evidently the dangerous consequences of entrusting with any one man, during life, a place of such high authority. After him, therefore, the place of president ceased to be perpetual. See Spon's Histoire de Geneve, tom. ii.

[d] The various projects and plans that were formed, conducted, and

more especially in three points, of which it will not be improper to give a particular account.

1st, Zuingle, in his form of ecclesiastical government, had given an absolute and unbounded power, in religious matters, to the civil magistrate, to whom he had placed the clergy in a degree of subjection that was displeasing to many. At the same time he allowed a certain subordination and difference of rank among the ministers of the church, and even thought it expedient to place at their head a perpetual president, or superintendant, with a certain degree of inspection and authority over the whole body. Calvin, on the contrary, reduced the power of the magistrate, in religious matters, within narrow bounds. He declared the church a separate and independent body, endowed with the power of legislation for itself. He maintained, that it was to be governed, like the primitive church, only by presbyteries and synods, that is, by assemblies of elders, composed both of the clergy and laity; and he left to the civil magistrate little more than the privilege of protecting and defending the church, and providing for what related to its external exigencies and concerns. Thus this eminent reformer introduced into the republic of Geneva, and endeavoured to introduce into all the reformed churches throughout Europe, that form of ecclesiastical government, which is called *Presbyterian*, from its neither admitting the institution of bishops, nor any subordination among the clergy; and which is founded on this principle, that all ministers of the Gospel are, by the law of God, declared to be equal in rank and authority. In consequence of this principle, he established at Geneva a consistory composed of ruling elders, partly pastors, and partly laymen, and invested this ecclesiastical body with a high degree of power and authority. He also convened synods, composed of the ruling elders of different churches, and, in these consistories and synods, procured laws to be enacted for the regulation of all matters of a religious nature; and, among other things, restored to its former vigour the ancient practice of excommunication. All these things were done with the consent of the greatest part of the senate of Geneva.

2dly, The system that Zuingle had adopted with respect to the eucharist, was by no means agreeable to Calvin, who, in order to facilitate the desired union with the Lutheran church, substituted in its place another, which appeared more conformable to the doctrine of that church, and, in reality, differed little from it. For while the doctrine of Zuingle supposed only a *symbolical* or figurative *presence* of the body and blood of Christ in the eucharist, and represented a pious remembrance of Christ's death, and of the benefits it procured to mankind, as the only fruits that arose from the celebration of the Lord's supper, Calvin explained this critical point in a quite different manner. He acknowledged a *real* though *spiritual presence* of Christ in this sacrament; or, in other words, he maintained, that true Christians, who approached this holy ordinance with a lively faith, were, in a certain manner, united to the man Christ; and that from this union the spiritual life derived new vigour in the soul, and was still carried on, in a progressive motion, to greater degrees of purity and perfection. This kind of language had been used in the forms of doctrine drawn up by Luther; and as Calvin observed, among other things, that the divine grace was conferred upon sinners, and sealed to them by the celebration of the Lord's supper, this induced many to suppose that he adopted the sentiment implied in the barbarous term *impanation*,[a] and did not essentially alter the doctrine of the Lutheran church on this important subject.[b] Be that as it may, his sentiments differed considerably from those of Zuingle; for, while the latter asserted, that all Christians, whether regenerate or unregenerate, might be partakers of the body and blood of Christ, Calvin confined this privilege to the pious and regenerate believer alone.

3dly, The absolute decree of God, with respect to the future and everlasting condition of the human race, which made no part of the theology of Zuingle, was an essential tenet in the creed of Calvin, who inculcated with zeal the following doctrine: that God, in predestinating, from all eternity, one part of mankind to everlasting happiness, and another to endless misery, was led to make this distinction by no other motive than his own good pleasure and free will.

XIII. The first point was of such a nature, that, great as the credit and influence of Calvin were, he could not procure an universal reception for it in the reformed churches. The English and Germans rejected it, and even the Swiss refused to adopt it. It was, however, received by the reformed churches in France, Holland, and

executed with equal prudence and resolution by Calvin, in behalf, both of the republic and church of Geneva, are related by the learned person, who, in 1730, gave a new edition (enriched with interesting historical notes, and authentic documents) of Spon's Histoire de Geneve. The particular accounts of Calvin's transactions, given by this anonymous editor, in his notes, are drawn from several curious manuscripts of undoubted credit.

☞ [a] The term *Impanation* (which signifies here the *presence* of Christ's body in the eucharist, *in* or *with* the *bread* that is there exhibited) amounts to what is called Consubstantiation. It was a modification of the monstrous doctrine of Transubstantiation, first invented by some of the disciples of Berenger, who had not a mind to break all measures with the church of Rome, and was afterwards adopted by Luther and his followers, who, in reality, made sad work of it. For, in order to give it some faint air of possibility, and to maintain it as well as they could, they fell into a wretched scholastic jargon about the nature of substances, subsistences, attributes, properties, and accidents, that did infinite michief to the true and sublime science of gospel theology, whose beautiful simplicity it was adapted to destroy. The very same perplexity and darkness, the same quibbling, sophistical, and unintelligible logic, that reigned in the attempts of the Roman catholics to defend the doctrine of Transubstantiation, were visible in the controversial writings of the Lutherans in behalf of Consubstantiation, or Impanation. The latter had, indeed, one absurdity less to maintain; but being obliged to assert, in opposition to intuitive evidence and unchangeable truth, that the same body can be in many places at the same time, they were consequently obliged to have recourse to the darkest and most intricate jargon of the schools, to hide the nonsense of this unaccountable doctrine. The modern Lutherans are grown somewhat wiser in this respect; at least, they seem less zealous than their ancestors about the tenet in question.

[b] See Fueslini Centur. I. Epistol. Theol. Reform. tom. i. p. 255. 262.—Lettres de Calvin à Mons. de Falaise, p. 84.—We learn from Fueslin that Calvin wrote to Bucer a letter, intimating that he approved his sentiments. It is possible, that he may have derived from Bucer the opinion he entertained with respect to the eucharist.—See Bossuet's Histoire, des Variations des Eglises Protestantes, tom. ii.; and Courayer's Examen des Defauts de Theologiens, tom. ii. These two writers pretend that the sentiments of Calvin, with respect to the eucharist, were almost the same with those of the catholics.* The truth of the matter is, that the obscurity and inconsistency with which this great man expressed himself upon that subject, render it extremely difficult to give a clear and accurate account of his doctrine.

☞ * How it could come into the heads of such men as Bossuet and Dr. Courayer to say, that "the sentiments of Calvin concerning the eucharist were almost the same with those of the catholics," is, indeed, strange enough. The doctrine of transubstantiation was to Calvin an invincible obstacle to any sort of conformity between him and Rome on that subject; for, however obscure and figurative his expressions with respect to Christ's spiritual presence in the eucharist may have been, he never once dreamed of any thing like a corporal presence in that holy sacrament.

Scotland. The Swiss remained firm in their opposition; they would not suffer the form of ecclesiastical government, that had once been established under the inspection of Zuingle, to be changed in any respect, nor the power of the civil magistrate, in religious matters, to receive the smallest prejudice. The other two points were long debated, even in Switzerland, with the greatest warmth. Several churches, more especially those of Zurich and Bern, maintained obstinately the doctrine of Zuingle concerning the eucharist;[a] and they could not be easily persuaded to admit, as an article of faith, the doctrine of predestination, as it had been taught by Calvin.[b] The prudence, however, of this great man, seconded by his resolute perseverance and his extraordinary credit, triumphed at length so far, as to bring about an union between the Swiss churches and that of Geneva, first in relation to the doctrine of the eucharist,[c] and afterwards also on the subject of predestination.[d] The followers of Calvin extended still farther the triumphs of their chief, and improved with such success the footing he had gained, that, in process of time, almost all the reformed churches adopted his theological system; a result to which, no doubt, his learned writings greatly contributed.[e]

XIV. It will not be improper to pass in review the different countries in which the doctrine and discipline of the reformed church, as modelled by Calvin, were established in a fixed and permanent manner. Among its chief patrons in Germany we may reckon Frederic III. elector Palatine, who, in 1560, removed from their pastoral functions the Lutheran doctors, and filled their places with Calvinists; and, at the same time, obliged his subjects to embrace the tenets, rites, and institutions of the church of Geneva.[f] This order was indeed abrogated, in 1576, by his son and successor Louis, who restored Lutheranism to its former credit and authority. The effects of this revolution were, however, transitory; for, in 1583, under the government of the elector John Casimir, who had followed the example of his brother Frederic in embracing the discipline of the reformed church, Calvinism resumed what it had lost, and became triumphant.[g] From this period the church of the Palatinate obtained the second place among the reformed churches; and its influence and reputation were so considerable, that the form of instruction, which was composed for its use by Ursinus, and which is known under the title of the *Catechism of Heidelberg*, was almost universally adopted by the Calvinists.[h] The republic of Bremen embraced, also, the same doctrine and institutions. Albert Hardenberg, the intimate friend of Melancthon, was the first who attempted to introduce there the doctrine of Calvin concerning the eucharist. This attempt he made so early as the year 1556; and, though a powerful opposition rendered it at that time unsuccessful, and procured the expulsion of its author from the city of Bremen, yet the latent seeds of Calvinism took root, and, toward the conclusion of this century, acquired such strength, that no measures either of prudence or force were sufficient to prevent the church of Bremen from regulating its faith, worship, and government, by that of Geneva.[i] The various motives that engaged other German states to adopt by degrees the same sentiments, and the incidents and circumstances that favoured the progress of Calvinism in the empire, must be sought in those writers, who have undertaken to give an ample and complete history of the Christian church.

XV. Those among the French, who first renounced the jurisdiction and doctrine of the church of Rome, are commonly called Lutherans by the writers of these early times. This denomination, joined to other circumstances, induced some to imagine, that these French converts to the protestant cause were attached to the tenets of the Lutheran church, and averse to those of the Swiss divines.[k] But this is by no means a just representation of the matter. It appears much more probable, that the first French protestants were uniform in nothing but their antipathy to the church of Rome, and that, this point being excepted, there was a great variety in their religious sentiments. It is, however, to be observed, that the vicinity of Geneva, Lausanne, and other cities which had adopted the doctrine of Calvin, together with the incredible zeal of this eminent man, and his two colleagues Farel and Beza, in nourishing the opposition to the church of Rome and augmenting both the indignation and number of its enemies, produced a very remarkable effect upon the French churches; for, before the middle of this century, they all entered into the bonds of fraternal communion with the church of Geneva. The French protestants were called by their enemies Huguenots, by way of derision and contempt; the origin, however, of this denomination is extremely uncertain.[l] Their fate was severe; the storms of persecution assailed them with unparalleled fury; and, though many princes of the royal blood,

[a] See Fueslini Centur. Epistolar. p. 264.—Museum Helvet. tom. i. p. 490. tom. v. p. 479, 483. tom. ii. p. 79.

[b] Beside Ruchat and Hottinger, see Museum Helveticum, tom. ii.—Gerdes, Miscellan. Groningens. Nova, tom. ii.

[c] This agreement was concluded in 1549, for one point; and in 1554 for the other.

[d] See the Consensus Genev. et Tigurinor. in Calvini Opuscul's.

[e] The learned Dan. Ern. Jablonsky, in his Letters to Leibni z, published by Kappius, maintains (p. 24, 41,) that the opinion of Zuingle has no longer any patrons among the reformed. But this is a palpable mistake: for its patrons and defenders are, on the contrary, extremely numerous; and at this very time the doctrine of Zuingle is received in England, Switzerland, and other countries, and seems to acquire new degrees of credit from day to day.

[f] Hen. Altingii Hist. Eccl. Palat. in Lud. Chr. Miegii Monum. Palat. tom. i. p. 223. Loscheri Historia Motuum, par. ii. lib. iv. cap. iv. p. 125.—Salig, Hist. Confession. Aug. tom. iii. lib. ix. cap. v. p. 433.

[g] Alting. loc. cit.—Loscheri Hist. par. iii. lib. vi. p. 324.—See also a German work, by Goth. Struvius, entitled Pfaelzische Kirchen Historie, p. 110.

[h] For an account of the catechism of Heidelberg, see Kocheri Bibliotheca Theologiæ Symbolicæ, p. 593 and 308.

[i] Salig, loc. cit. par. iii. lib. x. cap. v. p. 715. cap. vi. p. 776.—Loscherus, loc. cit. par. ii. lib. iv. cap. v. p. 134. par. iii. lib. vi. cap. vii. p. 276.—Gerdes, Historia, Renovati Evangeliii, tom. iii. p. 157.

[k] Losch. par. ii. cap. vi.—Salig, tom. ii. lib. v. cap. vi.

☞ [l] Some etymologists suppose this term derived from *Huguon*, a word used in Touraine, to signify "persons who walk at night in the streets;" and as the first Protestants, like the first Christians, may have chosen that season for their religious assemblies, through the fear of persecution, the nickname of *huguenot* may, naturally enough, have been applied to them by their enemies. Others are of opinion, that it was derived from a French and faulty pronunciation of the German word *eidgenossen*, which signifies *confederates*, and had been originally the name of that valiant part of the city of Geneva which entered into an alliance with the Swiss cantons, in order to maintain their liberties against the tyrannical attempts of Charles III. duke of Savoy. These confederates were called *egnotes*; and thence, very probably, was derived the word *huguenot*, now under consideration. The count de Villars, in a letter written to the king of France from the province of Languedoc, where he was lieutenant-general, and dated the 11th of November, 1560, calls the riotous Calvinists of the Cevennes, *Huguenots*; and this is the first time that the term is found in the registers of that province, applied to the protestants.

and the flower of the nobility, adopted their sentiments, and stood forth in their cause,[a] no other part of the reformed church suffered so grievously as they did for the sake of religion. Even the peace, which they obtained from Henry III. in 1576, was the source of that civil war, in which the powerful and ambitious house of Guise, instigated by the sanguinary suggestions of the Roman pontiffs, aimed at nothing less than the extirpation of the royal family, and the utter ruin of the protestant religion; while the Huguenots, on the other hand, headed by leaders of the most heroic valour and the most illustrious rank, combated for their religion and for their sovereigns with various success. These dreadful commotions, in which both the contending parties committed such deeds as are yet (and always will be) remembered with horror, were at length calmed by the fortitude and prudence of Henry IV. This monarch, indeed, sacrificed the dictates of conscience to the suggestions of policy; and imagining, that his government could have no stable or solid foundation, as long as he persisted in disowning the authority and jurisdiction of Rome, he renounced the reformed religion, and made a solemn and public profession of popery. Perceiving, however, on the other hand, that it was not possible to extirpate or suppress entirely the protestant religion, he granted to its professors, by the famous edict promulgated at Nantes in 1598, the liberty of serving God according to their consciences,[b] and a full security for the enjoyment of their civil rights and privileges, without persecution or molestation from any quarter.[c]

XVI. The church of Scotland acknowledges as its founder John Knox, the disciple of Calvin; and, accordingly, from its first reformation, it adopted the doctrine, rites, and form of ecclesiastical government established at Geneva. To these it has always adhered with the utmost uniformity, and has maintained them with the greatest jealousy and zeal; so that even in the last century the designs of those who attempted to introduce certain changes into its discipline and worship, were publicly opposed by the force of arms.[d]

A quite different constitution is observable in the church of England, which could never be brought to an entire compliance with the ecclesiastical laws of Geneva, and which retained, but for a short time, even those which it adopted. It is well known, that the greatest part of those English, who first threw off the yoke of Rome, seemed much more inclined to the sentiments of Luther concerning the eucharist, the form of public worship, and ecclesiastical government, than to those of the Swiss churches. But the scene changed after the death of Henry VIII. when, by the industrious zeal of Calvin, and his disciples, more especially Peter Martyr, the cause of Lutheranism lost ground considerably; and the universities, schools, and churches, became the oracles of Calvinism, which also acquired new votaries among the people from day to day.[e] Hence it happened, that, when it was proposed, in the reign of Edward VI., to give a fixed and stable form to the doctrine and discipline of the church, Geneva was acknowledged as a sister church; and the theological system, there established by Calvin, was adopted, and rendered the public rule of faith in England. This, however, was done without any change of the form of episcopal government, which had already taken place, and was entirely different from that of Geneva; nor was this step attended with any alteration of several religious ceremonies, which were looked upon as superstitious by the greatest part of the reformed. This difference, however, between the churches, though it appeared at first of little consequence, and, in the judgment even of Calvin, was deemed an object of toleration and indulgence, was nevertheless, in succeeding times, a source of dissensions and calamities, which were highly detrimental both to the civil and ecclesiastical constitution of Great Britain.

XVII. The origin of these unhappy dissensions, which it has not yet been possible entirely to heal, must be sought in the conduct of those persecuted fugitives, who, to save their lives, their families, and their fortunes, from the sanguinary rage and inhuman tyranny of Queen Mary, left their native country in 1554, and took refuge in Germany.[f] Of these fugitive congregations some performed divine worship with the rites that had been authorized by Edward VI., while others preferred the Swiss method of worship as more recommendable on account of its purity and simplicity. The former were called *Conformists*, on account of their compliance with the ecclesiastical laws enacted by that prince; and the denominations of *Nonconformists* and *Puritans* were given to the latter, from their insisting upon a form of worship, more exempt from superstition, and of a more pure kind, than the liturgy of

[a] See the Histoire Eccles. des Eglises Reformées au Royaume de France, published at Antwerp in 1580, and supposed by many to have been written by Beza. The writers that have given the best accounts of the French reformed churches, their confession of faith, and their forms of worship and discipline, are enumerated by Kocher, in his Biblioth. Theolog. Symbolicæ, p. 299.

☞ [b] This edict restored and confirmed, in the fullest terms, all the favours that had ever been granted to the protestants by other princes, and particularly by Henry III. To these privileges some were added, which had never been granted or even demanded before; such as a free admission to all employments of trust, honour, and profit; the establishment of courts and chambers, in which the professors of the two religions were equal in number; and the permitting of the children of protestants to be educated, without any molestation or constraint, in the public universities.

[c] Benoit, Histoire de l'Edit de Nantes, tom. i. lib. v. p. 200.—Daniel, Hist. de France, tom. ix. page 409. Boulay, Hist. Academ. Paris. tom. vi.

[d] Salig, Hist. Aug. Confessionis. part ii. lib. vi. cap. i. p. 403.—☞ Dr. Mosheim alludes, in this passage, to the attempts made in the reign of Charles II. to introduce episcopacy into Scotland.

[e] Loscher, par. ii. lib. iii. cap. vii.—Salig, tom. ii. lib. vi. cap. iii.

☞ [f] I cannot help mentioning the uncharitableness of the Lutherans, upon this occasion, who hated these unhappy exiles because they were *Sacramentarians*, (for so the Lutherans called those who denied Christ's bodily presence in the eucharist,) and expelled from their cities such of the English protestants as repaired to them, as a refuge from popish superstition and persecution. Such as sought an asylum in France, Geneva, and those parts of Switzerland and Germany where the Reformation had taken place, and where Lutheranism was not professed, were received with great humanity, and allowed to have places of public worship. But it was at Frankfort that the exiles were most numerous; and there began the contest and division which gave rise to that separation from the church of England, which continues to this day. It is, however, a piece of justice due to the memory of the excellent Melancthon, to observe, that he warmly condemned this uncharitable treatment, and more especially the indecent reproaches which the Lutherans cast upon the English martyrs who had sealed the Reformation, whom they called the *Devil's martyrs*. "Vociferantur quidam, (says this amiable reformer,) Martyres Angelicos esse Martyres Diaboli. Nolim hac contumeliâ afficere sanctum spiritum in Latimero, qui annum octogesimum egressus fuit, et in aliis sanctis viris quos novi." These are the words of this truly Christian reformer, in one of his letters to Camerarius, Epist. lib. iv. p. 959; and in another of his letters, speaking of the burning of Burgius at Paris, he thus severely censures Westphal's intolerant principles: "Tales viros ait Westphalus esse Diaboli Martyres. Hanc judicii perversitatem quis non detestetur?" Ep. lib. ii. p. 387. Such were the humane and liberal sentiments of Melancthon, which have rendered his name so precious to the lovers of piety, probity, and moderation, while the zealots of his own church have treated his memory with obloquy, and composed dissertations *de indifferentismo Melancthonis*.

Edward seemed to them to be. The controversy concerning the ceremonial part of divine worship that had divided these protestants when they were in exile, changed scenes, and was removed with them to England, when the auspicious accession of Elizabeth to the throne permitted them to return to their native country. The hopes of enjoying liberty, and of promoting their respective systems, increased their contests instead of diminishing them; nd the breach was widened to such a degree, that the most sagacious and provident observers of things seemed to despair of seeing it healed. The wise queen, in her design to accomplish the reformation of the church, was fully resolved not to confine herself to the model exhibited by the protestants of Geneva, and by their adherents the Puritans; and, therefore, she recommended to the attention and imitation of the doctors, who were employed in this weighty and important matter, the practice and institutions of the primitive ages.[a] When her plan was put in execution, and the face of the church was changed and reformed by new rules of discipline, and purer forms of public worship, the famous *Act of Uniformity* was issued forth, by which all her subjects were commanded to observe these rules, and to submit to the reformation of the church on the footing on which it was now placed by the queen, as its supreme visible head upon earth. The Puritans refused their assent to these proceedings; pleaded the dictates of their consciences in behalf of this refusal; and complained heavily, that the gross superstitions of popery, which they had looked upon as abrogated and abolished, were now revived, and even imposed by authority. They were not indeed all equally exasperated against the new constitution of the church; nor did they in effect carry their opposition to equal degrees of excess. The more violent demanded the total abrogation of all that had been done toward the establishment of a national religion, and required nothing less than that the church of England should be exactly modelled after that of Geneva. The milder and more moderate Puritans were much more equitable in their demands, and only desired liberty of conscience, with the privilege of celebrating divine worship in their own way. The queen did not judge it proper to grant to either the object of their requests; but, rather intent upon the suppression of this troublesome sect, (as she called it,) permitted its enemies to employ for that purpose all the resources of artifice, and all the severity of the laws. Thus was that form of religion established in Britain, which separated the English equally from the church of Rome, on the one hand, and from the other churches that had renounced popery on the other; but which, at the same time, laid a perpetual foundation for dissensions and feuds, in that otherwise happy and prosperous nation.[b]

XVIII. The incident that gave rise to these unhappy divisions, which were productive of so many and such dreadful calamities, was a matter of very small moment, that did not seem to affect, in any way, the interests of true religion and virtue. The chief leaders among the Puritans entertained a strong aversion to the vestments worn by the English clergy in the celebration of divine worship. As these habits had been used in the times of popery, and seemed to renew the impressions that had been made upon the people by the Romish priests, they appeared to the Puritans in no other light than as the ensigns of Anti-Christ. The spirit of opposition, being once set on foot, proceeded, in its remonstrances, to matters of superior moment. The form of ecclesiastical government, established in England, was one of the first and main grievances of which the Puritans complained. They looked upon this form as quite different from that which had been instituted by Christ, the great lawgiver of the church; and, in conformity with the sentiments of Calvin, maintained, that, by the divine law, all the ministers of the Gospel were absolutely equal in point of rank and authority. They did not indeed think it unlawful, that a person distinguished by the title of bishop, or superintendant, should preside in the assembly of the clergy, for the sake of maintaining order and decency in their method of proceeding; but they deemed it incongruous and absurd, that the persons invested with this character should be ranked, as the bishops had hitherto been, among the nobility of the kingdom, employed in civil and political affairs, and distinguished so eminently by their worldly opulence and power. This controversy was not carried on, however, with excessive animosity and zeal, as long as the English bishops pretended to derive their dignity and authority from no other source than the laws of their country, and pleaded a right, purely human, to the rank they held in church and state. But the flame broke out with redoubled fury in 1588, when Bancroft, afterwards archbishop of Canterbury, ventured to assert, that the episcopal order was superior to the body of presbyters, not in consequence of any human institution, but by the express appointment of God himself.[c] This doctrine was readily adopted by many, and the consequences that seemed naturally to flow from it in favour of episcopal ordination, happened in effect, and gave new fuel to the flame.

☞ [a] Dr. Mosheim seems disposed, by this ambiguous expression of the primitive ages, to insinuate that queen Elizabeth had formed a pure, rational, and evangelical plan of religious discipline and worship. It is however certain, that, instead of being willing to strip religion of the ceremonies which remained in it, she was rather inclined to bring the public worship still nearer to the Romish ritual,* and had a great propensity to several usages in the church of Rome, which were justly looked upon as superstitious. She thanked publicly one of her chaplains, who had preached in defence of the "real presence;" she was fond of images, and retained some in her private chapel; and would undoubtedly have forbidden the marriage of the clergy, if Cecil, her secretary, had not interposed.† Having appointed a committee of divines to review king Edward's liturgy, she gave them an order to strike out all offensive passages against the pope, and to make people easy about the corporal presence of Christ in the sacrament.‡

[b] No writer has treated this part of the ecclesiastical history of Britain in a more ample and elegant manner than Daniel Neal, in his History of the Puritans, or Protestant Nonconformists. The first part of this laborious work was published at London, in 1732, and the latter part in 1738. The author, who was himself a non-conformist, has not indeed been able to impose silence so far on the warm and impetuous spirit of party, as not to discover a certain degree of partiality in favour of his brethren: for, while he relates, in the most circumstantial manner, all the injuries the Puritans received from the bishops, and those of the established religion, he in many places diminishes, excuses, or suppresses, the faults and failings of these separatists. See also, for an account of the religious history of these times, Strype's Lives of the Archbishops Parker, Grindal, and Whitgift.

[c] See Strype's Life and Acts of John Whitgift, archbishop of Canterbury, p. 121. ☞ The first English reformers admitted but two orders of church officers to be of divine appointment, viz. bishops and deacons; a presbyter and a bishop, according to them, being merely two names for the same office; but Dr. Bancroft, in a sermon preached at Paul's cross, (January 12, 1588,) maintained, that the bishops of England were a distinct order from priests, and had superiority over them *jure divino.*

* Heylin, p. 124.

† Strype's Life of Parker, p. 107.

‡ Neal's Hist. of the Puritans, vol. i. p. 138.

of controversy; for they who embraced the sentiments of Bancroft, considered all ministers of the Gospel, who had not received ordination from a bishop, as not properly invested with the sacred character, and also maintained that the clergy, in those countries where there were no bishops, were destitute of the gifts and qualifications that were necessary to the exercise of the pastoral office, and were to be deemed inferior to the Roman catholic priests.

XIX. All these things exasperated the puritans whose complaints, however, were not confined to the objects already mentioned. There were many circumstances that entered into their plan of reformation. They had a singular antipathy against cathedral churches, and demanded the abolition of the archdeacons, deans, canons, and other officials, that are supported by their lands and revenues. They disapproved the pompous manner of worship that is generally observed in these churches, and looked, particularly, upon instrumental music, as improperly employed in the service of God. The severity of their zeal was also very great; for they were of opinion, that not only open profligates, but even persons whose piety was dubious, deserved to be excluded from the communion of the church:[a] and they endeavoured to justify the rigour of this decision, by observing, that, as the church was the congregation of the faithful, nothing was more incumbent on its ministers and rulers, than to guard against its being defiled by the presence of persons destitute of true faith and piety. They found, moreover, much subject of affliction and complaint in the ceremonies that were imposed by the queen's order, and by the authority of her council.[b] Among these were the festivals or holydays that were celebrated in honour of the saints, the use of the sign of the cross, more especially in the sacrament of baptism, the nomination of godfathers and godmothers as sureties for the education of children, whose parents were still living,[c] and the doctrine relating to the validity of lay baptism.[d] They disliked the reading of the apocryphal books in the church; and, with respect to set forms of prayer, although they did not go so far as to insist upon their being entirely abolished, yet they pleaded for a right to all ministers, of modifying, correcting, and using them in such a manner, as might tend most to the advancement of true piety, and of addressing the Deity in such terms as were suggested by their inward feelings, instead of those which were dictated by others. In a word, they were of opinion, that the government and discipline of the church of England ought to have been modelled after the ecclesiastical laws and institutions of Geneva, and that no indulgence was to be shown to those ceremonies or practices, which bore the smallest resemblance to the discipline or worship of the church of Rome.

XX. These sentiments, considered in themselves, seemed neither susceptible of a satisfactory defence, nor of a complete refutation. Their solidity or falsehood depended upon the principles from which they were derived; and no regular controversy could be carried on upon these matters, until the contending parties adopted some common and evident principles, by which they might corroborate their respective systems. It is only by an examination of these, that it can be known on which side the truth lies, and what degree of utility or importance can be attributed to a contest of this nature. The principles laid down by the queen's commissioners on the one hand, and the Puritans on the other, were indeed very different.

For, in the first place, the former maintained, that the right of reformation, that is, the privilege of removing the corruptions, and of correcting the errors that might have been introduced into the doctrine, discipline, or worship of the church, was lodged in the sovereign, or civil magistrate alone; while the latter denied, that the power of the magistrate extended so far, and maintained, that it was rather the business of the clergy to restore religion to its native dignity and lustre. This was the opinion of Calvin, as has been already observed.

☞ [a] The puritans justified themselves in relation to this point, in a letter addressed from their prison to queen Elizabeth, in 1592, by observing, that their sentiments concerning the persons subject to excommunication, and also with regard to the effects and extent of that act of church discipline, were conformable to those of all the reformed churches, and to the doctrine and practice of the church of England in particular. They declared more especially, that, according to their sense of things, the censure of excommunication deprived only of spiritual privileges and comforts, without taking away either liberty, goods, lands, government private or public, or any other civil or earthly commodity of this life; and thus they distinguished themselves from those furious and fanatical anabaptists, who had committed such disorders in Germany, and some of whom were now making a noise in England.

☞ [b] By this council our author means, the High-Commission court, of which it is proper to give some account, as its proceedings essentially belong to the ecclesiastical history of England. This court took its rise from a remarkable clause in the act of supremacy, by which the queen and her successors were empowered to choose persons "to exercise, under her, all manner of jurisdiction, privileges, and pre-eminences, touching any spiritual or ecclesiastical jurisdiction within the realms of England and Ireland, as also to visit, reform, redress, order, correct, and amend, all errors, heresies, schisms, abuses, contempts, offences and enormities whatsoever; provided that they have no power to determine any thing to be heresy, but what has been adjudged to be so by the authority of the canonical scripture, or by the first four general councils, or any of them; or by any other general council, wherein the same was declared heresy by the express and plain words of canonical scripture, or such as shall hereafter be declared to be heresy by the high court of parliament, with the assent of the clergy in convocation." Upon the authority of this clause, the queen appointed a certain number of commissioners for ecclesiastical causes, who, in many instances, abused their power. The court they composed, was called *the Court of High Commission*, because it claimed a more extensive jurisdiction, and higher powers, than the ordinary courts of the bishops. Its jurisdiction reached over the whole kingdom, and was much the same with that which had been lodged in the single person of lord Cromwell, vicar-general of Henry VIII. These commissioners were empowered to make inquiry, not only by the legal methods of juries, and witnesses, but by all other ways and means which they could devise, that is, by rack, torture, inquisition, and imprisonment. They were invested with a right to examine such persons as they suspected, by administering to them an oath, (not allowed in their commission, and therefore called *ex officio*,) by which they were required to answer all questions, and thereby might be obliged to accuse themselves or their most intimate friends. The fines they imposed were merely discretionary; the imprisonment to which they condemned was limited by no rule but their own pleasure; they imposed, when they thought proper, new articles of faith on the clergy, and practised all the iniquities and cruelties of a real inquisition. See Rapin's and Hume's History of England, and Neal's History of the Puritans.

☞ [c] Other rites and customs displeasing to the puritans, and omitted by our author, were, kneeling at the sacrament of the Lord's supper, bowing at the name of Jesus, giving the ring in marriage, the prohibition of marriage during certain times of the year, and the licensing of it for money, as also the confirmation of children by episcopal imposition of hands.

☞ [d] The words of the original are "nec sacris Christianis pueros recens natos ab aliis, quam sacerdotibus, initiari patiebantur." The Roman catholics, who look upon the external rite of baptism as absolutely necessary to salvation, consequently allow it to be performed by a layman, or a midwife, where a clergyman is not at hand, or (if such a ridiculous thing may be mentioned) by a surgeon, where a still birth is apprehended. The church of England, though it teacheth in general, that none ought to baptize but men dedicated to the service of God, yet doth not deem null baptism performed by laics or women, because it makes a difference between what is essential to a sacrament, and what is requisite to the regular way of using it. The puritans, that they might neither prescribe, nor even connive at a practice that seemed to be founded on the absolute necessity of infant baptism, would allow that sacred rite to be performed by the clergy alone.

Secondly, the queen's commissioners maintained, that the rules of proceeding, in reforming the doctrine or discipline of the church, were not to be derived from the sacred writings alone, but also from the writings and decisions of the fathers in the primitive ages. The Puritans, on the contrary, affirmed, that the inspired word of God being the pure and only fountain of wisdom and truth, it was thence alone that the rules and directions were to be drawn, which were to guide the measures of those who undertook to purify the faith, or to rectify the discipline and worship, of the church; and that the ecclesiastical institutions of the early ages, as also the writings of the ancient doctors, were absolutely destitute of all authority.

Thirdly, the commissioners ventured to assert, that the church of Rome was a true church, though corrupt and erroneous in many points of doctrine and government; that the pontiff, though chargeable with temerity and arrogance in assuming to himself the title and jurisdiction of head of the whole church, was, nevertheless, to be esteemed a true and lawful bishop; and, consequently, that the ministers ordained by him were qualified for performing the pastoral duties. This was a point which the English bishops thought it absolutely necessary to maintain, since they could not otherwise claim the honour of deriving their dignities, in an uninterrupted line of succession, from the apostles. But the Puritans entertained very different notions of this matter; they considered the Romish hierarchy as a system of political and spiritual tyranny, that had justly forfeited the title and privileges of a true church; they looked upon its pontiff as Anti-Christ, and its discipline as vain, superstitious, idolatrous, and diametrically opposite to the injunctions of the Gospel; and, in consequence of these sentiments, they renounced its communion, and regarded all approaches to its discipline and worship as highly dangerous to the cause of true religion.

Fourthly, the commissioners considered, as the best and most perfect form of ecclesiastical government, that which took place during the first four or five centuries; they even preferred it to that which had been instituted by the apostles, because, as they alleged, our Saviour and his apostles had accommodated the form, mentioned in Scripture, to the feeble and infant state of the church, and left it to the wisdom and discretion of future ages to modify it in such a manner as might be suitable to the triumphant progress of Christianity, the grandeur of a national establishment, and also to the ends of civil policy. The Puritans asserted, in opposition to this, that the rules of church government were clearly laid down in the Scriptures, the only standard of spiritual discipline;[a] and that the apostles, in establishing the first Christian church on the aristocratic plan that was then observed in the Jewish Sanhedrim, designed it as an unchangeable model, to be followed in all times, and in all places.

Lastly, the court reformers were of opinion, that things *indifferent*, which are neither commanded nor forbidden by the authority of Scripture, such as the external rites of public worship, the kind of vestments that are to be used by the clergy, religious festivals, and the like, might be ordered, determined, and rendered a matter of obligation by the authority of the civil magistrate; and that, in such a case, the violation of his commands would be no less criminal than an act of rebellion against the laws of the state. The Puritans alleged, in answer to this assertion, that it was an indecent prostitution of power to impose, as necessary and indispensable, those things which Christ had left in the class of matters indifferent, since this was a manifest encroachment upon that liberty with which the divine Saviour had indulged us. To this they added, that such ceremonies as had been abused to idolatrous purposes, and had a manifest tendency to revive the impressions of superstition and popery in the minds of men, could by no means be considered as indifferent, but deserved to be rejected without hesitation as impious and profane. Such, in their estimation, were the religious ceremonies of ancient times, whose abrogation was refused by the queen and her council.[b]

XXI. This contest between the commissioners of the court, and those religionists who desired a more complete reformation than had yet taken place, would have been much more dangerous in its consequences, had the party, distinguished by the general denomination of *Puritans*, been united in their sentiments, views, and measures. But the case was quite otherwise; for this large body, composed of persons of different ranks, characters, opinions, and intentions, and unanimous in nothing but their antipathy to the forms of doctrine and discipline that were established by law, was suddenly divided into a variety of sects; of which some spread abroad the delusions of enthusiasm, which had turned their own brains; while others displayed their folly in inventing new and whimsical plans of church government. Of all these sects the most famous was that which was formed, about the year 1581, by Robert Brown, an insinuating man, but very unsettled and inconsistent in his views and notions of things. This innovator did not greatly differ, in point of doctrine, either from the church of England, or from the rest of the Puritans; but he had formed singular notions concerning the nature of the church, and the rules of ecclesiastical government. He was for dividing the whole body of the faithful into separate societies or congregations, not larger than those which were formed by the apostles in the infancy of Christianity; and maintained, that such a number of persons, as could be contained in an ordinary place of worship, ought to be considered as a church, and enjoy all the rights and privileges that are competent to an ecclesiastical community. These small societies he pronounced independent, *jure divino*, and entirely exempt from the jurisdiction of the bishops, in whose hands the court placed the reins of spiritual go-

☞ [a] By this they meant, at least, that nothing should be imposed as necessary, but what was expressly contained in the Scriptures, or deduced from them by necessary consequence. They maintained still farther, that supposing it proved, that all things necessary to the good government of the church could not be deduced from those writings, yet the discretionary power of supplying this defect was not vested in the civil magistrate, but in the spiritual officers of the church.

☞ [b] Dr. Mosheim, in these five articles, has followed the account of this controversy given by Mr. Neal. This writer adds a sixth article, not of debate, but of union. "Both parties (says he) agreed too well in asserting the necessity of an uniformity of public worship, and of calling in the sword of the magistrate for the support and defence of their several principles, which they made an ill use of in their turns, as they could grasp the power into their hands. The standard of uniformity, according to the bishops, was the queen's supremacy, and the laws of the land; according to the puritans, the decrees of provincial and national synods, allowed and enforced by the civil magistrate: but neither party were for admitting that liberty of conscience, and freedom of profession, which is every man's right, as far as is consistent with the peace of the government under which he lives."

vernment; and also from that of synods, which the Puritans in general regarded as the supreme visible sources of ecclesiastical authority. He also maintained, that the power of governing each congregation, and providing for its welfare, resided in the people; and that each member had an equal share in this direction, and an equal right to regulate affairs for the good of the whole society.[a] Hence all points both of doctrine and discipline were submitted to the discussion of the whole congregation, and whatever was supported by a majority of votes passed into a law. It was the congregation also that elected some of the brethren to the office of pastors, to perform the duty of public instruction, and the several branches of divine worship; reserving, however, the power of dismissing these ministers, and reducing them to the condition of private members, whenever such a change should appear to be conducive to the spiritual advantage of the community. For these pastors were not esteemed superior, either in sanctity or rank, to the rest of their brethren, nor distinguished from them by any other circumstance than the liberty of preaching and praying, which they derived from the free will and consent of the congregation. It is, besides, to be observed, that their right of preaching was by no means of an exclusive nature, or peculiar to them alone, since any member that thought proper to exhort or instruct the brethren, was abundantly indulged in the liberty of *prophesying* to the whole assembly. Accordingly, when the ordinary teacher or pastor had finished his discourse, all the other brethren were permitted to communicate in public their sentiments and illustrations upon any useful or edifying subject, on which they supposed they could throw new light. In a word, Brown endeavoured to model the form of the church after the infant community that was founded by the apostles, without once considering the important changes which had taken place since that time, both in the religious and civil state of the world, the influence that these changes must necessarily have upon all ecclesiastical establishments, or the particular circumstances of the Christian church, in consequence of its former corruptions and its late reformation. And, if his notions were crude and chimerical, the zeal, with which he and his associates maintained and propagated them, was intemperate and extravagant in the highest degree; for he affirmed, that all communion was to be broken off with those religious societies which were founded upon a different plan from his, and treated more especially the church of England as a spurious church, whose ministers were unlawfully ordained, whose discipline was popish and antichristian, and whose sacraments and institutions were destitute of all efficacy and virtue. The sect of this hot-headed innovator, not being able to endure the severe treatment which their opposition to the established forms of religious government and worship had drawn upon them, from an administration that was not distinguished by its mildness and indulgence, retired into the Netherlands, and founded churches at Middleburg, Amsterdam, and Leyden; but their establishments were neither solid nor durable.[b] Their founder returned into England, and, having renounced his principles of separation, took orders in the established church, and obtained a benefice.[c] The Puritan exiles, whom he thus abandoned, disagreed among themselves, and split into parties; and their affairs declined from day to day.[d] This engaged the wiser part of them to mitigate the severity of their founder's plan, and to soften the rigour of his uncharitable decisions; and hence arose the community of the *Independents*, or *Congregational Brethren;* a sect which still subsists, and of which an account shall be given in the history of the following century.

XXII. In the Belgic provinces, the friends of the Reformation seemed for a long time uncertain, whether they should embrace the communion of the Swiss or that of the Lutheran church. Each of these had zealous friends and powerful patrons.[e] The matter was, nevertheless, decided in 1571, and the religious system of Calvin was publicly adopted; for the Belgic confession of faith, which then appeared,[f] was drawn up in the spirit, and almost in the terms, of that which was received in the reformed churches of France, and differed considerably, in several respects, from the confession of Augsburg, but more especially in the article relating to Christ's presence in the eucharist.[g] This will not appear surprising to those who consider the vicinity of the French to the Low-Countries, the number of French protestants constantly passing or sojourning there, the extraordinary reputation of Calvin and of the college of Geneva, and the indefatigable zeal of his disciples in extending the limits of their church, and propagating throughout Europe their system of doctrine, discipline, and government. Be that as it may from this period, the Dutch, who had before been denominated *Lutherans*, assumed universally the title of *Reformed*, in which also they imitated the French, by whom this title had been first invented and adopted. It is true, that, as long as they were subject to the Spanish yoke, the fear of exposing themselves to the displeasure of their sovereign induced them to avoid the title of *Reformed*, and to call themselves *Associates of the Brethren of the Confession of Augsburg;* for the Lutherans were esteemed, by the Spanish court, much better subjects than the disciples of Calvin, who, on account of the tumults which had lately prevailed in France, were supposed to have a greater propensity to mutiny and sedition.[h]

☞ [a] It is farther to be observed, that, according to this system, one church was not entitled to exercise jurisdiction over another; but each might give the other counsel or admonition, if its members walked in a disorderly manner, or abandoned the capital truths of religion; and, if the offending church did not receive the admonition, the others were allowed to disown it publicly as a church of Christ. On the other hand, the powers of the church-officers were confined within the narrow limits of their own society. The pastor of the church might not administer the sacrament of baptism, or the Lord's supper, to any but those of his own communion.

☞ [b] The British churches at Amsterdam and Middleburg are incorporated into the national Dutch church, and their pastors are members of the Dutch synod, which is sufficient to show that there are at this time no traces of Brownism or Independency in these churches. The church at Leyden, where Robinson had fixed the standard of independency, about the year 1595, was dispersed; and it is very remarkable, that some members of this church, transplanting themselves into America, laid the foundation of the colony of New-England.

☞ [c] Brown, in his new preferment, forgot not only the rigour of his principles, but also the gravity of his former morals; for he led a very idle and dissolute life. See Neal's History of the Puritans, vol. i.

[d] Neal, vol. i. chap. vi.—Hoornbeckii Summa Controvers. lib. x. p. 738.—Fuller's Ecclesiastical History of Britain, book x.

[e] Loscher, par. iii. lib. v. cap. iv.

[f] Kocheri Biblioth. Theolog. Symbolicæ, p. 216.

[g] See Brandt's His. of the Netherlands (written in Dutch,) vol. i. book v

☞ [h] Dr. Mosheim advances this on the authority of a passage in Brandt's History of the Reformation, which is a most curious and valuable work, notwithstanding the author's partiality to the cause of Arminianism, of which he was one of the most respectable patrons.

XXIII. The light of the Reformation was first transmitted from Saxony into Poland by the disciples of Luther. Some time after this happy period, the Bohemian Brethren, whom the Romish clergy had expelled from their country, as also several Helvetic doctors, propagated their sentiments among the Polanders. Some congregrations were also founded in that republic by the Anabaptists, Anti-Trinitarians, and other sectaries.[a] Hence it was, that three distinct communities, each of which adopted the main principles of the Reformation, were to be found in Poland,—the Bohemian Brethren, the Lutherans, and Swiss. These communities, in order to defend themselves with the greater vigour against their common enemies, formed among themselves a kind of confederacy, in a synod held at Sendomir in 1570, on certain conditions, which were comprehended in the Confession of Faith that derives its title from the city now mentioned.[b] But, as this association seemed rather adapted to accelerate the conclusion of peace, than to promote the cause of truth, the points in debate between the Lutherans and the Reformed being expressed in this reconciling confession in vague and ambiguous terms, it was soon after this warmly opposed by many of the former, and was entirely annulled in the following century. Many attempts have, indeed, been made to revive it; but they have not answered the expectations of those who have employed their dexterity and zeal in this matter. In Prussia the Reformed gained ground after the death of Luther and Melancthon, and founded the flourishing churches which still subsist in that country.[c]

XXIV. The Bohemian, or (as they are otherwise called) Moravian Brethren, who descended from the better sort of Hussites, and were distinguished by several religious institutions of a singular nature, which were well adapted to guard their community against the reigning vices and corruptions of the times, had no sooner heard of Luther's design of reforming the church, than they sent deputies, in 1522, to recommend themselves to his friendship and good offices. In succeeding times, they continued to discover the same zealous attachment to the Lutheran churches in Saxony, and also to those which were founded in other countries. These offers could not be well accepted without a previous examination of their religious sentiments and principles: and, indeed, this examination turned to their advantage; for neither Luther nor his disciples found any thing, either in their doctrine or discipline, that was, in any great measure, liable to censure; and though he could not approve every part of their Confession of Faith, which they submitted to his judgment, yet he looked upon it as an object of toleration and indulgence.[d] Nevertheless, the death of Luther, and the expulsion of these Brethren from their country in 1547, gave a new turn to their religious connexions; and great numbers of them, more especially of those who retired into Poland, embraced the religious sentiments and discipline of the Reformed. The attachment of the Bohemians to the Lutherans seemed, indeed, to be revived by the Convention of Sendomir; but, as the articles of union, drawn up in that assembly, soon lost all their force and authority, all the Bohemians gradually entered into the communion of the Swiss church.[e] This union was at first formed on the express condition, that the two churches should continue to be governed by their respective laws and institutions, and should have separate places of public worship; but, in the following century, all remains of dissension were removed in the synods holden at Ostrog in 1620 and 1627, and the two congregations were formed into one, under the title of The Church of the United Brethren. In this coalition the reconciled parties showed to each other reciprocal marks of toleration and indulgence; for the external form of the church was regulated by the discipline of the Bohemian Brethren, and the articles of faith were taken from the creed of the Calvinists.[f]

XXV. The descendants of the Waldenses, who lived shut up in the valleys of Piedmont, were naturally led, by their situation in the neighbourhood of the French, and of the republic of Geneva, to embrace the doctrines and rites of the reformed church. So far down, however, as the year 1630, they retained a considerable part of their ancient discipline and tenets; but the plague that broke out in that year having destroyed the greatest part of this unhappy people, and among the rest a considerable number of their pastors and clergy, they addressed themselves to the French churches for spiritual succour; and the new doctors, who were sent in consequence of that invitation, made several changes in the discipline and doctrine of the Waldenses, and rendered them conformable, in every respect, with those of the protestant churches in France.[g]

The Hungarians and Transylvanians were engaged to renounce the errors and superstitions of the church of Rome by the writings of Luther, and the ministry of his disciples. But, some time after, Matthias Devay, and other doctors, began to introduce, in a secret manner, among these nations, the doctrine of the Swiss churches in relation to the eucharist, as also their principles of ecclesiastical government. This doctrine and these principles were propagated in a more open and public manner about the year 1550, by Szegedin and other Calvinist teachers, whose ministry was attended with remarkable success. This change was followed by the same dissensions that had broken out in other countries on similar occasions; and these dissensions grew into an open schism among the friends of the Reformation in these provinces, which the lapse of time has rather confirmed than diminished.[h]

XXVI. After the solemn publication of the famous Form of Concord, many German churches, of the Lutheran communion, dissolved their original bonds, and

---

[a] Loscher, par. iii. lib. v. cap. iii.—Salig, tom. ii. lib. vi. cap. iii. iv. v.—Regenvolscii Hist. Eccles. Slavonicar. lib. i. cap. xvi.—Solignac, Hist. de Pologne, tom. v.—Kautz, Præcipua Relig. Evangel. in Poloniâ Fata, published at Hamburg, in 1738.

[b] See Dan. Ernest Jablonsky's Historia Consensus Sendomiriensis, published at Berlin, in 1731; as also the Epistola Apologetica of the same author, in defence of the work now mentioned, against the objections of an anonymous author.

[c] Loscher, par. iii. lib. vi. cap. i.

[d] See a German work of Carpzovius, entitled, Nachricht von den Bohmischen Brudern, p. 46; as also Jo. Chr. Kocheri Biblioth. p. 76.

[e] Beside Comenius, Camerarius, and Lasitius, who have written professedly the history of the Bohemian Brethren, see Loscher, par. iii. lib. v. cap. vi.—Salig, tom. ii. lib. vi. cap. iii.—Regenvolsc. lib. i. cap. xiii. xiv. xv.

[f] Regenvolscii Hist. lib. i. cap. xiv. p. 120.

[g] Leger, Histoire Generale des Eglises Vaudoises, livr. i. chap. xxxiii. p. 205, 206.—Abr. Sculeti Annales Renovati Evangelii, p. 294.—Dan. Gerdes, Hist. Renovati Evangelii. tom. ii. p. 401.

[h] Pauli Debrezeni Historia Eccles. Reform. in Hungar. et Transylvan. lib. ii. p. 64, 72, 98.—Unschuld. Nachricht, An. 1738, p. 1076.—Georg. Haneri Historia Eccles. Transylv.

embraced the doctrine and discipline of Calvin. Among these we may place the churches of Nassau, Hanau, and Isenburg, with several others of less note. In 1595, the princes of Anhalt, influenced by the counsels of Wolfgang Amling, renounced also the profession of Lutheranism, and introduced into their dominions the religious tenets and rites of Geneva; this revolution, however, produced a long and warm controversy between the Lutherans and the inhabitants of the principality.[a] The doctrines of the Calvinist or reformed church, particularly those which relate to the eucharist, were also introduced into Denmark, toward the conclusion of this century; for, in this kingdom, the disciples and votaries of Melancthon, who had always discovered a strong propensity to a union between the protestant churches, were extremely numerous, and they had at their head Nicholas Hemmingius, a man eminent for his piety and learning. But the views of this divine, and the schemes of his party, being discovered much sooner than they expected, by the vigilant defenders of the Lutheran cause, their plans were disconcerted,[b] and the progress of Calvinism was successfully opposed by the Lutheran ministers, seconded by the countenance and authority of the sovereign.[c]

XXVII. It must not, however, be imagined, that the different nations which embraced the communion of the Calvinist church, adopted, at the same time, without exception, all its tenets, rites, and institutions. This universal conformity was, indeed, ardently desired by the Helvetic doctors; but their desires, in this respect, were far from being accomplished. The English, as is sufficiently known, rejected the forms of ecclesiastical government and religious worship that were adopted by the other reformed churches, and could not be persuaded to receive, as public and national articles of faith, the doctrines that were propagated in Switzerland, in relation to the sacrament of the Lord's supper and the divine decrees.[d] The protestants in Holland, Bremen, Poland, Hungary, and the Palatinate, followed, indeed, the French and Helvetic churches in their sentiments concerning the eucharist, in the simplicity of their worship, and in their principles of ecclesiastical polity; but not in their notions of *predestination*, which intricate doctrine they left undefined, and submitted to the free examination and private judgment of every individual.[e] It may farther be affirmed, that, before the synod of Dordrecht,[f] no reformed church had obliged its members, by any special law or article of faith, to adhere to the doctrine of the church of Geneva relating to the primary causes of the salvation of the elect, or the ruin of the reprobate. It is true, that, in the countries now mentioned, the greatest part of the reformed doctors fell by degrees, of their own accord, into the Calvinistical opinion concerning these intricate points; and this was principally owing, no doubt, to the great reputation of the college of Geneva, which was generally frequented, in this century, by those among the reformed who were candidates for the ministry.

XXVIII. The books of the Old and New Testament are regarded by the reformed churches as the only sources of Divine Truth; it must however be observed, that, to their authority, the church of England adds that of the writings of the Fathers during the first five centuries.[g] The reformed and the Lutherans agree in maintaining that the Scriptures are infallible in all things; that, in matters of which the knowledge is necessary to salvation, they are clear, and complete; and also that they are to be explained by themselves, and not by the dictates of human reason, or the decisions of the ancient Fathers. Several of the doctors among the former have indeed employed too freely the sagacity of their natural understanding, in explaining the divine mysteries that are contained in the Gospel; and this circumstance has induced many to imagine, that the reformed adopted two sources of religion, two criterions of divine truth, viz. the Scripture and human reason. But perhaps it will be found, that, in this respect, doctors of both communions have sometimes gone too far, being led on by the spirit of controversy, and animated with the desire of victory; for, if we except the singular tenets of some individuals, it may be affirmed with truth, that the Lutherans and the reformed are unanimous in the matter now under consideration. They both maintain, that contradictory propositions cannot be the objects of faith; and consequently that all

[a] See for an account of this matter, the German work of Bechman, which is entitled Historie des Hauses Anhalt, vol. ii. p. 133, and that of Kraft, which bears the title of Ausfuhrliche Historie von dem Exorcismo, p. 428, 497. ☞ Though the princes professed Calvinism, and introduced Calvinist ministers into all the churches, where they had the right of patronage, yet the people were left free in their choice; and the noblemen and their vassals, who were attached to Lutheranism, had secured to them the unrestrained exercise of their religion. By virtue of a convention made in 1679, the Lutherans were permitted to erect new churches. The Zerbst line, and the greatest part of its subjects, profess Lutheranism; but the three other lines, with their respective people, are Calvinists.

[b] Erici Pontoppidani Annal. Ecclesiæ Danicæ Diplomatici, t. iii p. 57.

☞ [c] That is, (for our author consistently with truth can mean no more) the designs, that were formed to render Calvinism the national and established religion, proved abortive. It is certain, however, that Calvinism made a very considerable progress in Denmark, and has still a great number of votaries in that kingdom.

☞ [d] It is true, that the doctrine of Zuingle, who represented the bread and wine as nothing more than the external signs of the death of Christ, was not adopted by the church of England; but the doctrine of Calvin was embraced by that church, and is plainly taught in the xxviiith article of its faith. As to what relates to the doctrine of the divine decrees, Dr. Mosheim is equally in an error. The xviith article of the church of England, is, as bishop Burnet candidly acknowledges, framed according to St. Augustin's doctrine, which scarcely differs at all from that of Calvin; and though it be expressed with a certain latitude that renders it susceptible of a mitigated interpretation, yet it is very probable, that those who penned it were patrons of the doctrine of absolute decrees. The very cautions, that are subjoined to this article, intimate, that Calvinism was what it was meant to establish. It is certain, that the Calvinistical doctrine of predestination prevailed among the first English reformers, the greatest part of whom were, at least, *Sublapsarians:* in the reign of queen Elizabeth this doctrine was predominant, but after that period it lost ground imperceptibly, and was renounced by the church of England in the reign of king Charles I. Some members of that church still adhered, nevertheless, to the tenets of Calvin, and maintained, not only that the thirty-nine articles were Calvinistical, but also affirmed that they were not susceptible of that latitude of interpretation for which the Arminians contended. These episcopal votaries of Calvinism were called *Doctrinal Puritans.* See Burnet's Exposition of the Seventeenth Article, &c., and Neal's History of the Puritans, vol. i. p. 579.

[e] See Grotii Apologet. eorum, qui Hollandiæ ante mutationem, An. 1618, præfuerunt, cap. iii.

☞ [f] It was in this famous synod, that was assembled in the year 1618, and of which we shall have occasion to give a more ample account in the history of the following century, that the doctrine of Calvin was fixed as the national and established religion of the Seven United Provinces.

☞ [g] There is nothing in the thirty-nine articles of the church of England, which implies its considering the writings of the Fathers of the first five centuries, as an authoritative criterion of religious truth. There is, indeed, a clause in the Act of Uniformity, passed in the reign of queen Elizabeth, delaring that her delegates, in ecclesiastical matters, should not determine any thing to be heresy but what was adjudged so by the authority of Scripture, or by the first four general councils; and this has perhaps misled Dr. Mosheim in the passage to which this note refers. Much respect, indeed, (perhaps too much,) has been paid to the Fathers; but that has been always a matter of choice, and not of obligation.

doctrines which contain such ideas and notions as are repugnant to and destroy each other, must be false and incredible. It is true, indeed, that the reformed sometimes use this principle in a contentious manner, to overturn certain points of the Lutheran system, which they have thought proper to reject.[a]

XXIX. The reformed, if by this denomination we understand those who embrace the sentiments of Calvin, differ entirely from the Lutherans in the following points:

1st, In their notions of the sacrament of the Lord's Supper. The Lutherans affirm that the body and blood of Christ are materially present in this sacrament, though in an incomprehensible manner; and that they are really exhibited, both to the righteous and the wicked, to the worthy and to the unworthy receiver. The reformed hold, on the contrary, that the man Christ is only present in this ordinance by the external signs of bread and wine, though it must, at the same time, be observed, that this matter is differently explained and represented in the writings of their theologians.

2dly, In their doctrine of the eternal decrees of God, respecting man's salvation. The Lutherans maintain, that the divine decrees respecting the salvation or misery of men are founded upon a previous knowledge of their sentiments and characters; or, in other words, that God, foreseeing from all eternity the faith or incredulity of different persons, had reserved eternal happiness for the faithful, and eternal misery for the unbelieving and disobedient. The reformed entertained different sentiments concerning this intricate point. They consider the divine decrees as free and unconditional, and as founded on the will of God, which is limited by no superior order, and which is above all laws.

3dly, Concerning some religious rites and institutions, which the Reformed consider as bordering upon superstition, or tending, at least, to promote it, while the Lutherans view them in another light, and represent all of them as tolerable, and some of them as useful. Such are, the use of images in the churches, the distinguishing vestments of the clergy, the private confession of sins, the use of wafers in the administration of the Lord's supper, the form of exorcism in the celebration of baptism, and other ceremonies of like moment. The reformed doctors insist on the abolition of all these rites and institutions, upon this general principle, that the discipline and worship of the Christian church ought to be restored to their primitive simplicity, and freed from the human inventions and additions that were employed by superstition in the times of ignorance, to render them more striking to the deluded multitude.

XXX. The few heads of difference, between the two communions, which have been now briefly pointed out, have furnished an inexhaustible fund of controversy to the contending parties, and been drawn out into a multitude of intricate questions, and subjects of debate, that, by consequences, fairly or injudiciously deduced, have widened the scene of contention, and extended to almost all the important truths of religion. Thus the debate concerning the manner in which the body and blood of Christ are present in the eucharist, opened to the disputants a large field of inquiry; in which the nature and fruits of the institutions called sacraments, the majesty and glory of Christ's human nature, together with the communication of the divine perfections to it, and the inward frame of spirit that is required in the worship addressed to the Saviour, were carefully examined. In like manner, the controversy, which had for its object the divine decrees, led the doctors, by whom it was carried on, into the most subtile and profound researches concerning the nature of the divine attributes, particularly those of justice and goodness, the doctrines of fate and necessity, the connexion between human liberty and divine prescience; the extent of God's love to mankind, and of the benefits that arise from the merits of Christ as mediator; the operations of that divine spirit, or power, which rectifies the wills and sanctifies the affections of men; the perseverance of the elect in their covenant with God, and in a state of salvation; and other points of great moment. The subject of debate, that was drawn from the use of external ceremonies in religious worship, was also productive of several questions and inquiries; for, beside the researches into the origin and antiquity of certain institutions to which it gave occasion, it naturally led to a discussion of the following important questions: viz. "What are the special marks that characterize things *indifferent*?—How far is it lawful to comply with the demands of an adversary, whose opposition is only directed against things esteemed indifferent in their own nature?—What is the extent of Christian liberty?—Is it lawful to retain, in condescension to the prejudices of the people, or with a view to their benefit, certain ancient rites and institutions, which, although they carry a superstitious aspect, may nevertheless be susceptible of a favourable and rational interpretation?"

XXXI. It has always been a question much debated among protestants, and more especially in England and Holland, where it has excited great commotions and tumults,—to whom the right of governing the church, and the power of deciding in religious matters, properly belong? This controversy has been determined in favour of those who maintain, that the power of deciding, in matters of religious doctrine, discipline, and government, is, by the appointment of Christ himself, vested in the church, and therefore ought by no means to be intrusted with the civil magistrate; while, at the same time, they grant, that it is the business of the latter to assist the church with his protection and advice, to convoke and preside in its synods and councils, to take care that the clergy do not attempt to carry on any thing that may be prejudicial to the interests of the state, and, by his authority, to confirm the validity, and secure the execution of the different laws enacted by the church under his inspection. It is true, that from the time of Henry VIII. the sovereigns of England consider themselves as supreme heads of the church, in relation to its spiritual, as well as its temporal concerns; and it is plain enough, that, on the strength of this important title, both Henry and his son Edward assumed an extensive authority and jurisdiction in the church, and looked upon their spiritual power, as equal to that which had been unworthily enjoyed by the Roman pontiff.[b]

[a] Our author has here undoubtedly in view the Lutheran doctrine of Consubstantiation, which supposes the same extended body to be totally present in different places at one and the same time. To call this a gross and glaring contradiction, seems rather the dictate of common sense, than the suggestion of a contentious spirit.

[b] See Neal's History of the Puritans, vol. i. p. 11.

But queen Elizabeth receded considerably from these high pretensions, and diminished the spiritual power of her successors, by declaring that the royal jurisdiction extended only to the ministers of religion, and not to religion itself; to the rulers of the church, and not to the church itself; or, in other words, that the persons of the clergy were alone subject to their civil authority.[a] Accordingly, we see that the constitution of the church of England perfectly resembles that of the state, and that a striking analogy exists between the civil and ecclesiastical government established in that country. The clergy, consisting of the upper and lower houses of convocation, are immediately assembled by the archbishop of Canterbury, in consequence of an order from the sovereign, and propose in these meetings, by common consent, such measures as seem necessary to the well-being of the church. These measures are laid before the king and parliament, and derive from their approbation and authority the force of laws.[b] But it must be acknowledged, that this matter has given occasion to much altercation and debate; nor has it been found easy to fix the extent of the jurisdiction and prerogatives of these great bodies in a manner conformable to their respective pretensions, since the king and his council explain them in one way, and the clergy, more especially those who are zealous for the spiritual supremacy and independency of the church, understand them in another. The truth of the matter is plainly this, that the ecclesiastical polity in England has never acquired a stable and consistent form; nor has it been reduced to clear and certain principles. It has rather been carried on and administered by ancient custom and precedent, than defined and fixed by any regular system of laws and institutions.

XXXII. If it was not an easy matter to determine in what hands the power of deciding affairs of a religious nature was to be lodged, it was no less difficult to fix the form of ecclesiastical government in which this power was to be administered. Many vehement disputes were kindled on this subject, which neither the lapse of time, nor the efforts of human wisdom, have been able to bring to an amicable issue. The republic of Geneva, in consequence of the counsels of Calvin, judged it proper that the particular affairs of each church should be directed by a body of presbyters, all invested with an equal degree of power and authority; that matters of a more public and important nature were to be submitted to the judgment of an assembly, or synod, composed of elders chosen as deputies by the churches of a whole province or district; and that all affairs of such extensive influence and high moment, as concerned the welfare of the sacred community in general, should be examined and decided, as in early times, by an assembly of the whole church. This form of ecclesiastical government the church of Geneva adopted for itself,[c] and left no intreaties or methods of persuasion unemployed, that might recommend it to those reformed churches with which they lived in fraternal communion. But it was obstinately rejected by the English clergy, who regarded as sacred and immutable that ancient form of spiritual government, according to which a certain district or diocese is committed to the care and inspection of one ruler or bishop, to whom the presbyters of each church are subject, as also the deacons are to the presbyters; while the general interests of the church are treated and discussed in an assembly of bishops, and of such ecclesiastics as are next to them in rank and dignity. This form of episcopal polity was, with some small exceptions, adopted by the Bohemian and Moravian brethren,[d] who had become one of the reformed churches; but it was highly displeasing to those among the protestants, who had embraced the sentiments and discipline of Calvin. The dissensions, occasioned by these different schemes of ecclesiastical polity, were every way adapted to produce a violent schism in the church; so much the more, as the leaders of the contending parties pretended to derive their respective plans from the injunctions of Christ, and the practice of his disciples. And, in effect, it divided the English nation into two parties, who during a long time treated each other with great animosity and bitterness, and whose feuds, on many occasions, proved detrimental to the civil interests and prosperity of the nation. This schism, however, which did such mischief in England, was, by the prudence and piety of a few great and excellent divines, confined to that country, and prevented from either becoming universal, or interrupting the fraternal union that prevailed between the church of England and the reformed churches abroad. The worthy men, who thus set bounds to the influence of these unhappy divisions, found great opposition made, by the suggestions of bigotry, to their charitable purpose. To maintain, however, the bonds of union between the episcopal church of England and the presbyterian churches in foreign countries, they laid down the following maxim, which, though it be not universally adopted, tends nevertheless to the preservation of external concord among the reformed, viz. "That Jesus Christ has left upon record no express injunctions with respect to the external form

[a] See Courayer's Supplement aux deux Ouvrages pour la Defense de la Validité des Ordinations Anglicanes, chap. xv.

☞ This must be understood with many restrictions, if it can be at all admitted. The whole tenor of queen Elizabeth's reign showed plainly that she did not pretend to less power in religious matters than any of her predecessors.

☞ [b] Jo. Cosinus, de Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ Religione et Disciplinâ, in the learned Thomas Smith's Vitæ Eruditiss. Virorum, published in 1707.—See also Dav. Wilkins, de Veteri et Modernâ Synodi Anglic. Constitutione, tom. i. Concil. Magn. Britann. p. 7.—Neal, vol. i.

☞ [c] The account which Dr. Mosheim gives here and above (sect. xii. of this chapter) of the form of ecclesiastical government established by Calvin at Geneva, is far from being accurate. There are but two ecclesiastical bodies in that republic, viz. the venerable company of the pastors and professors, and the consistory: for a just description of which, see the judicious Mr. Keate's "Short Account of the Ancient History, present Government, and Laws of the Republic of Geneva," published in 1761.—I would only remark that what this sensible author observes, with respect to the consistory, in p. 124 of his interesting performance, belongs principally, if not wholly, to the venerable company. Dr. Mosheim seems to have been led into this mistake, by imagining that the ecclesiastical form of government established in Scotland, where indeed all church affairs are managed by consistorial, provincial, and national assemblies, or, in other words, by presbyteries, synods, and general synods, was a direct transcript of the hierarchy of Geneva. It is also probable, that he may have been deceived by reading, in Neal's History of the Puritans, that the Scottish reformers approved the discipline of the removed churches of Geneva and Switzerland, and followed their plan of ecclesiastical government. But he ought to have observed, that this approbation and imitation related only to the democratic form of the church of Geneva, and the parity of its ministers. Be that as it may, the plan of government which our historian here supposes to have place at Geneva, is in reality that which is observed in Scotland, and of which no more than the first and fundamental principles were taken from the discipline of Calvin. The small territory of Geneva would not admit such a form of ecclesiastical polity as Dr. Mosheim here describes.

[d] See Epist. de Ordinat. et Successione Episcopal. in Unitate Fratrum Bohem, conservatâ, in Christ. Matth. Pfaffii Institutionibus Juris Eccles. p. 410.

of government that is to be observed in his church; and, consequently, that every nation hath a right to establish such a form, as seemeth conducive to the interests, and suitable to the peculiar state, circumstances, and exigencies of the community, provided that such an establishment be in no respect prejudicial to truth, or favourable to the revival of superstition."[a]

XXXIII. It was the opinion of Calvin, not only that flagitious and profligate members were to be cut off from the sacred society, and excluded from the communion of the church, but also that men of dissolute and licentious lives were punishable by the laws of the state, and the arm of the civil magistrate. In this he differed from Zuingle, who, supposing that all authority, of every kind, was lodged in the hands of the magistrate alone, would not allow to the ministers of the church the power of excluding flagitious offenders from its communion, or withholding from them the participation of its sacraments.[b] But the credit and influence of Calvin were so great at Geneva, that he accomplished his purpose, even in the face of a formidable opposition from various quarters. He established the severest rules of discipline to correct the licentious manners of the times, by which he exposed himself to innumerable perils from the malignity and resentment of the dissolute, and to perpetual contests with the patrons of voluptuousness and immorality. He executed, moreover, these rules of discipline with the utmost rigour, had them strengthened and supported by the authority of the state, excluded obstinate offenders from the communion of the church, by the judicial sentence of the consistory, and even went so far as to procure their banishment from the city; not to mention other kinds of punishment, of no mild nature, which, at his desire, were inflicted upon men of loose principles and irregular lives.[c] The clergy in Switzerland were highly pleased with the form of church-government that had been established at Geneva, and ardently desirous of a greater degree of power to restrain the insolence of obstinate sinners, and a larger share of authority in the church, than they were intrusted with by the moderate ecclesiastical constitution of Zuingle. They devoutly wished that the discipline of Calvin might be followed in their cantons, and even made some attempts for that purpose. But their desires and their endeavours were equally vain; for the cantons of Bern, Zurich, and Basil, distinguished themselves among the others in opposing this change, and would by no means permit the bounds, that Zuingle had set to the jurisdiction of the church, to be removed, nor its power and authority to be augmented in any respect.[d]

XXXIV. All the various branches of learning, whether sacred or profane, flourished among the reformed during this century, as appears evidently by the great number of excellent productions which have been transmitted to our times. Zuingle, indeed, seemed disposed to exclude philosophy from the pale of the church;[e] but in this inconsiderate purpose he had few followers, and the succeeding doctors of the Helvetic church were soon persuaded of the necessity of philosophical knowledge, more especially in controversies, and researches of a theological kind. Hence it was, that, in 1588, an academical body was founded at Geneva by Calvin, whose first care was to place in this new seminary a professor of philosophy for the instruction of youth in the principles of reasoning. It is true, indeed, that this professor had a very limited province assigned to him, being obliged to confine his instructions to a mere interpretation of the precepts of Aristotle, who at this same time was the oracle of all the public schools,[f] and whose philosophical principles and method were exclusively adopted by all the other reformed colleges; though it is certain, that the philosophy of Ramus was, for some time, preferred, by many of the doctors of Basil, to that of the Stagirite.[g]

XXXV. The reformed church, from its very infancy, produced a great number of expositors of Scripture, whose learned and excellent commentaries deserve a memorable place[h] in the history of theological science. The exposition that Zuingle has given of the greatest part of the books of the New Testament, is far from being destitute of merit.[i] He was succeeded by Bullinger, Œcolampadius, and Musculus, and also by others, who, though inferior to those great men in erudition and genius, deserve a certain degree of approbation and esteem. But the two divines who shone with a superior and unrivalled lustre in this learned list of sacred expositors, were John Calvin and Theodore Beza. The former composed an excellent commentary on almost all the books of Holy

[a] See Spanhemii Opera, tom. ii. lib. viii. ix. p. 1055. This was the general opinion of the British divines who lived in the earliest period of the Reformation, and was first abandoned by Archbishop Whitgift. See Neal's History of the Puritans, vol. iii.

[b] See a remarkable letter of Rodolph Gualter, in Fueslin's Centuria I. Epistolarum à Reformatoribus Helveticis scriptarum, p. 478, where he expresses himself thus: "Excommunicationem neque Zuinglius . . . neque Bullingerus, unquam probârunt, et . . . obstiterunt iis qui eam aliquando voluerunt introducere . . . Basileæ quidem Œcolampadius, multum dissuadente Zuinglio, instituerat . . . sed adeo non durabilis fuit illa constitutio, ut Œcolampadius illam abrogârit, &c. See also p. 90.

[c] Of all the undertakings of Calvin, there was not one that involved him in so much trouble, or exposed him to such imminent danger, as the plan he had formed, with such resolution and fortitude, of purging the church, by the exclusion of obstinate and scandalous offenders, and inflicting severe punishments on all such as violated the laws, enacted by the church, or by the consistory, which was its representative. See the Life of Calvin, composed by Beza, and prefixed to his Letters.—Spon's Histoire de Geneve, and particularly the notes, tom. ii. p. 45, 65.—Calvin's Letters, and more especially those addressed to Jaques de Bourgogne. The party at Geneva, which Calvin called the sect of Libertines, (because they defended the licentious customs of ancient times, the erection of stews, and other vicious practices, not only by their discourse and their actions, but even by force of arms,) was both numerous and powerful. But the courage and resolution of this great reformer gained the ascendency, and triumphed over the opposition of his enemies.

[d] See the account of the tumults and commotions of Lausanne, in the Museum Helveticum, tom. ii. The disputes that were carried on upon this occasion, in the Palatinate, which adopted the ecclesiastical discipline of Geneva, are recorded by Altingius, in his Hist. Eccles. Palat. and by Struvius, in his Hist. Eccles. Palat. German.

[e] Zuingle, in the dedication of his book, *de Verâ et Falsâ Religione*, to Francis I. king of France, expresses himself in the following terms: "Philosophiæ interdictum est a Christi scholis; at isti (Sorbonistæ) fecerunt eam cœlestis verbi magistram."

[f] Beza, in his Epist. Theol. (ep. xxxvi. p. 156,) speaks thus: "Certum nobis ac constitutum est, et in ipsis tradendis logicis et in ceteris explicandis disciplinis ab Aristotelis sententiâ ne tantillum quidem deflectere."

[g] See Casp. Brandtii Vita Jacobi Arminii, p. 12, 22.

☞ [h] Dr. Mosheim pays a tribute to these great men of the reformed church, that seems to be extorted by justice, with a kind of effort from the spirit of party. He says, that Zuingle's labours are not contemptible; that Calvin attempted an illustration of the sacred writings; that the New Testament of Beza has not, even at this day, entirely lost the reputation it formerly enjoyed. This is faint praise; and therefore the translator has, without departing from the tenor of the author's phraseology, animated a little the coldness of his panegyric.

☞ [i] It was not only on the books of the New Testament that Zuingle employed his very learned and excellent labours. He expounded the book of Genesis, together with the twenty-four first chapters of Exodus, and gave new versions of the Psalms, of the Prophecies of Isaiah and Jeremiah.

Writ; and the atter published a Latin version of the New Testament, enriched with theological and critical observations, which has passed through many editions, and enjoys, at this day, a considerable part of the reputation and applause with which it was crowned at its first appearance. It must be acknowledged, to the honour of the greatest part of these commentators, that, wisely neglecting those allegorical significations and mystical meanings which the irregular fancies of former expositors had attributed to the terms of Scripture, they employed their whole diligence and industry in investigating the literal sense and the full energy of the words, in order to find out the true intention of the sacred writer. It must, however, be observed, on the other hand, that some of these interpreters, and more especially Calvin, have been sharply censured for applying, to the temporal state and circumstances of the Jews, several prophecies that point to the Messiah and to the Christian dispensation in the most evident and palpable manner, and thus removing some of the most striking arguments in favour of the divinity of the Gospel.[a]

XXXVI. The state of theology, and the revolutions it underwent among the Helvetic and the other reformed churches, were nearly the same as among the Lutherans. Zuingle was one of the first reformed doctors who reduced that sacred science into a certain sort of order, in his book concerning true and false Religion, which contained a brief exposition of the principal doctrines of Christianity. This production was followed by one much more comprehensive in its contents, and perfect in its kind, composed by Calvin, and entitled Institutes of the Christian Religion, which held in the reformed churches the same rank, authority, and credit, that the Loci Communes of Melancthon obtained among us.[b] The example of Calvin animated the doctors of his communion, and produced a great number of writers of Common-Place Divinity, some more, others less voluminous, among whom Musculus, Peter Martyr, and Piscator, particularly excelled. The most ancient of these writers are, generally speaking, the best, on account of their simplicity and clearness, being untainted with that affectation of subtlety, and that scholastic spirit, which have eclipsed the merit of many a good genius. Calvin was a model in this respect, more especially in his Institutes; a work remarkable for the finest elegance of style, and the greatest ease and perspicuity of expression, together with the most perfect simplicity of method, and clearness of argument. But this simplicity was soon effaced by the intricate science of the schools. The philosophy of Aristotle, which was taught in almost all the seminaries of learning, and suffered much from falling into bad hands, insinuated itself into the regions of theology, and rendered them barren, thorny, intricate, and gloomy, by the enormous multitude of barbarous terms, captious questions, minute distinctions, and useless subtleties, that followed in its train.[c]

XXXVII. The reformed doctors of this century generally concluded their treatises of didactic theology with a delineation of the moral duties that are incumbent upon Christians, and the rules of practice that are prescribed in the Gospel. This method was observed by Calvin, and was followed, out of respect for his example, by almost all the divines of his communion, who looked upon him as their model and their guide. This eminent man, toward the conclusion of his Institutes, speaks of the power of the magistrate, and the ends of civil government; and, in the last chapter, gives the portraiture of the life and manners of a true Christian, but in a much more concise manner than the copiousness, dignity, and importance of the subject seemed to require. The progress of morality among the reformed, was obstructed by the very same means that retarded its improvement among the Lutherans. It was neglected amidst the tumult of controversy; and, while every pen was drawn to maintain certain systems of doctrine, few were employed in cultivating or promoting that noblest of all sciences, which has virtue, life, and manners, for its objects.

This master-science, which Calvin and his associates had left in a rude and imperfect state, was first reduced into some kind of form, and explained with a certain degree of accuracy and precision, by William Perkins,[d] an English divine, as the reformed doctors universally allow. He was seconded in this laudable undertaking by Telingius, a native of Holland; and it was by a worthy and

[a] See Ægidii Hunnii Calvinus Judaizans, published in 1595, which was refuted by David Pareus, in a book published the same year, under the title of Calvinus Orthodoxus.

[b] The reader must not forget that the learned author of this History was a Lutheran.

[c] It must however be acknowledged, that the scholastic method of teaching theology seems to have first infected our (the Lutheran) church, though the contagion spread itself, soon after, among the reformed doctors. It was certainly very recent in Holland at the time of the famous synod of Dordrecht. In this assembly Maccovius, professor at Franeker, a man deeply versed in all the mysteries of the scholastic philosophy, was accused of heresy by his colleague Sibrand Lubbert. When the matter was examined, the synod declared that Maccovius was unjustly accused of heresy; but that, in his divinity lectures, he had not followed that simplicity of method, and clearness of expression, which are commendable in a public teacher of Christianity; and that he rather followed the subtle manner of the scholastic doctors, than the plain and unaffected phraseology of the inspired writers. The decision of the synod is expressed by Walter Balcanqual (in the acts of that ecclesiastical assembly, subjoined to his letters to Sir Dudley Carleton) in the following words: "Maccovium . . . nullius hæreseos reum teneri . . . peccâsse eum, quod quibusdam ambiguis et obscuris scholasticis phrasibus usus sit; quod scholasticum docendi modum conetur in Belgicis academiis introducere . . . Monendum esse eum, ut cum spiritu sancto loquatur, non cum Bellarmino aut Suarezio."* These admonitions produced little effect on Maccovius, as appears by his theological writings, which are richly seasoned with scholastic wit and intricate speculations. He therefore appears to have been the first who introduced the subtleties of philosophy into the theological system of the reformed churches in Holland. He was not, however, alone in this attempt, but was seconded by the acute Dr. William Ames, minister of the English church at the Hague, and several others of the same scholastic turn. This method of teaching theology must have been in use among almost all the reformed doctors before the synod of Dordrecht, if we give credit to Episcopius, who, in the last discourse which he addressed to his disciples at Leyden, tells them that he had carefully avoided this scholastic divinity; and that this was the principal cause that had drawn on him the vehement hatred and opposition of all the other professors and teachers of theology. His words are as follows: "Videbam veritatem multarum et maximarum rerum in ipsâ scripturâ sacrâ, elaboratis humanâ industriâ phrasibus, ingeniosis vocularum fictionibus, locorum communium artificiosis texturis, exquisitis terminorum ac formularum inventionibus, adeo involutam, perplexam et intricatam redditam esse, ut Œdipo sæpe opus esset ad Sphingem illam theologicam enodandam. Ita est, et hinc primæ lacrymæ—Reducendam itaque terminorum apostolicorum et cuivis obviorum simplicitatem semper sequendam putavi, et sequestrandas, quas academiæ et scholæ tanquam proprias sibi vendicant, logicas philosophicasque speculationes et dictiones." See Philippi Limborchii Vita Episcopii, p. 123.

[d] Mr. William Perkins was born at Marston in Warwickshire, in the first year of queen Elizabeth, and educated in Christ's College, Cambridge, of which he became fellow. He was one of the most famous practical writers and preachers of his age. His puritanical and non-conforming principles exposed him to the cognizance of the High-

* See the Acta Synodi Dord. in Hale's Golden Remains, p. 161.—and Philippi Limborchii Epistolar. Ecclesiasticar. Collect. p. 574.

pious spirit of emulation, excited by the example of these two doctors, that William Ames, a native of Scotland, and professor of divinity at Franeker,[a] was engaged to compose a complete body of Christian morality.[b] These writers were succeeded by others, who threw farther light on this important science.

XXXVIII. The reformed church was less disturbed, during this century, by sects, divisions, and theological disputes, than the Lutheran, which was often a prey to the most unhappy dissensions. This circumstance is looked upon by the former as a matter of triumph, though it may be very easily accounted for by all such as are acquainted with the history of that church.[c] We have however, in the writings of Calvin, an account, and also a refutation, of a most pernicious sect that sprang up in that establishment, and produced troubles of a more deplorable kind than any that happened in our community.[d] This odious sect, which assumed the denominations of *Libertines* and *Spiritual Brethren and Sisters*, arose in Flanders, under the auspices of Pockesius, Ruffus, and Quintin; gained a certain footing in France through the favour and protection of Margaret, queen of Navarre, and sister to Francis I.; and found patrons in several of the reformed churches.[e] Their doctrine, as far as it can be known by the writings of Calvin and its other antagonists, (for I do not find that these fanatics published any account of their tenets,) amounted to the following propositions: "That the Deity was the sole operating cause in the mind of man, and the immediate author of all human actions; that, consequently, the distinctions of good and evil, which had been established with respect to these actions, were false and groundless, and that men could not, properly speaking, commit sin; that religion consisted in the union of the spirit, or rational soul, with the Supreme Being; that all those who had attained this happy union, by sublime contemplation and elevation of mind, were allowed to indulge, without exception or restraint, their appetites and passions; that all their actions and pursuits were then perfectly innocent; and that, after the death of the body, they were to be united to the Deity." These extravagant tenets resemble, in such a striking manner, the opinions of the Beghards, or Brethren of the Free Spirit, that it appears to me, beyond all doubt, that the Libertines, or Spirituals, now under consideration, were no more than a remnant of that ancient sect. The place of their origin tends to confirm this hypothesis, since it is well known, that, in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, Flanders swarmed with licentious fanatics of this kind.

XXXIX. We must not confound (as is frequently done) with these fanatics, another kind of Libertines, whom Calvin had to combat, and who gave him much trouble and perplexity during the whole course of his life and ministry; I mean the Libertines of Geneva. These were rather a cabal of rakes than a sect of fanatics; for they made no pretences to any religious system, but pleaded only for the liberty of leading voluptuous and immoral lives. This cabal was composed of such licentious citizens as could not bear the severe discipline of Calvin, who punished with rigour, not only dissolute manners, but also whatever carried the aspect of irreligion and impiety. This irregular troop stood forth in defence of the licentiousness and dissipation that had reigned in their city before the Reformation, pleaded for the continuance of those brothels, banquetings, and other entertainments of a sensual kind, which the regulations of Calvin were designed to abolish, and employed all the bitterness of reproach and invective, all the resources of fraud and violence, all the powers of faction, to accomplish their purpose.[f] In this turbulent cabal there were several persons, who were not only notorious for their dissolute and scandalous manner of living, but also for their contempt of all religion. Of this odious class was Gruet, who attacked Calvin with the utmost animosity and fury, calling him bishop of Asculum, the new pope, and branding him with other contumelious denominations. This Gruet denied the divinity of the Christian religion, the immortality of the soul, the difference between moral good and evil, and rejected, with disdain, the doctrines that are deemed most sacred among Christians; for which impieties he was at last brought before the civil tribunals, in 1550, and was punished with death.[g]

XL. The opposition that was made to Calvin did not end here. He had contests of another kind to sustain against those who disapproved his theological system, and, more especially, his melancholy and discouraging doctrine in relation to eternal and absolute decrees. These adversaries felt, by a disagreeable experience, the warmth and violence of his haughty temper, and that impatience of contradiction which arose from an over-jealous concern for his honour, or rather for his unrivalled supremacy. He would not suffer them to remain at Geneva; and, in the heat of controversy, being carried away by the impetuosity of his passions, he accused them of crimes from

Commission Court; but his peaceable behaviour, and eminent reputation in the learned world, procured him an exemption from the persecutions that fell upon his brethren. His works, which were printed in three volumes folio, afford abundant proofs of his piety and industry, especially when it is considered that he died in the 44th year of his age.

☞ [a] Dr. William Ames, educated at Cambridge under Mr. Perkins, fled from the persecution of archbishop Bancroft, and was invited by the states of Friesland to the divinity chair in the university of Franeker, which he filled with great reputation for twelve years. He then removed to Rotterdam, at the invitation of an English church there, and became their pastor. He was at the synod of Dordrecht, and informed the ambassador of king James at the Hague, from time to time, of the debates of that assembly. Besides his controversial writings against the Arminians, he published the following; Medulla Theologiæ (the work here referred to by Dr. Mosheim;)—Manuductio Logica;—Cases of Conscience;—Analysis of the Book of Psalms;—Notes on the First and Second Epistles of St. Peter, &c. These productions are not void of merit, considering the times in which they were written.

☞ [b] In the preface to his famous book de Conscientiâ et ejus Jure, Dr. Ames observes, that an excessive zeal for doctrine had produced an unhappy neglect of morality: "Quod hæc pars prophetiæ (i. e. moralityi,) hactenus minus fuerit exculta, hoc inde fuit, quod primipilares nostri perpetuo in acie adversus hostes pugnare, fidem propugnare, et aream ecclesiæ purgare, necessitate quadam cogebantur, ita ut agros et vineas plantare et rigare non potuerint ex voto, sicut bello fervente usu venire solet." The address to the students of Francker, which is subjoined to this book, under the title of Parænesis ad Studiosos, &c. deserves to be perused, as it tends to confirm what has been already observed with respect to the neglect of the science of morality. "Theologi (says he) præclare se instructos putant ad omnes officii sui partes, si dogmata tantum intelligant. Neque tamen omnia dogmata scrutantur, sed illa sola, quæ præcipue solent agitari et in controversiam vocari."

☞ [c] Dr. Mosheim ought to have given us a hint of his manner of accounting for this, to avoid the suspicion of having been somewhat at a loss for a favourable solution.

☞ [d] Why all these comparisons? Our author seems, on some occasions, to tinge his historical relation with the spirit of party.

[e] See "Calvini Instructio adversus fanaticam et furiosam Sectam Libertinorum, qui se Spirituales vocant," among his theological tracts.

[f] Spon's Histoire de Geneve, tom. ii. p. 44, in the edition of 1730.

[g] Spon's Hist. tom. ii.

which they have been fully absolved by the impartial judgment of unprejudiced posterity.[a] Among these victims of Calvin's unlimited power and excessive zeal, we may reckon Sebastian Castalio, master of the public school at Geneva, who, though not exempt from failings,[b] was nevertheless a man of probity, and was also remarkable for the extent of his learning and the elegance of his taste. As this learned man could neither approve all the measures that were followed, nor all the opinions that were entertained by Calvin and his colleagues, and particularly that of absolute and unconditional predestination, he was deposed from his office in 1544, and banished from the city. The magistrates of Basil, however, received this ingenious exile, and gave him the Greek professorship of their university.[c]

XLI. A like fate happened to Jerome Bolsec, a French monk of the Carmelite order, who, though much inferior to Castalio in genius and learning, was judged worthy of esteem, on account of the motive that brought him to Geneva; for it was a conviction of the excellence of the protestant religion that engaged him to abandon the monastic retreats of superstition, and to repair to this city, where he followed the profession of physic. His imprudence, however, was great, and was the principal cause of the mifortunes that befell him. It led him, in 1551, to lift up his voice in the full congregation, after the conclusion of divine worship, and to declaim, in the most indecorous manner, against the doctrine of absolute decrees; for which offence he was thrown into prison, and soon after, sent into banishment. He then returned to the place of his nativity, and to the communion of Rome, and published the most bitter and slanderous libels, in which the reputation, conduct, and morals of Calvin and Beza, were cruelly attacked.[d] From this treatment of Bolsec arose the misunderstanding between Calvin and his intimate friend and patron Jaques de Bourgogne, a man illustrious by his descent from the dukes of Burgundy, who had settled at Geneva with no other view than to enjoy the pleasure of conversing with him. Jaques de Bourgogne had employed Bolsec as his physician, and was so well satisfied with his services, that he endeavoured to support him, and to prevent his being ruined by the enmity and authority of Calvin. This incensed the latter to such a degree, that he turned the force of his resentment against this illustrious nobleman, who, to avoid his vengeance, removed from Geneva, and passed the remainder of his days in a rural retreat.[e]

XLII. Bernardino Ochino, a native of Sienna, (and, before his conversion, general of the Capuchin order,) was, in 1543, banished from Switzerland, in consequence of a sentence passed upon him by the Helvetic church. This proselyte, who was a man of a fertile imagination, and a lively and subtle turn of mind, had been invited to Zurich as pastor of the Italian church established in that city. But the freedom, or rather the licentiousness of his sentiments, justly exposed him to the displeasure of those who had been his patrons and protectors; for, among many other opinions very different from such as were commonly received, he maintained that the law, which confined a husband to one wife, was susceptible of exceptions in certain cases. In his writings also he propagated several notions which were repugnant to the theological system of the Helvetic doctors, and pushed his inquiries into many subjects of importance, with a boldness and freedom by no means suited to the genius and spirit of the age in which he lived. Some have, however, undertaken his defence, and have alleged in his behalf, that the errors he maintained at the time of his banishment, (when, worn out with age, and oppressed with poverty, he was rather an object of compassion, than of resentment,) were not of such a heinous nature as to justify so severe a punishment. However that may have been, this unfortunate exile retired into Poland, where he embraced the communion of the Anti-Trinitarians and Anabaptists,[f] and ended his days in 1564.[g]

XLIII. It is remarkable that those very doctors, who animadverted with such severity upon all that dared to dissent from any part of their theological system, thought proper, nevertheless, to behave with the greatest circumspection, and the most pacific spirit of mildness, in the long controversy which was carried on with such animosity between the Puritans, and the advocates of episcopacy, in England; for if, on the one hand, they could not but stand well affected to the Puritans, who were steadfast defenders of the discipline and sentiments of the Helvetic church; so, on the other, they were connected with their episcopal doctors by the bonds of Christian communion and fraternal love. In this critical situation, their whole thoughts were turned to reconciliation and peace; and they exhorted their brethren, the Puritans, to put on a spirit of meekness and forbearance toward the episcopal church, and not to break the bonds of charity and communion with its rulers or its members. Such was the gentle spirit of the doctors in Switzerland toward the church of England, notwithstanding the severe treatment the greatest part of the reformed had received from that church, which constantly insisted on the divine origin of its government and discipline, and scarcely allowed, to the

[a] At this day we may venture to speak thus freely of the rash decisions of Calvin, since even the doctors of Geneva, as well as those of the other reformed churches, ingenuously acknowledge that his eminent talents and excellent qualities were accompanied with great defects, for which, however, they plead indulgence, in consideration of his services and virtues. See the notes to Spon's Histoire de Geneve, tom. ii. p. 110, as also the preface to Calvin's Letters to Jaques de Bourgogne.

☞ [b] See Bayle's Dictionary, at the article Castalio, in which the merit and demerit of that learned man seem to be impartially and accurately examined.

[c] See Uytenbogard's Ecclesiastical History, part ii. where that author endeavours to defend the innocence of Castalio.—See also Colomesii Italia Orientalis, p. 99.—Bayle's Dict. tom. i.

[d] See Bayle's Dict. at the article Bolsec.—Spon's Hist. de Geneve, tom. ii. p. 55, in the Notes.—Bibilioth. Raisonnée, tom. xxxii. p. 446, tom. xxxiv. p. 409.

[e] See the preface to Lettres de Calvin à Jaques de Bourgogne, and La Bibliotheque Raisoneé, tom. xxxii. xxxiv.

[f] See Boverii Annales Capucinorum; and a book entitled, La Guerre Seraphique, ou Histoire des Perils qu'a couru la Barbe des Capucins, livr. ii. p. 147. livr. iii. p. 190, 230.—Observationes Halenses Latinæ, tom. iv. Observ. xx. p. 406. tom. v. Observ. i. p. 3.—Bayle's Diction. at the article Ochin.—Christ. Sandii Biblioth. Anti-Trinitar. p. 4. Niceron's Memoires pour servir a l'Hist. des Hommes illustres, t. xix. p. 166.

☞ [g] Ochino did not leave the accusations of his adversaries without a reply; he published, in Italian, an Apology for his character and conduct, printed, with a Latin translation by Seb. Castalio, without the date of the year. The Geneva edition of this apology bears the date of 1554, and a German edition appeared in 1556. Beza, in his letter to Dudithius, insults the memory of Ochino, and pretends to justify the severity with which he was treated, in such a taunting and uncharitable manner as does him little credit. See his Epist. Theolog. Genevæ, 1575. What the writers of the Romish church have laid to the charge of Ochino, may be seen in the life of cardinal Commendoni, written by Gratiani, bishop of Amelia, (and published in a French translation by the eloquent Flechier, bishop of Nismes,) B. 2. C. 9. p. 138—149. N.

other reformed communities, the privileges, or even the denomination of a true church. This moderation of the Helvetic doctors was the dictate of prudence. They did not think it expedient to contend with a generous and flourishing people, or to incur the displeasure of a mighty queen, whose authority seemed to extend not only over her own dominions, but even to the United Provinces, which were placed in her neighbourhood, and, in some measure, under her protection. Nor did the apprehensions of a general schism in the reformed church contribute a little to render them meek, moderate, and pacific. It is one thing to punish and excommunicate a handful of weak and unsupported individuals, who attempt to disturb the tranquillity of the state by the introduction of opinions, which, though neither highly absurd, nor of dangerous consequence, have yet the demerit of novelty; and another to irritate, or promote divisions in a flourishing church, which, though weakened by intestine feuds, is yet both powerful and respectable in a high degree. Besides, the dispute between the church of England and the other reformed churches, did not, as yet, turn upon points of doctrine, but only on the rites of external worship and the form of ecclesiastical government. It is, however, to be observed, that, soon after the period now under consideration, certain religious doctrines were introduced into the debate between the churches, that contributed much to widen the breach, and to obscure the prospect of reconciliation.[a]

XLIV. That the reformed church abounded, during this century, with great and eminent men, justly celebrated for their talents and learning, is too well known to require proof. Beside Calvin, Zuingle, and Beza, who exhibited to the republic of letters very striking instances of genius and erudition, we may place, in the list of those who have gained an immortal name by their writings, Œcolampadius, Bullinger, Farel, Viret, Martyr, Bibliander, Musculus, Pelican, Lavater, Hospinian, Ursinus, Cranmer, archbishop of Canterbury, Szegedinus, and many others, whose names and merits are recorded by the writers of literary history, particularly by Melchior Adam, Antony Wood, Gerard Brandt, and Daniel Neal, the learned and industrious author of the History of the Puritans.

CHAPTER III.

The History of the Anabaptists or Mennonites.

I. THE true origin of that sect which acquired the denomination of Anabaptists[b] by their administering anew the rite of baptism to those who came over to their communion, and derived that of *Mennonites* from the famous man to whom they owe the greatest part of their present felicity, is hidden in the depths of antiquity, and

[a] All the protestant divines of the reformed church, whether puritans or others, seemed, indeed, hitherto of one mind about the doctrines of faith. But, toward the latter end of queen Elizabeth's reign, there arose a party, that first wished to soften, and then to overthrow, the received opinions concerning predestination, perseverance, free-will, effectual grace, and the extent of Christ's redemption. These are the doctrines to which Dr. Mosheim alludes in this passage. The clergy of the episcopal church began to lean toward the notions concerning these intricate points, which Arminius propagated some time after this; while, on the other hand, the puritans adhered rigorously to the system of Calvin. Several episcopal doctors remained attached to the same system; and all these abettors of Calvinism, whether episcopal or presbyterian, were called *doctrinal puritans*.

[b] The modern Mennonites reject the denomination of Anabaptists, and also disavow the custom of repeating the ceremony of baptism, whence this denomination is derived. They acknowledge that the ancient Anabaptists practised the repetition of baptism to those who joined them from other Christian churches; but they maintain, at the same time, that this custom is at present abolished by the far greater part of their community. See Herm. Schyn's Historiæ Mennonitarum plenior Deductio, cap. ii. But here, if I do not mistake, these good men forget that ingenuous candour and simplicity, of which, on other occasions, they make such ostentation, and have recourse to artifice, in order to disguise the true cause and origin of the denomination in question. They pretend, for instance, that the Anabaptists, their ancestors, were so called from their baptizing *a second time* all the adult persons who left other churches to enter into their communion. But it is certain, that the denomination in question was given to them, not only on this account, but also, and indeed principally, from the following consideration; that they did not look upon those who had been baptized in a state of infancy, or at a tender age, as rendered, by the administration of this sacrament, true members of the Christian church; and therefore insisted upon their being re-baptized, in order to their being received into the communion of the Anabaptists. It is likewise certain that all the churches of that communion, however they may vary in other respects, and differ from each other in their tenets and practices, agree nevertheless in this opinion, and persevere obstinately in it. In a more especial manner are the ancient Flemish Anabaptists entitled to this denomination; for they not only re-baptized the children that had been already baptized in other churches, but even observed the same method with respect to persons who had reached the years of reason and discretion; and, what is still more remarkable, the different sects of Anabaptists deal in the same manner one with another; each sect rebaptizes the persons that enter into its communion, although they have already received that sacrament in another sect of the same denomination; and the reason of this conduct is, that each sect considers its baptism alone as pure and valid. It is indeed to be observed, that there is another class of Anabaptists, called Waterlandians, who are more moderate in their principles, and wiser in all respects than those now mentioned, and who do not pretend to re-baptize adult persons already baptized in other Christian churches, or in other sects of their own denomination. These moderate sectaries are, however, with propriety termed Anabaptists, on account of their re-baptizing such as had received the baptismal rite in a state of infancy or childhood. The patrons of this sect seem, indeed, very studious to conceal a practice which they cannot deny to take place among them; and their eagerness to conceal it, arises from a fear of reviving the hatred and severities which formerly pursued them. They are apprehensive that, by acknowledging the truth, the modern Mennonites may be considered as the descendants of those flagitious and fanatical Anabaptists of Munster, whose enormities rendered their very name odious to all true Christians. All this appears evident from the following passage in Schyn's Historiæ Mennonitarum plenior Deductio, tom. ii. where that author pretends to prove that his brethren are unjustly stigmatized with the odious denomination of Anabaptists. His words are: "Anabaptismus ille plane obsolevit; et a multis retro annis neminem cujuscunque sectæ Christianæ fidei, *juxta mandatum Christi* baptizatum, dum ad nostras Ecclesias transire cupit, re-baptizaverunt." i. e. That species of Anabaptism with which we are charged exists no longer, nor has it happened during the space of many years past, that any person professing Christianity, of whatever church or sect he may have been, and who had been previously baptized *according to the commandment of Christ*, has been re-baptized upon his entering into our communion. This passage would, at first sight, induce an inattentive reader to imagine that there is no such thing among the modern Mennonites, as the custom of re-baptizing those who enter into their community. But the words, *juxta mandatum Christi*, discover sufficiently the artifice and fraud that lie hidden in this apology; for the Anabaptists maintain that there is no *commandment of Christ* in favour of infant baptism. Moreover, we see the whole fallacy exposed, by what the author adds to the sentence already quoted: "Sed illam etiam *adultorum* baptismum ut sufficientem agnoscunt." Nevertheless, this author, as if he had perfectly proved his point, concludes, with an air of triumph, that the odious name of Anabaptists cannot be given, with any propriety, to the Mennonites at this day; "Quare (says he,) verissimum est, illud odiosum nomen Anabaptistarum illis non convenire." In this, however, he is certainly in an error; and the name in question is as applicable to the modern Mennonites, as it was to the sect from which they descend, since the best and wisest of the Mennonites maintain, in conformity with the principles of the ancient Anabaptists, that the baptism of infants is destitute of validity, and consequently are very careful in re-baptizing their proselytes, notwithstanding their having been baptized in their tender years, in other Christian churches. Many circumstances persuade me that the declarations and representations of things given by the modern Mennonites, are not always worthy of credit. Unhappily instructed by the miseries and calamities in which their ancestors were involved, they are anxiously careful to conceal entirely those tenets and laws which are the distinguishing characteristics of their sect; while they embellish what they cannot totally

is, of consequence, extremely difficult to be ascertained.[a] This uncertainty will not appear surprising, when it is considered, that this sect started up suddenly in several countries, at the same point of time, under leaders of different talents and different intentions, and at the very period when the first contests of the reformers with the Roman pontiffs drew the attention of the world, and employed the pens of the learned, in such a manner, as to render all other objects and incidents almost matters of indifference. The modern Mennonites not only consider themselves as the descendants of the Waldenses, who were so grievously oppressed and persecuted by the despotic heads of the Romish church, but pretend, moreover, to be the purest offspring of these respectable sufferers, being equally averse to all principles of rebellion, on the one hand, and all suggestions of fanaticism on the other.[b] Their adversaries, on the contrary, represent them as the descendants of those turbulent and furious Anabaptists, who, in the sixteenth century, involved Holland, Switzerland, Germany, and more especially the province of Westphalia, in such scenes of blood, perplexity, and distress; and allege, that, terrified by the dreadful fate of their associates, and also influenced by the moderate counsels and wise injunctions of Mennon, they abandoned the ferocity of their primitive enthusiasm, and were gradually brought to a better mind. After having examined these different accounts of the origin of the Anabaptists with the utmost attention and impartiality, I have found that neither of them can justly be pronounced conformable to strict truth.

II. It may be observed, in the first place, that the Mennonites are not entirely in an error when they boast of their descent from the Waldenses, Petrobrusians, and other ancient sects, who are usually considered as witnesses of the truth, in the times of general darkness and superstition. Before the rise of Luther and Calvin, there lay concealed, in almost all the countries of Europe, particularly in Bohemia, Moravia, Switzerland, and Germany, many persons, who adhered tenaciously to the following doctrine, which the Waldenses, Wickliffites, and Hussites, had maintained, some in a more disguised, and others in a more open and public manner; viz. "That the kingdom of Christ, or the visible church which he established upon earth, was an assembly of true and real saints, and ought therefore to be inaccessible to the wicked and unrighteous, and also exempt from all those institutions which human prudence suggests, to oppose the progress of iniquity, or to correct and reform transgressors." This maxim is the true source of all the peculiarities that are to be found in the religious doctrine and discipline of the Mennonites; and it is most certain, that the greatest part of these peculiarities were approved by many of those, who, before the dawn of the reformation, entertained the notion already mentioned, relating to the visible church of Christ.[c] There were, however, different ways of thinking among the different members of this sect, with respect to the methods of attaining such a perfect church-establishment as they had in view. Some, who were of a fanatical complexion on the one hand, and were persuaded on the other, that such a visible church as they had modelled out in fancy, could not be realized by the power of man, entertained the pleasing hope, that God, in his own good time, would erect to himself a holy church, exempt from every degree of blemish and impurity, and would set apart, for the execution of this grand design, a certain number of chosen instruments, divinely assisted and prepared for this work, by the extraordinary succours of his Holy Spirit. Others, of a more prudent and rational turn of mind, entertained different views of this matter. They neither expected stupenduous miracles, nor extraordinary revelations, since they were persuaded, that it was possible, by human wisdom, industry, and vigilance, to purify the church from the contagion of the wicked, and restore it to the simplicity of its original constitution, provided that the manners and spirit of the primitive Christians could recover their lost dignity and lustre.

III. The drooping spirits of these people, who had been dispersed through many countries, and persecuted every where with the greatest severity, were revived when they were informed that Luther, seconded by several persons of eminent piety, had attempted with success the reformation of the church. Then they spoke with openness and freedom; and the enthusiasm of the fanatical, as well as the prudence of the wise, discovered themselves in their natural colours. Some of them imagined, that the time was now come in which God himself was to dwell with his servants in an extraordinary manner, by celestial succours, and to establish upon earth a kingdom truly spiritual and divine. Others, less sanguine and chimerical in their expectations, flattered themselves, nevertheless, with the fond hope of the approach of that happy period, in which the restoration of the church, which had been so long expected in vain, was to be accomplished, under the divine protection, by the labours and counsels of pious and eminent men. This sect was soon joined by great numbers, and (as usually happens in sudden revolutions of this nature) by many persons, whose characters and capacities were very different, though their views seemed to turn upon the same object. Their progress was rapid; for, in a very short time, their discourses, visions, and predictions, excited commotions in a great part of Europe, and drew into their communion a prodigious multitude, whose ignorance rendered them easy victims to the illu-

conceal, and disguise with the greatest art such of their institutions as otherwise might appear of a pernicious tendency, and might expose them to censure.

[a] The writers for and against the Anabaptists are amply enumerated by Caspar Sagittarius, in his Introductio ad Histor. Eccles. tom. i. p. 826. and by Christ. M. Pfaffius, in his Introduct. in Histor. Liter. Theologiæ, part ii. p. 349.—Add to these a modern writer and a Mennonite preacher, Herman Schyn, who published at Amsterdam, in 1723, his Historia Mennonitarum, and, in 1729, his Plenior Deductio Histor. Mennonit. These two books, though they do not deserve the title of a History of the Mennonites, are nevertheless useful, in order to come at a thorough knowledge of the affairs of this sect; for this author is much more intent upon defending his brethren against the accusations and reproaches with which they have been loaded, than careful in tracing out the origin, progress, and revolutions of their sect. Indeed the Mennonites have not much reason to boast either of the extraordinary learning or dexterity of this their patron; and it is to be imagined, that they may easily find a more able defender. For an accurate account of the Mennonite historians, and their confessions of faith, see Jo. Christ. Kocheri Bibliotheca Theol. Symbolicæ, p. 461.

[b] See Herm. Schyn's Plenior Deductio Histor. Mennon. cap. i. as also a Dutch work by Galen Abrahamzon, entitled, Verdediging der Christenen, die Doopsgesinde genand worden.

[c] See, for an account of the religious sentiments of the Waldenses, Limborch's excellent History of the Inquisition, translated into English by the learned Dr. Samuel Chandler, book i. chap. viii.—It appears from undoubted testimonies, that the Wickliffites and Hussites did not greatly differ from the Waldenses, with regard to the point under consideration.

☞ See also Lydii Waldensia, and Allix's Ancient Churches of Piedmont, ch. xxii.—xxvi. p. 211—280. N.

sions of enthusiasm. It is, however, to be observed, that, as the leaders of this sect had fallen into that erroneous and chimerical notion, that the new kingdom of Christ, which they expected, was to be exempted from every kind of vice, and from the smallest degree of imperfection and corruption, they were not satisfied with the plan of reformation proposed by Luther. They looked upon it as much beneath the sublimity of their views, and, consequently, undertook a more perfect reformation, or, to express more properly their visionary enterprise, they proposed to found a true church, entirely spiritual, and truly divine.

IV. It is difficult to determine, with certainty, the particular spot that gave birth to that seditious and pestilential sect of Anabaptists, whose tumultuous and desperate attempts were equally pernicious to the cause of religion, and the civil interests of mankind. Whether this sect arose in Switzerland, Germany, or Holland, is still a point of debate, whose decision is of no great importance.[a] It is most probable, that several persons of this odious class made their appearance at the same time, in different countries; and we may fix this period soon after the dawn of the Reformation in Germany, when Luther arose to set bounds to the ambition of Rome. This appears from a variety of circumstances, and especially from this striking one, that the first Anabaptist doctors of any eminence were, almost all, heads and leaders of particular and separate sects; for it must be carefully observed, that though all these projectors of a new, unspotted, and perfect church, were comprehended under the general denomination of Anabaptists, on account of their opposing the baptism of infants, and their re-baptizing such as had received that sacrament in a state of childhood in other churches, yet they were, from their very origin, subdivided into various sects, which differed from each other in points of no small moment. The most pernicious faction of all those that composed this motley multitude, was the sect which pretended that the founders of the new and perfect church, already mentioned, were under the direction of a divine impulse, and were armed against all opposition by the power of working miracles. It was this detestable faction that, in 1521, began their fanatical work, under the guidance of Munzer, Stubner, Storck, and other leaders of the same furious complexion, and excited the most unhappy tumults and commotions in Saxony and the adjacent countries. They employed at first the various arts of persuasion, in order to propagate their doctrine. They preached, exhorted, admonished, and reasoned, in a manner that seemed proper to gain the multitude, and related a great number of visions and revelations, with which they pretended to have been favoured from above. But when they saw that these methods of making proselytes were not attended with such rapid success as they fondly expected, and that the ministry of Luther, and other eminent reformers, proved detrimental to their cause, they had recourse to more expeditious measures, and madly attempted to propagate their fanatical doctrine by force of arms. Munzer and his associates assembled, in 1525 a numerous army, chiefly composed of the peasants of Suabia, Thuringia, Franconia, and Saxony, and, at the head of this credulous and deluded rabble, declared war against all laws, governments, and magistrates of every kind, under the chimerical pretext, that Christ was now to take the reins of civil and ecclesiastical government into his own hands, and to rule alone over the nations. But this seditious crowd was routed and dispersed, without much difficulty, by the elector of Saxony and other princes; Munzer was ignominiously put to death, and his factious counsellors were scattered abroad in different places.[b]

V. This bloody defeat of one part of these seditious and turbulent fanatics, did not produce that effect upon the rest which might naturally have been expected; it rendered them, indeed, more timorous, but it did not open their eyes upon their delusion. It is certain, that, even after this period, numbers of them, who were infected with the same odious principles that occasioned the destruction of Munzer, wandered about in Germany, Switzerland, and Holland, and excited the people to rebellion by their seditious discourses. They collected congregations in several places; affected to foretel, in consequence of a divine commission, the approaching abolition of magistracy, and the downfall of civil rulers and governors; and, while they pretended to be ambassadors of the Most High, insulted on many occasions the majesty of Heaven by the most flagitious crimes. Those who distinguished themselves by the enormity of their conduct in this infamous sect, were Louis Hetzer, Balthazar Hubmeyer, Felix Mentz, Conrad Grebel, Melchior Hoffman, and George Jacob, who, if their power had seconded their designs, would have involved all Switzerland, Holland, and Germany, in tumult and bloodshed.[c] A great part of this rabble seemed really delirious; and nothing more extravagant or more incredible can be imagined than the dreams and visions that were constantly arising in their disordered brains. Such of them as had some sparks of reason left, and had reflexion enough to reduce their notions into a certain form, maintained, among others, the following points of doctrine: "That the church of Christ ought to be exempt from all sin; that all things ought to be in common among the faithful; that all usury, tithes, and tribute, ought to be entirely abolished; that the baptism of infants was an invention of the devil; that every Christian was invested with a power of preaching the Gospel, and, consequently, that the church stood in no need of ministers or pastors; that in the kingdom of Christ civil magistrates were absolutely useless; and that God still continued to reveal his will to chosen persons by dreams and visions."[d]

It would betray, however, a strange ignorance, or an unjustifiable partiality, to maintain, that all those who professed this eccentric and absurd doctrine were chargeable with that furious and brutal extravagance which has been mentioned as the character of too great a part of their sect. This was by no means the case; several of these enthusiasts discovered a milder and more pacific spirit, and were free from any other reproach, than that which resulted from the errors they maintained, and their

[a] Fueslin has attempted to examine, whether the Anabaptists first arose in Germany or Switzerland, in a German work, entitled, *Beytrage zur Schwezerisch Reformat. Geschichte*, tom. i. p. 190; tom. ii. p. 64, 265, 327; tom. iii. p. 323; but without success.

[b] See Seckendorf, Histor. Lutheranismi, lib. i. p. 192, 304. lib. ii. p. 13.—Sleidan, Commentar. lib. v. p. 47.—Joach. Camerarii Vita Melancthonis, p. 44.

[c] See Jo. Bapt. Ottii Annales Anabaptist. p. 21.—Jo. Hornbeckii Summa Controvers. lib. v. p. 332.—Anton. Matthæi Analect. veteris Ævi, tom. iv. p. 629, 677, 679.—Bernard. Raupachii Aust. Evangel. t. ii. p. 41.—Jo. Georg. Schelhorn, Act. ad Hist. Ec. pertin. t. i. p. 100.—See also Arnold's Kirchen Hist. lib. xvi. c. xxi. and Fueslin's Beytrage.

[d] This account of the doctrine of the Anabaptists is principally taken from the learned Fueslin already quoted.

too ardent desire of spreading them among the multitude. It may still farther be affirmed with truth, that many of those who followed the wiser class of Anabaptists, and even some who adhered to the most extravagant factions of that sect, were men of upright intentions and sincere piety, who were seduced into this mystery of fanaticism and iniquity, on the one hand, by their ignorance and simplicity, and, on the other, by a laudable desire of reforming the corrupt state of religion.

VI. The progress of this turbulent sect, in almost all the countries of Europe, alarmed all who had any concern for the public good. Princes, and sovereign states, exerted themselves to check these rebellious enthusiasts in their career, by issuing out, first, severe edicts to restrain their violence, and employing, at length, capital punishments to conquer their obstinacy.[a] But here a maxim, already verified by repeated experience, received a new degree of confirmation; for the conduct of the Anabaptists, under the pressure of persecution, plainly showed the extreme difficulty of correcting or influencing, by the prospect of suffering, or even by the terrors of death, minds that are either deeply tainted with the poison of fanaticism, or firmly bound by the ties of religion. In almost all the countries of Europe, an unspeakable number of these unhappy wretches preferred death, in its worst forms, to a retraction of their errors. Neither the view of the flames that were kindled to consume them, nor the ignominy of the gibbet, nor the terrors of the sword, could shake their invincible, but ill-placed constancy, or make them abandon tenets, that appeared dearer to them than life and all its enjoyments. The Mennonites have preserved voluminous records of the lives, actions, and unhappy fate of those of their sect, who suffered death for the crimes of rebellion or heresy, which were imputed to them.[b] Certain it is, that they were treated with severity; and it is much to be lamented that so little distinction was made between the members of this sect, when the sword of justice was unsheathed against them. Why were the innocent and the guilty involved in the same fate? Why were doctrines purely theological, or, at worst, fanatical, punished with the same rigour that was shown to crimes inconsistent with the peace and welfare of civil society? Those who had no other marks of peculiarity than their administering baptism to adult persons only, and their excluding the unrighteous from the external communion of the church, ought undoubtedly to have met with milder treatment than that which was given to those seditious incendiaries, who were for unhinging all government and destroying all civil authority. Many suffered for errors which they had embraced with the most upright intentions, seduced by the eloquence and fervour of their doctors, and persuading themselves that they were contributing to the advancement of true religion. But, as the greatest part of these enthusiasts had communicated to the multitude their visionary notions, concerning the new spiritual kingdom that was soon to be erected, and the abolition of magistracy and civil government that was to be the immediate effect of this great revolution, this rendered the very name of an Anabaptist unspeakably odious, and made it always excite the idea of a seditious incendiary, a pest to human society. It is true, that many Anabaptists suffered death, not on account of their being considered as rebellious subjects, but merely because they were judged to be incorrigible heretics; for in this century the error of limiting the administration of baptism to adult persons only, and the practice of re-baptizing such as had received that sacrament in a state of infancy, were looked upon as most flagitious and intolerable heresies. It is, nevertheless, certain, that the greatest part of these wretched sufferers owed their unhappy fate to their rebellious principles and tumultuous proceedings, and that many also were punished for their temerity and imprudence, which had led them to the commission of various crimes.

VII. There stands upon record a most shocking instance of this, in the dreadful commotions that were excited at Munster, in 1533, by some Dutch Anabaptists, who chose that city as the scene of their horrid operations, and committed in it such deeds as would surpass all credibility, were they not attested in a manner that excludes every degree of doubt and uncertainty. A handful of madmen, who had gotten into their heads the visionary notion of a new and spiritual kingdom, soon to be established in an extraordinary manner, formed themselves into a society, under the guidance of a few illiterate leaders chosen out of the populace; and they persuaded, not only the ignorant multitude, but even several among the learned, that Munster was to be the seat of this new and heavenly Jerusalem, whose spiritual dominion was thence to be propagated to all parts of the earth. The bold ringleaders of this furious tribe were John Matthison, John Bockhold, a tailor of Leyden, one Gerard, with some others, whom the blind rage of enthusiasm, or the still more culpable principles of sedition, had embarked in this extravagant and desperate cause. They made themselves masters of the city of Munster, deposed the magistrates, and committed all the enormous crimes, and ridiculous follies, which the most perverse and infernal imagination could suggest.[c] John Bockhold was proclaimed king and legislator of this new hierarchy; but his reign was transitory, and his end deplorable; for Munster was, in 1536, retaken after a long siege by its bishop and sovereign, count Waldeck, the New Jerusalem of the Anabaptists destroyed, and its mock monarch punished with a most painful and ignominious death.[d] The disorders occasioned by the

[a] It was in Saxony, if I mistake not, and also in the year 1525, that penal laws were first enacted against this fanatical tribe. These laws were renewed in 1527, 1528, 1534. See a German work of the learned Kappius, entitled, Nachlese von Reformations Urkunden, part i. p. 176. Charles V. incensed at the increasing impudence and iniquity of these enthusiasts, issued out against them severe edicts, in the years 1527 and 1529. (See Ottii Annales Anabapt. p. 45.) The magistrates of Switzerland treated, at first, with remarkable lenity and indulgence, the Anabaptists who lived under their government; but when it was found that this lenity rendered them still more enterprising and insolent, it was judged proper to have recourse to a different manner of proceeding. Accordingly the magistrates of Zurich, in 1525, denounced capital punishment against this riotous sect.

[b] See Joach. Christ. Jehring, Præfat. ad Historiam Mennonitarum.

[c] Bockhold, or Bockelson, aliis John of Leyden, who headed them at Munster, ran naked in the streets, married eleven wives, at the same time, to show his approbation of polygamy; and entitled himself king of Sion; all which formed but a very small part of the pernicious follies of this mock monarch.

[d] See Anton. Corvini Narratio de miserabili Monaster. Anabapt. Excidio.—Casp. Sagittar. Introduct. in Histor. Ecclesiast. tom. i. p. 537 and 835.—Herm. Hamelmann, Historia Renati Evangelii in urbe Monaster. in Operib. Genealogico-Historicis, p. 1203.—The elegant Latin poem of Bolandus in elegiac verse, entitled, J. Fabricii Bolandi Motus Monasteriens. Libri decem,—Herm. Kerssenbrock, Histor. Belli Monaster. edited by Dan. Gerdes in Miscellan. Groningens. Nov. tom. ii. The last-mentioned author speaks also of Bernard Rothman, an ecclesiastic of Munster, who had introduced the reformation into that city, but afterwards was infected with the enthusiasm of the Anabaptists; and who, though, in other respects, he had shown himself to be neither desti-

Anabaptists at this period, not only in Westphalia, but also in other parts of Germany,[a] showed too plainly to what horrid extremities the pernicious doctrines of this wrong-headed sect were calculated to lead the inconsiderate and unwary; and therefore it is not at all to be wondered, that the secular arm employed rigorous measures to extirpate a faction, which was the occasion, and the source, of unspeakable calamities in so many countries.[b]

VIII. While the terrors of death, in the most dreadful forms, were presented to the view of this miserable sect, and numbers of them were executed every day, without a proper distinction being made between the innocent and the guilty, those who escaped the severity of justice were in the most discouraging situation that can well be imagined. On the one hand, they beheld, with sorrow, all their hopes blasted by the total defeat of their brethren at Munster; and, on the other, they were filled with the most anxious apprehensions of the perils that threatened them on all sides. In this critical situation they derived much comfort and assistance from the counsels and zeal of Menno Simonis, a native of Friseland, who had formerly been a popish priest, and, as he himself confesses, a notorious profligate. This man went over to the Anabaptists, at first, in a clandestine manner, and frequented their assemblies with the utmost secrecy; but, in 1436, he threw off the mask, resigned his rank and office in the Romish Church, and publicly embraced their communion. About a year after this, he was earnestly solicited by many of the sect to assume among them the rank and functions of a public teacher; and as he looked upon the persons, from whom this proposal came, to be exempt from the fanatical phrenzy of their brethren at Munster, (though, according to other accounts, they were originally of the same stamp, only rendered somewhat wiser by their sufferings,) he yielded to their entreaties. From this period to the end of his days, that is, during the space of twenty-five years, he travelled from one country to another with his wife and children, exercising his ministry under a series of pressures and calamities of various kinds, and constantly exposed to the danger of falling a victim to the severity of the laws. East and West Friseland, together with the province of Groningen, were first visited by the zealous apostle of the Anabaptists: thence he directed his course into Holland, Guelderland, Brabant, and Westphalia, continued it through the German provinces on the coast of the Baltic sea, and penetrated as far as Livonia. In all these places his ministerial labours were attended with remarkable success, and added to his sect a prodigious number of proselytes. Hence he is deservedly looked upon as the common chief of almost all the Anabaptists, and the parent of the sect that still subsists under that denomination. The success of this missionary will not appear very surprising to those who are acquainted with his character, spirit, and talents, and who have a just notion of the state of the Anabaptists at the period now under consideration. Menno was a man of genius; though, as his writings show, his genius was not under the direction of a very sound judgment. He had the inestimable advantage of a natural and persuasive eloquence, and his learning was sufficient to make him pass for an oracle in the eyes of the multitude. He appears, moreover, to have been a man of probity, of a meek and tractable spirit, gentle in his manners, pliant and obsequious in his commerce with persons of all ranks and characters, and extremely zealous in promoting practical religion and virtue, which he recommended by his example, as well as by his precepts. A man of such talents and dispositions could not fail to attract the admiration of the people, and to gain a great number of adherents wherever he exercised his ministry. But no where could he expect a more plentiful harvest than among the Anabaptists, whose ignorance and simplicity rendered them peculiarly susceptible of new impressions, and who, having been long accustomed to leaders that resembled phrenetic Bacchanals more than Christian ministers, and often deluded by odious impostors, who involved them in endless perils and calamities, were rejoiced to find at length a teacher, whose doctrine and manners flattered them with the hopes of more prosperous days.[c]

IX. Menno drew up a plan of doctrine and discipline of a much more mild and moderate nature than that of the furious and fanatical Anabaptists already mentioned, but somewhat more severe, though more clear and consistent, than the doctrine of some of the wiser branches of that sect, who aimed at nothing more than the restoration of the Christian church to its primitive purity. Accordingly he condemned the plan of ecclesiastical discipline, that was

---

tute of learning nor of virtue, yet enlisted himself in this fanatical tribe, and had a share in their most turbulent and furious proceedings.

☞ [a] The scenes of violence, tumult, and sedition, that were exhibited in Holland by this odious tribe, were likewise terrible. They formed the design of reducing the city of Leyden to ashes, but were happily prevented, and severely punished. John of Leyden, the Anabaptist king of Munster, had taken it into his head that God had made him a present of the cities of Amsterdam, Deventer, and Wesel; in consequence of which, he sent bishops to these three places, to preach *his* gospel of sedition and carnage. About the beginning of the year 1535, twelve Anabaptists, of whom five were women, assembled at midnight in a private house at Amsterdam. One of them, who was a tailor by profession, fell into a trance, and, after having preached and prayed during the space of four hours, stripped himself naked, threw his clothes into the fire, and commanded all the assembly to do the same, in which he was obeyed without the least reluctance. He then ordered them to follow him through the streets in this state of nature, which they accordingly did, howling and bawling out, "Wo! wo! the wrath of God! wo to Babylon!" When, after being seized and brought before the magistrates, clothes were offered them to cover their indecency, they refused them obstinately, and cried aloud, "We are the naked truth." When they were brought to the scaffold, they sang, danced, and discovered all the marks of enthusiastic phrenzy.—These tumults were followed by a regular and deep laid conspiracy, formed by Van Geelen (an envoy of the mock king of Munster, who had made a very considerable number of proselytes) against the magistrates of Amsterdam, with a design to wrest the government of that city out of their hands. This incendiary marched with his fanatical troops to the town-house on the day appointed, drums beating, and colours flying, and fixed there his head-quarters. He was attacked by the burghers, who were assisted by some regular troops, and headed by several of the burgomasters of the city. After an obstinate resistance, he was surrounded with his whole troop, who were put to death in the severest and most dreadful manner, to serve as examples to the other branches of the sect, who were exciting commotions of a like nature in Friseland, Groningen, and other provinces and cities in the Netherlands.

[b] Ger. Brandt. Histor. Reform. Belgicæ, tom. i. lib. ii.

[c] Menno was born in the neighbourhood of Bolswert in Friseland, in 1505, and not in 1496, as most writers affirm. After a life of toil, peril, and agitation, he died in peace in 1561, at the country seat of a certain nobleman, (not far from the city of Oldesloe in Holstein,) who, moved with compassion at a view of the perils to which Menno was exposed, and the snares that were daily laid for his ruin, took him, with some of his associates, into his protection, and gave him an asylum. We have a particular account of this famous Anabaptist in the Cimbria Literata of Mollerus, tom. ii. p. 835. See also Schyn's Plenior Deduct. Histor. Mennon. cap. vi. p. 116.—The writings of Menno, which are almost all composed in the Dutch language, were published at Amsterdam, in 1651. An excessively diffuse and rambling style, frequent and unnecessary repetitions, an irregular and confused method, with other defects of equal moment, render the perusal of these productions highly disagreeable.

founded on the prospect of a new kingdom, to be miraculously established by Jesus Christ on the ruins of civil government, and the destruction of human rulers, and which had been the pestilential source of such dreadful commotions, such execrable rebellions, and such enormous crimes. He declared, publicly, his dislike to that doctrine which pointed out the approach of a marvellous reformation in the church by the means of a new and *extraordinary* effusion of the Holy Spirit. He expressed his abhorrence of the licentious tenets which several of the Anabaptists had maintained, with respect to the lawfulness of polygamy and divorce; and finally considered, as unworthy of toleration, those fanatics who were of opinion that the Holy Ghost continued to descend into the minds of many chosen believers, in as extraordinary a manner as it did at the first establishment of the Christian church, and that it testified its peculiar presence to several of the faithful, by miracles, predictions, dreams, and visions of various kinds. He retained, indeed, the doctrines commonly received among the Anabaptists in relation to the baptism of infants, the *Millenium*, or thousand-years' reign of Christ upon earth, the exclusion of magistrates from the Christian church, the abolition of war, and the prohibition of oaths enjoined by our Saviour, and the vanity, as well as the pernicious effects, of human science. But, while Menno retained these doctrines in a general sense, he explained and modified them in such a manner, as made them resemble the religious tenets which were universally received in the protestant churches; and this rendered them agreeable to many, and made them appear inoffensive even to numbers who had no inclination to embrace them. Indeed, it so happened, that the nature of the doctrines, considered in themselves, the eloquence of Menno, which set them off to such advantage, and the circumstances of the times, gave a high degree of credit to the religious system of this famous teacher among the Anabaptists, so that it made a rapid progress in that sect. And thus it was in consequence of the ministry of Menno that the different sorts of Anabaptists agreed together in excluding from their communion the fanatics who dishonoured it, and in renouncing all tenets that were detrimental to the authority of civil government, and, by an unexpected coalition, formed themselves into one community.[a]

X. To preserve a spirit of union and concord in a body composed of such a motley multitude of dissonant members, required more than human power; and Menno neither had, nor pretended to have, supernatural succours. Accordingly, the seeds of dissension were, in a little time, sown among this people. About the middle of this century, a warm contest, concerning excommunication, was excited by several Anabaptists, headed by Leonard Bowenson and Theodore Philip; and its fruits are yet visible in that divided sect. These men carried the discipline of

[a] These facts show us plainly how the famous question concerning the origin of the modern Anabaptists may be resolved. The Mennonites oppose, with all their might, the account of their descent from the ancient Anabaptists, which we find in so many writers, and would willingly give the modern Anabaptists a more honourable origin. (See Schyn's Histor. Mennonitar. cap. viii. ix. xxi. p. 223.) The reason of their zeal in this matter is evident. Their situation has rendered them timorous. They live, as it were, in the midst of their enemies, and are constantly filled with an uneasy apprehension, that, at some time or other, malevolent zealots may take occasion, from their supposed origin, to renew against them the penal laws, by which the seditious Anabaptists of ancient times suffered in such a dreadful manner. At least, they imagine that the odium under which they lie, will be greatly diminished, if they can prove, to the satisfaction of the public, the falsehood of the general opinion, that "the Mennonites are the descendants of the Anabaptists;" or, to speak more properly, "the same individual sect, purged indeed from the fanaticism that formerly disgraced it, and rendered wiser than their ancestors, by reflection and suffering."

After comparing diligently and impartially what has been alleged by the Mennonites and their adversaries in relation to this matter, I cannot see what it is properly, that forms the subject of their controversy; and if the merits of the case be stated with accuracy and perspicuity, I do not see how there can be any dispute at all about the matter now under consideration. For, in the first place, if the Mennonites mean nothing more than this, that Menno, whom they considered as their parent and their chief, was not infected with those odious opinions which drew the just severity of the laws upon the Anabaptists of Munster; that he neither looked for a new and spotless kingdom that was to be miraculously erected on earth, nor excited the multitude to depose magistrates, and abolish civil government; that he neither deceived himself, nor imposed upon others, by fanatical pretensions to dreams and visions of the supernatural kind; if (I say) this be all that the Mennonites mean, when they speak of their chief, no person, acquainted with the history of their sect, will pretend to contradict them. Even those who maintain that there was an immediate and intimate connexion between the ancient and modern Anabaptists, will readily allow to be true, all that has been here said of Menno.—2dly, If the Anabaptists maintain, that such of their churches as received their doctrine and discipline from Menno, have not only discovered, without interruption, a pacific spirit and an unlimited submission to civil government, (abstaining from every thing that bears the remotest aspect of sedition, and showing the utmost abhorrence of wars and bloodshed,) but have even banished from their confessions of faith, and their religious instructions, all those tenets and principles which led the ancient Anabaptists to disobedience, violence, and rebellion; this also will be readily granted.—And if they allege, in the third place, that even the Anabaptists who lived before Menno, were not *all* so delirious as Munzer, or so outrageous as the fanatical members of the sect, who rendered their memory eternally odious by the enormities they committed at Munster; that, on the contrary, many of these ancient Anabaptists abstained religiously from all acts of violence and sedition, followed the pious examples of the ancient Waldenses, Henricians, Petrobrusians, Hussites, and Wickliffites, and adopted the doctrine and disciple of Menno, as soon as that new parent arose to reform and patronise the sect; all this will be allowed without hesitation.

But, on the other hand, the Mennonites may assert many things in defence of the purity of their origin, which cannot be admitted by any person who is free from prejudice, and well acquainted with their history. If they maintain, 1st, that none of their sect descended, by birth, from those Anabaptists, who involved Germany and other countries in the most dreadful calamities, or that none of these furious fanatics adopted the doctrine and discipline of Menno, they may be easily refuted by a great number of facts and testimonies, and particularly by the declarations of Menno himself, who glories in his having conquered the ferocity and reformed the lives and errors of many members of this pestilential sect. Nothing can be more certain than this fact, viz. that the first Mennonite congregations were composed of the different sorts of Anabaptists already mentioned, of those who had been always inoffensive and upright, and of those who, before their conversion by the ministry of Menno, had been seditious fanatics. Nor can the acknowledgment of this incontestable fact be a just matter of reproach to the Mennonites, or be more dishonourable to them, than it is to us, that our ancestors were warmly attached to the idolatrous and extravagant worship of paganism or popery.—Again, it will not be possible for us to agree with the Mennonites, if they maintain, 2dly, that their sect does not retain, at this day, any of those tenets, or even any remains of those opinions and doctrines which led the seditious and turbulent Anabaptists of old to the commission of so many, and of such enormous crimes. For, not to mention Menno's calling the Anabaptists of Munster his *Brethren*, (a denomination indeed somewhat softened by the epithet of *erring*, which he joined to it,) it is undoubtedly true, that the doctrine concerning the nature of Christ's kingdom, or the church of the New-Testament, which led by degrees the ancient Anabaptists to those furious acts of rebellion that rendered them so odious, is by no means effaced in the minds of the modern Mennonites. It is, indeed, weakened and modified in such a manner as to have lost its noxious qualities, and to be no longer pernicious in its influence; but it is not totally renounced or abolished.—I shall not now inquire how far even the reformed and milder sect of Menno has been, in time past, exempt from tumults and commotions of a grievous kind, nor shall I examine what passes at this day among the Anabaptists in general, or in particular branches of that sect, since it is certain, that the more eminent communities of that denomination, particularly those that flourish in North Holland, and the places adjacent, behold fanatics with the utmost aversion, as appears evidently from this circumstance, among others, that they will not suffer the people called Quakers to enter into their communion.

excommunication to an enormous degree of severity. They not only maintained, that open transgressors, even those who sincerely deplored and lamented their faults, should, without any previous warning or admonition, be expelled from the communion of the church, but were also audacious enough to pretend to exclude the persons, thus excommunicated, from all intercourse with their wives, husbands, brothers, sisters, children, and other relatives. The same persons, as might naturally be expected from this instance of their severity, were harsh and rigid in their manners, and were for imposing upon their brethren a course of moral discipline, which was difficult and austere in the highest degree. Many of the Anabaptists protested against this, as unreasonable and unnecessary; and thus the community was suddenly divided into two sects, one of which treated transgressors with lenity and moderation, while the other proceeded against them with the utmost rigour. Nor was this the only difference that was observable in the conduct and manners of these two parties, since the members of the latter sect were remarkable for the sordid austerity that reigned in their rules of life and practice, while the former, considering more wisely the present state of human nature, were less severe in their injunctions, and were not altogether regardless of what is called decent, agreeable, and ornamental in life and manners. Menno employed his most vigorous efforts to heal these divisions, and to restore peace and concord in the community; but, when he perceived that his attempts were vain, he conducted himself in such a manner as he thought the most proper to maintain his credit and influence among both parties. For this purpose he declared himself for neither side, but was constantly trimming between the two, as long as he lived; at one time, discovering an inclination toward the austere Anabaptists; and, at another, seeming to prefer the milder discipline and manners of the moderate brethren. But in this he acted in opposition to the plainest dictates of prudence; and accordingly the high degree of authority he enjoyed, rendered his inconstancy and irresolution not only disagreeable to both parties, but also the means of inflaming, instead of healing, their divisions.[a]

XI. These two sects are, to this very day, distinguished by the denomination of *fine* and *gross*,[b] or, to express the distinction in more intelligible terms, into *rigid* and *moderate* Anabaptists. The former observe, with the most religious accuracy, veneration, and precision, the ancient doctrine, discipline, and precepts of the purer sort of Anabaptists; the latter depart much more from the primitive sentiments, manners, and institutions of their sect, and more nearly approach those of the protestant churches. The gross or moderate Anabaptists consisted, at first, of the inhabitants of a district in North-Holland, called Waterland; and hence their whole sect received the denomination of Waterlandians.[c] The fine or rigid part of that community were, for the most part, natives of Flanders; and hence their sect acquired the denomination of Flemings or Flandrians. But new dissensions and contests arose among these rigid Anabaptists, not, indeed, concerning any point of doctrine, but about the manner of treating persons that were to be excommunicated, and other matters of inferior moment. Hence a new schism arose; and they were subdivided into new sects, distinguished by the appellations of Flandrians and Friselanders, who differed from each other in their manners and discipline. The members of a third division took the name of their country, like the two former sects, and were called Germans; for the Anabaptists of Germany passed in shoals into Holland and the Netherlands. But, in process of time, the greatest part of these three sects came over, by degrees, to the moderate community of the Waterlandians, with whom they lived in the strictest bonds of peace and union. Those among the rigid Anabaptists, who refused to follow this example of moderation, are still known by the denomination of the Old Flemings or Flandrians, but are few in number, when compared with the united congregations of the milder sects now mentioned.

XII. No sooner had the ferment of enthusiasm subsided among the Mennonites, than all the different sects, into which they had been divided, unanimously agreed to draw the whole system of their religious doctrine from the Holy Scriptures alone. To give a satisfactory proof of the sincerity of their resolution in this respect, they took care to have *Confessions* drawn up, in which their sentiments concerning the Deity, and the manner of serving him, were expressed in the terms and phrases of Holy Writ. The most ancient, and also the most respectable of these Confessions, is that which we find among the Waterlandians. Several others of later date, were also composed, some for the use of large communities, for the people of a whole district, and which were consequently submitted to the inspection of the magistrate; others designed only for the benefit of private societies.[d] It might not, perhaps, be amiss to inquire, whether all the tenets received among the Mennonites are faithfully exhibited and plainly expressed in these Confessions, or whether se-

[a] See the Historia Bellorum et Certaminum quæ, ab An. 1615, inter Mennonitas contigerunt, published by an anonymous Mennonite.—See also a German work by Simon Frederic Rues, entitled Nachrichten von dem Zustande der Mennoniten, published at Jena in 1743.

[b] The terms *fine* and *gross* are a literal translation of *feinen* and *groben*, which are the German denominations used to distinguish these two sects. The same terms have been introduced among the protestants in Holland; the *fine* denoting a set of people, whose extraordinary and sometimes fanatical devotion resembles that of the English methodists; while the epithet *gross* is applied to the generality of Christians, who make no extraordinary pretensions to sanctity and devotion.

[c] See Fred. Spanhemii Elenchus Controvers. Theol. op. tom. iii. p. 772. The Waterlandians were also called Johannites, from John de Ries, who was of great use to them in many respects, and who, assisted by Lubert Gerard, composed their confession of faith in 1580. This confession (which far surpasses both in point of simplicity and wisdom all the other confessions of the Mennonites) has passed through several editions, and has been lately republished by Herman Schyn, in his Histor. Mennon. It was also illustrated in an ample Commentary, in 1686, by Peter Joannis, a native of Holland, and pastor among the Waterlandians. It has, however, been alleged, that this famous production is by no means the general confession of the Waterlandians, but the private one only of that particular congregation of which its author was the pastor. See Rues, Nachrichten, p. 93.

[d] See Schyn's Plenior Deduct. Hist. Mennon. cap. iv. where he maintains, that "these Confessions prove as great an uniformity among the Mennonites, in relation to the great and fundamental doctrines of religion, as can be pretended to by any other Christian community." But should the good man even succeed in persuading us of this boasted uniformity, he will yet never be able to make his assertion go down with many of his own brethren, who are, to this day, quarreling about several points of religion, and who look upon matters, which appear to him of little consequence, as of high moment and importance to the cause of true piety. And, indeed, how could any of the Mennonites, before the present (*eighteenth*) century, believe what Schyn here affirms, since it is well known, that they disputed about matters which he treats with contempt, as if they had been immediately connected with their eternal interests?

veral points be not there omitted which relate to the internal constitution of this sect, and would give us a complete idea of its nature and tendency. One thing is certain, that whoever peruses these Confessions with an ordinary degree of attention, will easily perceive, that those tenets which appear detrimental to the interests of civil society, particularly such as relate to the prerogatives of magistracy, and the administration of oaths, are expressed with the utmost caution, and embellished with the greatest art, to prevent their bearing an alarming aspect. At the same time, the more discerning observer will see, that these embellishments are intended to disguise the truth, and that the doctrines of the Anabaptists, concerning the critical points above-mentioned, are not represented, in their public confessions, in their real colours.

XIII. The ancient Anabaptists, who trusted in an extraordinary direction of the Holy Spirit, were (under the pretended influence of so infallible a guide) little solicitous about composing a system of religion, and never once thought of instilling into the minds of the people just sentiments of the Deity. Hence warm dissensions arose among them, concerning matters of the highest consequence, such as the divinity of Christ, polygamy, and divorce. Menno and his disciples made some attempts to supply this defect. Yet we find, after his time, that the Mennonites, more especially those of the rigid class, carried the freedom of their religious speculations to such an excessive height, as bordered upon extravagance. This circumstance alone, were there no other, proves that the heads of this sect employed the smallest part of their zeal to prevent the introduction and propagation of error, and that they looked upon sanctity of life and manners alone as the essence of true religion. The Waterlandians, indeed, and after them the other Anabaptists, were obliged, at length, to draw up a summary of their doctrine, and to lay it before the public, in order to remove the odium that was cast upon them, on account of their bold tenets and their extravagant disputes, which were likely to involve them in the greatest calamities. But these confessions of the Mennonites were, in reality, little more than a method of defence, to which they were reduced by the opposition they met with, and must therefore be rather considered as an expedient to avert the indignation of their enemies, than as articles of doctrine, which all of them without exception were obliged to believe. For we do not find among the Mennonites (a part of the modern Waterlandians excepted) any injunction, which expressly prohibits individuals from entertaining or propagating religious opinions different from the public creed of the community; and, indeed, when we look attentively into the nature and constitution of this sect, it will appear to have been, in some measure, founded upon this principle, that practical piety is the essence of religion, and that the surest and most infallible mark of the true church is the sanctity of its members; it is at least certain, that this principle was always universally adopted by the Anabaptists.

XIV. If we are to form our judgment of the religion of the Mennonites from their public creeds and confessions, we shall find, that, though it differs widely from the doctrine of the Lutherans, it varies little in most points from that of the reformed church. They consider the sacraments in no other light, than as *signs* or symbols of the spiritual blessings administered in the Gospel; and their ecclesiastical discipline seems to be almost entirely the same with that of the Presbyterians. There are, however, peculiar tenets, by which they are distinguished from all other religious communities; and these may be reduced under three heads; for it is observable, that there are certain doctrines, which are holden in common by all the various sects of the Mennonites; others, which are only received in some of the more eminent and numerous sects of that community; (such were the sentiments of Menno, which hindered him from being universally acceptable to the Anabaptists;) and some, which are only to be found among the more obscure and inconsiderable societies of that denomination. These last, indeed, appear and vanish, alternately, with the transitory sects that adopt them, and therefore do not deserve to engage our attention.

XV. The opinions, entertained by the Mennonites in general, seem to be derived from this leading and fundamental principle, that 'the kingdom which Christ established upon earth is a visible church, or community, into which the holy and the just are alone to be admitted, and which is consequently exempt from all those institutions and rules of discipline that have been invented by human wisdom for the correction and reformation of the wicked.'

This fanatical principle was frankly avowed by the ancient Mennonites: their more immediate descendants, however, began to be less ingenuous; and, in their public confessions of faith, they either disguised it under ambiguous phrases, or expressed themselves as if they meant to renounce it. To renounce it entirely was, indeed, impossible, without falling into the greatest inconsistency, and undermining the very foundation of those doctrines which distinguished them from all other Christian societies.[a] And yet it is certain that the present Mennonites, as they have, in many other respects, departed from the principles and maxims of their ancestors, have also given a striking instance of defection in the case now before us, and have almost wholly relinquished this fundamental doctrine of their sect, relating to the nature of the Christian church. A dismal experience has convinced them of the absurdity of this chimerical principle, which the dictates of reason, and the declarations of Scripture, had demonstrated sufficiently, but without effect. Now, that the Mennonites have opened their eyes, they seem to be pretty generally agreed about the following tenets: first, That there is an invisible church, which is universal in

[a] That they did not entirely relinquish it, is evident from their own creeds and confessions, even from those in which the greatest caution has been employed to conceal the principles that rendered their ancestors odious, and to disguise whatever might render themselves liable to suspicion. For example, they speak in the most pompous terms concerning the dignity, excellence, utility, and divine origin, of civil magistrates; and I am willing to suppose that they speak their real sentiments in this matter. But, when they proceed to give reasons that prevent their admitting magistrates into their communion, they discover unwarily the very principles which they are otherwise so studious to conceal. Thus, in the thirtieth article of the Waterlandian Confession, they declare, that "Jesus Christ has not comprehended the institution of civil magistracy in his spiritual kingdom, in the church of the New Testament, nor has he added it to the offices of his church." The Latin words are: "Potestatem hanc politicam Dominus Jesus in regno suo spirituali, ecclesiâ Novi Testamenti, non instituit, neque hanc officiis ecclesiæ suæ adjunxit." Hence it appears, that the Mennonites look upon the church of the New Testament as a holy republic, inaccessible to the wicked, and, consequently, exempt from those institutions and laws which are necessary to oppose the progress of iniquity. Why then do they not speak plainly, when they deliver their doctrine concerning the nature of the church, instead of affecting ambiguity and evasions?

its extent, and is composed of members from all the sects and communities that bear the Christian name: secondly, That the mark of the true church is not, as their former doctrine supposed, to be sought in the unspotted sanctity of all its members, (since the acknowledge that the visible church is promiscuously composed of the righteous and the wicked,) but in the knowledge of the truth, as it was delivered by Christ, and in the agreement of all the members of the church in professing and defending it.

XVI. Notwithstanding all this, it is manifest, beyond all possibility of contradiction, that the religious opinions which still distinguish the Mennonites from all other Christian communities, flow directly from the ancient doctrine of the Anabaptists concerning the nature of the church. It is in consequence of this doctrine, that they admit none to the sacrament of baptism, but persons who are come to the full use of their reason; because infants are incapable of binding themselves by a solemn vow to a holy life, and it is altogether uncertain whether, in mature years, they will be saints or sinners. Influenced by the same doctrine, they neither admit civil rulers into their communion, nor allow any of their members to perform the functions of magistracy; for, where there are no malefactors, magistrates are useless. Hence they pretend also to deny the lawfulness of repelling force by force, and consider war, in all its shapes, as unchristian and unjust; for, as those who are *perfectly holy*, can neither be provoked by injuries, nor commit them, they do not stand in need of the force of arms, either for the purposes of resentment or defence. It is still the same principle that excites in them the utmost aversion to the execution of justice, and more especially to capital punishments; since according to this principle, there are no transgressions or crimes in the kingdom of Christ, and consequently no occasion for the arm of the judge. Nor can it be imagined, that they should refuse to confirm their testimony by an oath upon any other foundation than this, that the perfect members of a holy church can neither dissemble nor deceive. It was certainly then the ancient doctrine of the Anabaptists, concerning the sanctity of the church, that gave rise to the tenets now mentioned, and was the source of that rigid and severe discipline, which excited such tumults and divisions among the members of that community.

XVII. The rules of moral discipline, formerly observed by the Mennonites, were rigorous and austere in the highest degree, and thus every way conformable to the fundamental principle, which has been already mentioned as the source of all their peculiar tenets. It is somewhat doubtful whether these rules still subsist and are respected among them; but it is certain, that in former times their moral precepts were very severe. And indeed it could not well be otherwise: for, when these people had once imbibed a notion that sanctity of manners was the *only* genuine mark of the true church, it may well be imagined, that they would spare no pains to obtain this honourable character for their sect; and that, for this purpose, they would use the strictest precautions to guard their brethren against disgracing their profession by immoral practices. Hence it was, that they unanimously, and no doubt justly, exalted the rules of the Gospel, on account of their transcendent purity. They alleged, that Christ had promulgated a new law of life, far more perfect than that which had been delivered by Moses and the prophets; and they excluded from their communion all such as deviated, in the least, from the most rigorous rules of simplicity and gravity in their looks, their gestures, their clothing, and their tables; all whose desires surpassed the dictates of mere necessity; and even all who observed a certain decorum in their manners, and paid a decent regard to the innocent customs of the world. But this primitive austerity is greatly diminished in the more considerable sects of the Mennonites, and more especially among the Waterlandians and Germans. The opulence they have acquired, by their industry and commerce, has relaxed their severity, softened their manners, and rendered them less insensible of the sweets of life; so that at this day the Mennonite congregations furnish their pastors with as much matter of censure and admonition as any other Christian communion.[a] There are, however, still some remains of the abstinence and severity of manners that prevailed formerly among the Anabaptists; but these are only to be found among some of the smaller sects of that persuasion, and more particularly among those who live remote from great and populous cities.

XVIII. The particular sentiments and opinions that divided the more considerable societies of the Mennonites, were those which follow: 1. Menno denied that Christ derived from his mother the body he assumed; and thought, on the contrary, that it was produced out of nothing, in the womb of that blessed virgin, by the creative power of the Holy Ghost.[b] This opinion is yet firmly maintained by the ancient Flemings or rigid Anabaptists, but has, long since, been renounced by all other sects of that denomination.[c] 2. The more austere Mennonites, like their forefathers, not only animadvert, with the most

☞ [a] It is certain, that the Mennonites in Holland, at this day, are, in their tables, their equipages, and their country seats, the most luxurious part of the Dutch nation. This is more especially true of the Mennonites of Amsterdam, who are very numerous and opulent.

[b] This is the account that is given of the opinion of Menno by Herman Schyn, in his Plenior Deduct. Hist. Mennonit. which other writers represent in a different manner. After an attentive perusal of several passages in the writings of Menno, where he professedly handles this very subject, it appears to me more than probable, that he inclined to the opinion attributed to him in the text, and that it was in this sense only, that he supposed Christ to be clothed with a divine and celestial body; for that may, without impropriety, be called celestial and divine, which is produced immediately, in consequence of a creating act, by the Holy Ghost. It must, however, be acknowledged, that Menno does not seem to have been unchangeably wedded to this opinion: for, in several places, he expresses himself ambiguously on this head, and even sometimes falls into inconsistencies. Hence, perhaps, it may not be unreasonable to conclude, that he renounced indeed the common opinion concerning the origin of Christ's human nature, but was undetermined with respect to the hypothesis, which, among many that were proposed, it was proper to substitute in its place. ☞ See Fueslini Centuria I. Epistolar. a Reformator. Helveticis scriptar. p. 383.—Be that as it may, Menno is generally considered as the author of this opinion concerning the origin of Christ's body, which is still entertained by the more rigid part of his followers. It appears probable, nevertheless, that this opinion was much older than his time, and was only adopted by him with the other tenets of the Anabaptists. As a proof of this, it may be observed, that Bolandus, in his Poem, entitled, Motus Monasteriensis, lib. x. v. 49, plainly declares, that many of the Anabaptists of Munster (who certainly had not been instructed by Menno) held this very doctrine in relation to Christ's incarnation:

Esse* Deum statuunt alii, sed corpore carnem
Humanam sumto sustinuisse negant:
At Diain mentem, tenuis quasi fauce canalis,
Per Mariæ corpus virginis isse ferunt.

[c] Many writers are of opinion, that the Waterlandians, of all the Anabaptists, evinced the strongest propensity to adopt the doctrine of Menno, relating to the origin of Christ's body. See Histoire des Anabaptists, p. 223, and the Ceremonies et Coutumes de tous les Peuples du

* Christum.

unrelenting severity, upon actions manifestly criminal, and evidently repugnant to the divine laws, but also treat, in the same manner, the smallest marks of an internal propensity to the pleasures of sense, or of a disposition to comply with the customs of the world. They condemn, for example, elegant dress, rich furniture, every thing, in a word, that looks like ornament, or surpasses the bounds of absolute necessity. Their conduct also to offenders is truly merciless; for they expel them from the church without previous admonition, and never temper the rigour of their judgments by an equitable consideration of the infirmities of nature in this imperfect state. The other Mennonites are by no means chargeable with this severity toward their offending brethren; they exclude none from their communion but the obstinate contemners of the divine laws; nor do they proceed to this extremity even with regard to such, until repeated admonitions have proved ineffectual to reform them. 3. The more rigid Mennonites look upon excommunicated persons as the pests of society, who are to be avoided on all occasions, and to be banished from all the comforts of social intercourse. Neither the voice of nature, nor the ties of blood, are allowed to plead in their behalf, or to procure them the smallest degree of indulgence. In such a case the exchange of good offices, the sweets of friendly conversation, and the mutual effusions of tenderness and love, are cruelly suspended, even between parents and children, husbands and wives, and also in all the other endearing relations of human life. But the more moderate branches of this community have wisely rejected this unnatural discipline, and consider the honour and sanctity of the church as sufficiently vindicated, when its members avoid a close and particular intimacy with those who have been expelled from its communion. 4. The rigid Anabaptists enjoin it as an obligation upon their disciples, and the members of their community, to wash the feet of their guests as a token of brotherly love and affection, and in obedience to the example of Christ; which they suppose, in this case, to have the force of a positive command; and hence they are sometimes called *Podoniptæ*. But the other Mennonites deny that Christ meant, in this instance of his goodness and condescension, to recommend this custom to the imitation of his followers, or to give to his example, in this case, the authority of a positive precept.

XIX. The Anabaptists, however divided on other subjects, agreed in their notions of learning and philosophy, which, in former times, they unanimously considered as the pest of the Christian church, and as highly detrimental to the progress of true religion and virtue. Hence it happened, that among a considerable number of writers who, in this century, employed their pens in the defence of that sect, there is not one whose labours bear any inviting marks of learning and genius. The rigid Mennonites persevere still in the barbarous system of their ancestors, and, neglecting the improvement of the mind and the culture of the sciences, devote themselves entirely to trade, manual industry, and the mechanic arts. The Waterlandians, indeed, are honourably distinguished from all the other Anabaptists, in this, as well as in many other respects; for they permit several members of their community to frequent the public universities, and there to apply themselves to the study of languages, history, antiquities, and more especially of physic, whose utility and importance they do not pretend to deny; and hence it happens, that, in our times, so many pastors among the Mennonites assume the title and profession of physicians. It is not unusual to see Anabaptists of this more humane and moderate class engaged even in philosophical researches, to the excellence and advantages of which their eyes are, at length, so far opened, as to make them acknowledge their importance to the well-being of society. It was, no doubt, in consequence of this change of sentiment, that they erected, not long ago, a public seminary of learning at Amsterdam, in which there is always a person of eminent abilities chosen as professor of philosophy. But, though these moderate Anabaptists acknowledge the benefit that may be derived to civil society from the culture of philosophy and the sciences, they still persist so far in their ancient prejudices, as to deem theology a system that has no connexion with them; and, consequently, they are of opinion, that in order to preserve it pure and untainted, the utmost caution must be used not to blend the dictates of philosophy with the doctrines of religion. It is farther to be observed, that, in the present times, even the Flemish or rigid Anabaptists begin gradually to divest themselves of their antipathy to learning, and allow their brethren to apply themselves to the study of languages, history, and the sciences.

XX. That simplicity and ignorance, of which the ancient Anabaptists boasted, as the guardians of their piety and the sources of their felicity, contributed principally to the divisions that prevailed among them, even from their rise, in a degree unknown and unprecedented in any other Christian community. This will appear evident to such as inquire, with the smallest attention, into the more immediate causes of their dissensions; for it is observable, that their most vehement contests had not for their object any difference in opinion concerning the doctrines or mysteries of religion, but generally turned upon matters relating to the conduct of life, on what was lawful, decent, just, and pious, in actions and manners, and what, on the contrary, was to be deemed criminal, indecorous, unjust, or impious. These disputes were a natural consequence of their favourite principle, that holiness of life, and purity of manners, were the authentic marks of the true church. But the misfortune lay here, that, being ignorant themselves, and under the guidance of persons whose knowledge was little superior to theirs, they were unacquainted with the true method of determining, in a multitude of cases, what was pious, laudable and lawful, and what was impious, unbecoming, and criminal. The criterion they employed for this purpose was neither the decision of right reason, nor the authority of the divine laws, accurately interpreted, since their ignorance rendered them incapable of using these means of arriving at the truth. They judged, therefore, of these matters by the suggestions of fancy, and the opinions of others. But, as this method of discerning between right and wrong, decent and indecent, was extremely uncertain and precarious, and necessarily tended to produce a variety of decisions, according to the different feelings, fancies, tempers, and

Monde, tom. iv. p. 200. But that these writers are in error, is abundantly manifest from the public Confession of Faith of the Waterlandians, composed by John de Ries. See also, for a farther refutation of this mistake, Herm. Schyn's Deduct. Plen. p. 165.

capacities of different persons, hence naturally arose diversity of sentiments, debates, and contests of various kinds. These debates produced schisms, which are never more easily excited, or more obstinately fomented and perpetuated, than where ignorance, the true source of bigotry, prevails.

XXI. The Mennonites, after having been long in an uncertain and precarious situation, obtained a fixed and unmolested settlement in the United Provinces, under the shade of a legal toleration procured for them by William, prince of Orange, the glorious founder of Belgic liberty. This illustrious chief, who acted from principle in allowing liberty of conscience and worship to Christians of different denominations, was moreover engaged, by gratitude, to favour the Mennonites, who had assisted him, in 1572, with a considerable sum of money, when his coffers were almost exhausted.[a] The fruits, however, of this toleration, were not immediately enjoyed by all the Anabaptists that were dispersed through the different provinces of the rising republic; for, in several places, both the civil magistrates and the clergy made a long and obstinate opposition to the will of the prince in this matter; particularly in the province of Zealand and the city of Amsterdam, where the plots formed by the Anabaptists, and the tumults they had excited, were still remembered by the people with horror.[b] This opposition, indeed, was in a great measure conquered before the conclusion of this century, partly by the resolution and influence of William the First, and his son Maurice, and partly by the exemplary conduct of the Mennonites, who manifested their zealous attachment to the republic on several occasions, and redoubled, instead of diminishing, the precautions which were calculated to remove all grounds of suspicion, and take from their adversaries every pretext which could render their opposition justifiable. But it was not before the following century, that their liberty and tranquillity were fixed upon solid foundations, when, by a Confession of Faith, published in 1626, they cleared themselves from the imputation of those pernicious and detestable errors which had been laid to their charge.[c]

XXII. The sectaries in England, who reject the custom of baptising infants, are not distinguished by the title of Anabaptists, but by that of Baptists. It is, however, probable, that they derive their origin from the German and Dutch Mennonites, and that, in former times, they adopted their doctrine in all its points. That, indeed, is by no means the case at present; for the English Baptists differ, in many things, both from the ancient and modern Mennonites. They are divided into two sects. The members of one sect are distinguished by the denomination of General or Arminian Baptists, on account of their rejection of the doctrine of absolute and unconditional decrees; and the others are called Particular or Calvinistical Baptists, from the striking resemblance of their religious system to that of the presbyterians, who have Calvin for their chief.[d] The Baptists of the latter sect settled chiefly in London, and in the adjacent towns and villages; and they have departed so far from the tenets of their ancestors, that, at this day, they retain no more of the peculiar doctrines and institutions of the Mennonites, than the administration of baptism by immersion, and the refusal of that sacrament to infants, and those of tender years; and consequently they have none of those scruples relating to oaths, wars, and the functions of magistracy, which still remain among even the most rational part of the Mennonites. They observe in their congregations the same rules of government, and the same forms of worship, that are followed by the presbyterians; and their community is under the direction of men eminent for their piety and learning.[e] From their Confession of Faith, published in 1643, it appears plainly, that their religious sentiments were then the same as they are at this day.[f]

XXIII. The General Baptists, or, as they are called by some, the Antipædobaptists, are dispersed in great numbers through several counties of England, and are, for the most part, persons of mean condition, and almost totally destitute of learning and knowledge. This latter circumstance will appear less surprising, when it is considered, that, like the ancient Mennonites, they profess a contempt of erudition and science. There is much latitude in their system of religious doctrine, which consists in such vague and general principles, as render their communion accessible to Christians of almost all denominations; and, accordingly, they tolerate, in fact, and receive among them, persons of every sect, even Socinians and Arians; nor do they reject, from their communion, any who profess themselves Christians, and receive the Scriptures as the source of truth, and the rule of faith.[g] They agree with the Particular Baptists in this circumstance, that they admit to baptism adult persons only, and administer that sacrament by dipping or total immersion; but they differ from them in another respect, that is, in their repeating the administration of baptism to those who had received it, either in a state of infancy, or by aspersion, instead of dipping; for, if the common accounts may be believed, the Particular Baptists do not carry matters so far. The following sentiments, rites, and tenets, are also peculiar to the former: 1. After the manner of the ancient Mennonites, they look upon their sect as the only true Christian church, and consequently shun, with the most scrupulous caution, the communion of all other religious societies. 2. They dip only once (and not three times, as is practised elsewhere) the candidates for baptism, and consider it as a matter of indifference, whether that sacrament be administered in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, or in that of

[a] See Brandt, Histoire de Reformatie in de Nederlande, vol. i. p. 525.—Ceremonies et Coutumes de tous les Peuples du Monde, tom. iv. p. 201.

[b] Brandt's Hist. book xi. p. 555, 586, 609; book xiv. p. 780; book xvi. p. 811.

[c] See Herm. Schyn's Deduct. Plen. cap. iv. p. 79.

[d] See Whiston's Memoirs of his Life and Writings, vol. ii. p. 461.

[e] See a German work composed by Ant. William Bohm, under the title of the History of the Reformation in England, p. 151, 473, 536, 1152.

[f] Bibliotheque Britannique, tom. vi.

[g] This appears evidently from their Confession of Faith, which appeared first in 1660, was re-published by Mr. Whiston, in the Memoirs of his Life, vol. ii. p. 561, and is drawn up with such latitude, that, with the removal and alteration of a few points,* it may be adopted by Christians of all denominations.† Mr. Whiston, though an Arian, became a member of this Baptist community, which, as he thought, came nearest to the simplicity of the primitive and apostolic age. The famous Mr. Emlyn, who was persecuted on account of his Socinian principles, joined himself also to this society, and died in their communion.

☞ * Namely, those relating to universal redemption, the perseverance of the saints, election and reprobation, which are illustrated entirely on Arminian principles; and consequently cannot be embraced by rigid Calvinists; not to mention the points relating to baptism, which are the distinctive marks of this sect.

☞ † Our author certainly does not mean to include Roman catholics, in this large class; for then his assertion would not be true.

Christ alone. 3. They adopt the doctrine of Menno with respect to the Millenium, or the reign of the saints with Christ upon earth for a thousand years. 4. Many of them embrace his particular opinion concerning the origin of Christ's body.[a] 5. They look upon the precept of the apostles, prohibiting the use of blood and things strangled,[b] as a law that was designed to be in force in all ages and periods of the church. 6. They believe that the soul, from the moment that the body dies until its resurrection at the last day, remains in a state of perfect insensibility. 7. They use the ceremony of extreme unction. And, to omit matters of a more trifling nature, 8. Several of them observe the Jewish, as well as the Christian Sabbath.[c] These Baptists have three different classes of ecclesiastical governors, bishops, elders, and deacons; the first of these, among whom there have been several learned men,[d] they modestly call messengers,[e] as St. John is known to have styled that order in the book of the Revelations.

XXIV. Before we conclude the history of the Anabaptists, it may not be improper to mention a very singular and ridiculous sect that was founded by David George, a native of Delft, and a member of that community. This enthusiast, after having laid the foundation of the sect of the Davidists, or David-Georgians, deserted the Anabaptists, and removed to Basil, in 1544, where he changed his name, and by the liberality and splendour that attended his opulence, joined to his probity and purity of manners, acquired a very high degree of esteem, which he preserved till his death. The lustre of his reputation was, however, transitory; for, soon after his decease, which happened in 1556, his son-in-law, Nicholas Blesdyck, charged him with having maintained the most blasphemous and pestilential errors. The senate of Basil, before whom this accusation was brought, being satisfied with the evidence by which it was supported, pronounced sentence against the deceased heretic, and ordered his body to be dug up and publicly burned. And indeed, nothing more horridly impious and extravagant can be conceived, than the sentiments and tenets of this fanatic, if they were really such as they have been represented, either by his accusers or his historians; for he is said to have given himself out for the Son of God, the fountain of divine wisdom, to have denied the existence of angels, good and evil, of heaven and hell, and to have rejected the doctrine of a future judgment; and he is also charged with having trampled upon all the rules of decency and modesty with the utmost contempt.[f] In all this, however, there may be much exaggeration. The enthusiast in question, though a man of some natural genius, was, nevertheless, totally destitute of learning of every kind, and had something obscure, harsh, and illiberal in his manner of expression, that gave too much occasion to an unfavourable interpretation of his religious tenets. That he had both more sense and more virtue than he is generally supposed to have possessed, appears manifestly, not only from his numerous writings, but also from the simplicity and candour that were visible in the temper and spirit of the disciples he left behind him, some of whom are yet to be found in Holstein, Friseland, and other countries.[g] He deplored the decline of vital and practical religion, and endeavoured to restore it among his followers; and in this he seemed to imitate the example of the more moderate Anabaptists. But the excessive warmth of an irregular imagination threw him into illusions of the most dangerous and pernicious kind, and seduced him into a persuasion that he was honoured with the gift of divine inspiration, and had celestial visions constantly presented to his mind. Thus was he led to such a high degree of fanaticism, that, rejecting as mean and useless the external services of piety, he reduced religion to contemplation, silence, and a certain frame or habit of soul, which it is equally difficult to define and to understand. The soaring Mystics, and the visionary Quakers, may therefore, if they please, give David George a distinguished rank in their enthusiastical community.

XXV. Henry Nicolas, a Westphalian, one of the intimate companions of this fanatic, though somewhat different from him in the nature of his enthusiasm, and also in point of genius and character, founded a sect in Holland, in 1555, which he called the *Family of Love*. The principles of this sect were afterwards propagated in England, and produced no small confusion in both countries. The judgment that has been formed with respect to David George may be applied with truth, at least in a great measure, to his associate Nicolas, who, perhaps, would have prevented a considerable part of the heavy reproaches with which he has been loaded, had he been endowed with a degree of genius, discernment and knowledge, sufficient to enable him to express his sentiments with perspicuity and elegance. Be that as it may, the character, temper, and views of this man, may be learned from the spirit that reigned in his flock.[h] As to his pretensions, they were, indeed, visionary and chimerical; for he maintained, that he had a commission from heaven, to teach men that the essence of religion consisted in the feelings of divine love; that all other theological tenets, whether they related to objects of faith, or modes of worship, were of no moment; and consequently, that it was a matter of perfect indifference, what opinions Christians entertained concerning the divine nature, provided their hearts burned with the pure and sacred flame of piety and love. To this, his main doctrine, Nicolas may have probably added other odd fancies, as always is the case with those innovators who are endued with a warm and fruitful imagination; to obtain, however, a true notion of the opinions of this enthusiast, it will be much more advisable to consult his own writings, than to depend entirely upon the accounts and refutations of his adversaries.[i]

☞ [a] Namely, that the body of Jesus was not derived from the substance of the blessed Virgin, but was *created* in her womb by an omnipotent act of the Holy Spirit. [b] Acts xv. 29.

[c] These accounts of the doctrine of the Baptists are taken from Wall's History of Infant Baptism, vol. ii. and also from the second volume of Whiston's Memoirs.

[d] See Whiston's Memoirs, vol. ii. p. 466, as also Crosby's History of the English Baptists.

[e] St. John calls them the "angels of the churches;" the word angel (in Greek ἄγγελος) signifies properly an envoy or messenger.

[f] See Nic. Blesdyckii Historia Davidis Georgii à Jacobo Revio edita; as also the life of the same fanatic, written in the German language, by Stolterforth. Among the modern writers see Arnold's Kirchen und Ketzer Historie, tom. i. p. 750; tom. ii. p. 534 and 1183, in which there are several things that tend to clear the character of David. See also Henr. Mori Enthusiasmus Triumphatus, sect. xxiii.—and the documents I have published in relation to this matter, in the History of Servetus, p. 425.

[g] See Jo. Melleri Introduct. in Histor. Chersones. Cimbricæ, par. ii. p. 116, and his Cimbria Literata, tom. i. p. 422.

[h] See Jo. Hornbeck, Summa Controvers. lib. vi. p. 393.—Arnold, p. 746.—Bohm, book iv. ch. v. p. 541.

[i] The most learned of all the authors who wrote against the Family

CHAPTER IV.

The History of the Socinians.

I. THE Socinians are said to have derived this denomination from the illustrious family of the Sozzini, which flourished a long time at Sienna in Tuscany, and produced several great and eminent men, and among others Lælius and Faustus Socinus, who are commonly supposed to have been the founders of this sect. The former was the son of Marianus, a famous lawyer, and was himself a man of uncommon genius and learning; to which he added, as his very enemies were obliged to acknowledge, the lustre of a virtuous life and of unblemished manners. Being obliged to leave his country, in 1547, on account of the disgust he had conceived against popery, he travelled through France, England, Holland, Germany, and Poland, in order to examine the religious sentiments of those who had thrown off the yoke of Rome, and thus at length to come at the truth. After this he settled at Zurich, where he died in 1562, before he had arrived at the fortieth year of his age.[a] His mild and gentle disposition rendered him averse from whatever had the air of contention and discord. He adopted the Helvetic confession of faith, and professed himself a member of the church of Switzerland; and this did not induce him to conceal entirely the doubts he had formed in relation to certain points of religion, and which he communicated, in effect, by letter, to some learned men, whose judgment he respected, and in whose friendship he could confide.[b] His sentiments were indeed propagated, in a more public manner, after his death, since Faustus, his nephew and his heir, is supposed to have drawn, from the papers he left behind him, that religious system upon which the Socinian sect was founded.

II. It is, however, to be observed, that this denomination does not always convey the same ideas, since it is susceptible of different significations, and is, in effect, used sometimes in a more strict and proper, and at others in a more improper and extensive sense. For, according to the usual manner of speaking, all are termed Socinians, whose sentiments bear a certain affinity to the system of Socinus; and those are more especially ranked in that class, who either boldly deny, or artfully explain away, the doctrines that assert the divine nature of Christ, and a trinity of persons in the Godhead. But, in a strict and proper sense, they only are deemed the members of this sect, who embrace wholly, or with a few exceptions, the form of theological doctrine, which Faustus Socinus either drew up himself or received from his uncle, and delivered to the Unitarian brethren, or Socinians, in Poland and Transylvania.[c]

III. The origin of Socinianism may be traced to the earliest period of the Reformation. Scarcely had the happy revolution in the state of religion taken place, when a set of men, fond of extremes, and consequently disposed to look upon as erroneous whatever had hitherto been taught and professed in the church of Rome, began to undermine the doctrine of Christ's divinity, and the other truths that are connected with it, and proposed reducing the whole of religion to practical piety and virtue. The efforts of these men were opposed with united zeal and vigilance by the Romish, Reformed, and Lutheran churches; and their designs were so far disconcerted, as to prevent their forming themselves and their followers into a regular and permanent sect. So early as the year 1524, the divinity of Christ was openly denied by Louis Hetzer, one of the wandering and fanatical Anabaptists, who, about three years afterwards, suffered death at Constance.[d] There were not wanting, among the first Anabaptists, several persons who entertained the opinions of Hetzer, though it would be manifestly unfair to lay these opinions to the charge of the whole community. But it was not only from that quarter that erroneous opinions were propagated in relation to the points already mentioned; others seemed to have been seized with the contagion, and it manifested itself from day to day in several countries. John Campanus, a native of Juliers, disseminated, at Wittenberg and other places, various tenets of an heretical aspect; and taught, among other things, that the Son was inferior to the Father, and that the Holy Ghost was not the title of a divine person, but a denomination used to denote the *nature* of the Father and of the Son; and thus did this innovator revive, in a great measure, the errors of the ancient Arians.[e] A doctrine of a similar kind was propagated, in 1530, at Augsburg and in Switzerland, by a person, whose name was Claudius, who, by his opposition to the doctrine of Christ's divinity, excited no small commotions.[f] But none of these new teachers were so far encouraged by the number of their followers, or the indulgence of their adversaries, as to be in a condition to form a regular sect.

IV. The attempts of Michael Servede,[g] or Servetus, a Spanish physician, were much more alarming to those

of Love, was Dr. Henry More, in his Grand Explanation of the Mystery of Godliness, &c. book vi. George Fox, the founder of the sect of Quakers, inveighed also severely against this seraphic family, and called them a motley tribe of fanatics, because they took oaths, danced, sang, and made merry. See Sewell's History of the Quakers, book iii. p. 88, 89, 344.

[a] Cloppenburg, Dissertatio de Origine et Progressu Socinianismi.—Jo. Hornbeck, Summa Controversiarum, p. 563.—Jo. Henr. Hottinger, Hist. Eccles. tom. ix. p. 417.

[b] Zanchius, Præf. ad Libr. de tribus Elohim.—Beza, Epist. lxxxi. p. 167. Certain writings are attributed to him by Sandius, in his Bibliotheca Anti-Trinitar. but it is very doubtful whether he was the real author of them.

[c] We have, hitherto, no complete or accurate history either of the sect called Socinians, or of Lælius and Faustus Socinus, its founders; nor any satisfactory account of those who laboured principally with them, and, after them, in giving a permanent and stable form to this community; for the accounts we have of the Socinians, and their principal doctors, from Hornbeck,* Calovius,† Cloppenburg,‡ Sandius,§ Lubieniecius,‖ and Lauterbach,¶ are far from being proper to satisfy the curiosity of those, who desire something more than a vague and superficial knowledge of this matter. The history of Socinianism, published at Paris by Lamy in 1723, is a wretched compilation from the most common-place writers on that subject; it is also full of errors, and is loaded with a variety of matters that have no sort of relation to the history of Socinus, or to the doctrine he taught. The very learned and laborious La Croze promised a complete history of Socinianism, but did not fulfil this interesting engagement.

[d] Sandii Bibliotheca Anti-Trinitar.—Jo. Bapt. Ottii Annal. Anabaptist.—Breitingeri Museum Helveticum, tom. v. vi.

[e] See the Dissertation de Joh. Campano, Anti-Trinitario, in the Amœnitates Literariæ of the learned Schelhornius, tom. xi.

[f] See Schelhornii Dissert. Epistol. de Mino Celso Senensi, Claudio item Allobroge, homine Fanatico et SS. Trinitatis hoste.—Jac. Breitingeri Museum Helvetic. tom. vii.—Jo. Hallerus, Epistol. in Fuesslin's Centuria Epistolar. Viror Eruditor.

[g] By taking away the last syllable of this name (I mean the Spanish termination *de*) there remains *Serve*, which, by placing differently the letters that compose it, makes *Reves*. Servetus assumed the latter name in the title-pages of all his books. He also called himself sometimes *Michael Villanovanus*, or *Villanovanus* alone, after the place of his nativity, omitting the name of his family.

* In his Socinianism. Confutat. vol. i.—† In his Opera Anti-Socinia-na.—‡ In his Dissertat. de origine et progressu Socinianismi, tom. ii. op. —§ In his Bibliotheca Anti-Trinitariorum.—‖ In his Historia Reformationis Polonicæ.—¶ In his Ariano-Socinismus.

who had the cause of true religion at heart, than the feeble and impotent efforts of the innovators now mentioned. This man, who made so great a noise in the world, was born at Villa-Nueva, in the kingdom of Arragon, distinguished himself by the superiority of his genius, and had made a considerable progress in various branches of science. In the years 1531 and 1532, he published, in Latin, his seven books concerning the errors that are contained in the doctrine of the Trinity, and two Dialogues on the same subject, in which he attacked, in the most audacious manner, the sentiments adopted by the greatest part of the Christian church, in relation to the divine nature, and a trinity of persons in the Godhead. Some years after this he travelled into France, and, after a variety of adventures, settled at Vienne in Dauphiné, where he applied himself, with success, to the practice of physic. It was here, that, letting loose the reins of his warm and irregular imagination, he invented that strange system of theology, which was printed, in a clandestine manner, in 1553, under the title of Christianity restored. He seemed to be seized with a passion for reforming (in his way); and many things concurred to favour his designs, such as the fire of his genius, the extent of his learning, the power of his eloquence, the strength of his resolution, the obstinacy of his temper, and an external appearance, at least, of piety, that rendered all the rest doubly engaging. Add, to all this, the protection and friendship of many persons of weight, in France, Germany, and Italy, which he had obtained by his talents and abilities both natural and acquired; and it will appear, that few innovators have set out with a better prospect of success. But, notwithstanding these signal advantages, all his views were totally disappointed by the vigilance and severity of Calvin, who, when Servetus had escaped from his prison, and was passing through Switzerland, in order to seek refuge in Italy, caused him to be apprehended at Geneva, in 1553, and had an accusation of blasphemy brought against him before the council.[a] The issue of this accusation was fatal to Servetus, who, adhering resolutely to the opinions he had embraced, was, by a public sentence of the court, declared an obstinate heretic, and condemned to the flames. For it is observable, that, at this time, the ancient laws which had been enacted against heretics by the emperor Frederic II. and had been so frequently renewed after his reign, were still in vigour at Geneva. It must, however, be acknowledged, that this learned and ingenious sufferer was worthy of a better fate; though it is certain, on the other hand, that his faults were neither few nor trivial, since it is well known, that his excessive arrogance was accompanied with a malignant and contentious spirit, an invincible obstinacy of temper, and a considerable portion of fanaticism.[b]

V. The religious system that Servetus struck out of a wild and irregular fancy, was, indeed, singular in the highest degree. The greatest part of it was a necessary consequence of his peculiar notions concerning the universe, the nature of God, and the nature of things, which were equally strange and chimerical. Thus it is difficult to unfold, in a few words, the doctrine of this unhappy man; nor, indeed, would any detail render it intelligible in all its branches. He took it into his head that the true and genuine doctrine of Christ had been entirely lost, even before the council of Nice; and he was, moreover, of opinion, that it had never been delivered with a sufficient degree of precision and perspicuity in any period of the church. To these extravagant assertions he added another still more so, even that he himself had received a commission from above to reveal anew this divine doctrine, and to explain it to mankind. His notions with respect to the Supreme Being, and a trinity of persons in the Godhead, were obscure and chimerical beyond all measure, and amounted in general to the following propositions: That "the Deity, before the creation of the world, had produced within himself two *personal representations* or *manners of existence*,[c] which were to be the *medium* of intercourse between him and mortals, and by which, consequently, he was to reveal his will, and to display his mercy and beneficence to the children of men; that these two representatives were the Word and the Holy Ghost; that the former was united to the man Christ, who was born of the Virgin Mary by an omnipotent act of the divine will; and that, on this account, Christ might be properly called God; that the Holy Spirit directed the course, and animated the whole system of nature; and more especially produced in the minds of men wise counsels, virtuous propensities, and divine feelings; and, finally, that these two representations were to cease after the destruction of this terrestrial globe, and to be absorbed into the substance of the Deity, from which they had been formed." This is, at least, a general sketch of the doctrine of Servetus, who, however, did not always explain his system in the same manner, nor take any pains to avoid inconsistencies and contradictions; and who frequently expressed himself in such ambiguous terms, that it is extremely difficult to learn from them his true sentiments. His system of morality agreed in many circumstances with that of the Anabaptists, whom he also imitated in censuring, with the utmost severity, the custom of Infant-Baptism.

VI. The pompous plans of reformation, that had been formed by Servetus, were not only disconcerted, but even fell into oblivion, after the death of their author. He was, indeed, according to vulgar report, supposed to have left behind him a considerable number of disciples; and we

☞ [a] This accusation was brought against Servetus by a person, who lived in Calvin's family as a servant; and this circumstance displeased many.

☞ [b] Dr. Mosheim refers the reader here, in a note, to an ample and curious history of Servetus, composed by him in his native tongue. Those who are not acquainted with that language, will find a full account of this singular man, and of his extraordinary history, in a Latin dissertation, composed under the inspection of Dr. Mosheim, and entitled, Historia Michaelis Serveti, quam, Præside Jo. Laur. Moshemio, Doctorum examini publice exponit Henricus ab Allwaerden. There is an accurate history of this unhappy man, written by M. de la Roche, in the first volume of the work, entitled, Memoirs of Literature, containing a Weekly Account of the State of Learning, both at home and abroad. There is also an account of him given by Mackenzie, in his Lives and Characters of the most eminent Writers of the Scottish nation. To these we may add an Impartial History of Servetus, &c. written by an anonymous author, and published at London in 1724.

It is impossible to justify the conduct of Calvin in the case of Servetus, whose death will be an indelible reproach upon the character of that great and eminent reformer. The only thing that can be alleged, not to efface, but to diminish his crime, is, that it was no easy matter for him to divest himself at once of that persecuting spirit, which had been so long nourished and strengthened by the popish religion in which he was educated. It was a remaining portion of the spirit of popery in the breast of Calvin that kindled his unchristian zeal against the wretched Servetus.

☞ [c] These representations, or manners of existence, Servetus also called œconomies, dispensations, dispositions, &c. for he often changed his terms in unfolding his visionary system.

find, in the writings of the doctors of this century, many complaints and apprehensions that seem to confirm this supposition, and would persuade us that Servetus had really founded a sect; yet, when this matter is attentively examined, there will appear just reason to doubt, whether this man left behind him any one person that might properly be called his true disciple. For those who were denominated Servetians by the theological writers of this century, not only differed from Servetus in many points of doctrine, but also varied widely from him in his opinion of the Trinity, which was the peculiar and distinguishing point of his theological system. Valentine Gentili, a Neapolitan, who suffered death at Bern in 1566, adopted the Arian hypothesis, and not that of Servetus, as many writers have imagined; for his only error consisted in this, that he considered the Son and the Holy Ghost as subordinate to the Father.[a] Nearly allied to this, was the doctrine of Matthew Gribaldi, a lawyer, whom a timely death saved from the severity of an ecclesiastical tribunal, that was ready to pronounce sentence against him on account of his errors; for he supposed the divine nature to be divided into three eternal spirits, which were distinguished from each other, not only by number, but also by subordination.[b] It is not so easy to determine the particular charge that was brought against Alciat, a native of Piedmont, and Sylvester Tellius, who were banished from the city and territory of Geneva, in 1559; nor do we know, with certainty, the errors that were embraced by Paruta, Leonardo, and others,[c] who ranked among the followers of Servetus. It is, however, more than probable, that none of the persons now mentioned were the disciples of Servetus, or adopted the hypothesis of that visionary innovator. The same thing may be affirmed with respect to Gonesius, who is said to have embraced the doctrine of that unhappy man, and to have introduced it into Poland;[d] for, though he maintained some opinions that really resembled it in some of its points, his manner of explaining the mystery of the Trinity was totally different from that of Servetus.

VII. It is evident that none of the persons, now mentioned, professed the form or system of theological doctrine, that is properly called *Socinianism*, the origin of which is, by the writers of that sect, dated from the year 1546, and placed in Italy. These writers tell us, that, in this year, above forty persons eminently distinguished by their learning and genius, and still more by their generous zeal for truth, held secret assemblies, at different times, in the territory of Venice, and particularly at Vicenza, in which they deliberated upon a general reformation of the received systems of religion, and, in a more especial manner, undertook to refute the peculiar doctrines that were afterwards publicly rejected by the Socinians. They tell us farther, that the principal members of this clandestine society, were Lælius Socinus, Alciat, Ochino, Paruta, and Gentili; that their design was divulged, and their meetings were discovered, by the temerity and imprudence of some of their associates; that two of them were apprehended and put to death; while the rest, being dispersed, sought a refuge in Switzerland, Germany, Moravia, and other countries; and that Socinus, after having wandered up and down in several parts of Europe, went into Poland, first in 1551, and afterwards in 1558, and there sowed the seeds of his doctrine, which grew apace, and produced a rich and abundant harvest.[e] Such is the account of the origin of Socinianism that is generally given by the writers of that sect. To assert that it is, in every circumstance, fictitious and false, would perhaps be going too far; but, on the other hand, it is easy to demonstrate that the system, commonly called Socinianism, was neither invented nor drawn up in the meetings at Venice and Vicenza.[f]

VIII. While, therefore, we reject this inaccurate ac-

[a] See Bayle's Dictionary.—Spon's Hist. de Geneve, tom. ii. p. 80.—Sandii Biblioth. Anti-Trinit. p. 26.—Lamy's Histoire du Socinianisme, part ii. ch. vi. p. 251.—Fueslin's Reformations Beytrage, tom. v.

[b] Sandius, p. 17.—Lamy, part ii. ch. vii.—Spon, tom. ii. p. 85. not.—Haller, in Museo Tigurino, tom. ii. p. 114.

[c] For an account of these, and other persons of the same class, see Sandius, Lamy, and also Lubieniecius' Historia Reformat. Polonicæ, lib. ii. cap. v.—There is a particular and ample account of Alciat given by Bayle, in his Dictionary; see also Spon, tom. ii.

[d] This is affirmed upon the authority of Wissowatius and Lubieniecius; but the very words of the latter will be sufficient to shew us upon what grounds. He says, "Is Serveti sententiam de præ-eminentiâ patris in patriam attulit, eamque non dissimulavit," i. e. Gonesius introduced into Poland the opinion embraced by Servetus in relation to the pre-eminence of the Father, and was by no means studious to conceal it. Who now does not see, that, if it was the *pre-eminence of the Father* that Gonesius maintained, he must have differed considerably from Servetus, whose doctrine removed all *real* distinction in the divine nature? The reader will do well to consult Sandius with regard to the sentiments of Gonesius, since it is from this writer, that Lamy has borrowed the greatest part of what he has advanced in his Histoire de Socinianisme, tom. ii. chap. x.

[e] See the Bibliotheca Anti-Trinit. of Sandius, who mentions some writings that are supposed to have been published by the clandestine society of pretended reformers at Venice and Vicenza, though the truth of this supposition is extremely dubious;—Andr. Wissowatii Narratio quomodo in Poloniâ Reformati ab Unitariis separati sunt, which is subjoined to the Biblioth. of Sandius.—The reader may likewise consult Lubieniecius, (Histor. Reformat. Polon. lib. ii. cap. i.) who intimates, that he took this account of the origin of Socinianism from the manuscript Commentaries of Budzinus, and his Life of Lælius Socinus. See also Sam. Przipcovius, in Vita Socini.

[f] See Gustav. Georg. Zeltneri Historia Crypto-Socinianismi Altorfini, cap. ii. sect. xli. p. 321, note.—This writer seems to think that the inquiries hitherto made into this affair are by no means satisfactory; and he therefore wishes that some men of learning, equal to the task, would examine the subject anew. This, indeed, is much to be wished. In the mean time, I shall venture to offer a few observations, which may, perhaps, contribute to cast some light upon this matter. That there was in reality such a society as is mentioned in the text, is far from being improbable. Many circumstances and relations prove sufficiently, that, immediately after the Reformation had taken place in Germany, secret assemblies were holden, and measures proposed, in several provinces that were still under the jurisdiction of Rome, with a view to combat the errors and superstition of the times. It is also, in a more especial manner, probable that the territory of Venice was the scene of these deliberations, since it is well known that a great number of the Venetians at this time, though they had no personal attachment to Luther, approved his design of reforming the corrupt state of religion, and wished well to every attempt that was made to restore Christianity to its native and primitive simplicity. It is farther highly credible, that these assemblies were interrupted and dispersed by the vigilance of the papal emissaries, and that some of their members were apprehended and put to death, while the rest saved themselves by flight. All this is probable enough; but it is extremely improbable, and utterly incredible, that all the persons who are said to have been present at these assemblies, were really so. And I therefore willingly adopt the opinion of those who affirm, that many persons, who, in after-times, distinguished themselves from the multitude by opposing the doctrine of the Trinity in Unity, were considered as members of the Venetian society, by ignorant writers, who looked upon that society as the source and nursery of the whole Unitarian sect. It is certain, for instance, that Ochino is erroneously placed among the members of the famous society now mentioned; for, not to insist upon the circumstance, that it is not sufficiently clear whether he was really a Socinian or not, it undeniably appears, from the Annales Capucinorum of Boverius, as well as from other unquestionable testimonies, that he left Italy so early as the year 1543, and went to Geneva. See a singular book, entitled, La Guerre Seraphique, ou l'Histoire des Perils qu'a courus la Barbe des Capucins, livr. iii. p. 191, 216.—What I have said of Ochino may be confidently affirmed with respect to Lælius Socinus, who, though reported to have been at the head of the society now under consideration, was certainly never present at any of its meetings.

count of the matter under consideration, it is incumbent upon us to substitute a better in its place; and, indeed, the origin and progress of the Socinian doctrine may, I think, easily be traced out by such as are acquainted with the history of the church during this century. There were certain sects and doctors, against whom the zeal, vigilance and severity of Catholics, Lutherans, and Calvinists, were united, and, in opposing whose settlement and progress, these three communions, forgetting their dissensions, joined their most vigorous counsels and endeavours. The objects of their common aversion were the Anabaptists, and those who denied the divinity of Christ, and a trinity of persons in the Godhead. To avoid the unhappy consequences of such a formidable opposition, great numbers of both classes retired into Poland, from this persuasion, that, in a country whose inhabitants were passionately fond of freedom, religious liberty could not fail to find a refuge. However, on their first arrival, they proceeded with circumspection and prudence, and explained their sentiments with much caution, and a certain mixture of disguise, not knowing surely what might happen, nor how far their opinions would be treated with indulgence. Thus they live in peace and in quiet during several years, mixed with the Lutherans and Calvinists, who had already obtained a solid settlement in Poland, and who admitted them into their communion, and even into the assemblies where their public deliberations were holden. They were not, however, long satisfied with this state of constraint, notwithstanding the privileges with which it was attended; but, having insinuated themselves into the friendship of several noble and opulent families, they began to act with greater spirit, and even to declare, in an open manner, their opposition to certain doctrines that were generally received among Christians. Hence arose violent contests between them and the Swiss or reformed churches, with which they had been principally connected. These dissensions drew the attention of the government, and occasioned, in 1565, a resolution of the diet of Petrikow, ordering the innovators to separate themselves from the churches already mentioned, and to form a distinct congregation or sect.[a] These founders of the Socinian church were commonly called Pinczovians, from the town in which the heads of their sect resided. Hitherto, indeed, they had not carried matters so far as they did afterwards; for they professed chiefly the Arian doctrine concerning the divine nature, maintaining that the Son and the Holy Ghost were two distinct natures, begotten by God the Father, and subordinate to him.[b]

IX. The Unitarians, being thus separated from the other religious societies in Poland, had many difficulties to encounter, both of an internal and external kind. From without, they were threatened with a very unfavourable prospect, arising from the united efforts of Catholics, Lutherans, and Calvinists, to crush their infant sect. From within, they dreaded the effects of intestine discord, which portended the ruin of their community before it could arrive at any measure of stability or consistence. The latter apprehension had some foundation; for, as yet, they had agreed upon no regular system of principles, which might serve as a centre and bond of union. Some of them chose to persevere in the doctrine of the Arians, and to proceed no farther; and these were called *Farnovians.*[c] Others, more adventurous, went much greater lengths, and attributed to Jesus Christ scarcely any other rank and dignity than those of a divine messenger and a true prophet. A third class, distinguished by the denomination of *Budneians*,[d] went still farther; declaring that Christ was born in an ordinary way, according to the

For how can we suppose that a young man only one-and-twenty years old, would leave the place of his nativity, and repair to Venice or Vicenza without any other view than the pleasure of disputing freely on certain points of religion?* Or how could it happen, that a youth of such inexperienced years should acquire such a high degree of influence and authority, as to obtain the first rank, and the principal direction, in an assembly composed of so many eminently learned and ingenious men? Besides, from the life of Lælius, which is still extant, and from other testimonies of good authority, it is easy to show, that it was the desire of improvement and the hope of being aided in his inquiries after truth, by the conversation of learned men in foreign nations, that induced him to leave Italy, and not the apprehension of persecution and death, as some have imagined. It is also certain, that he returned into his native country afterwards, and, in 1551, remained some time at Sienna, while his father lived at Bologna. See his letter to Bullinger, in the Museum Helveticum, tom. v. p. 489. Now surely it cannot easily be imagined, that a man in his senses would return to a country from which, a few years before, he had been obliged to fly, in order to avoid the terrors of a barbarous inquisition and a violent death.

But, waving this question for a moment, let us suppose all the accounts we have from the Socinians, concerning this famous assembly of Venice and Vicenza, and the members of which it was composed, to be true and exact; yet it remains to be proved, that the Socinian system of doctrine was invented and drawn up in that assembly. This the Socinian writers maintain; and this, as the case appears to me, may be safely denied; for the Socinian doctrine is undoubtedly of much later date than this assembly; it also passed through different hands, and was, during many years, reviewed and corrected by men of learning and genius, and thus underwent various changes and improvements before it was formed into a regular, permanent, and connected system. To be convinced of this, it will be sufficient to cast an eye upon the opinions, doctrines, and reasonings of several of the members of the famous society, so often mentioned; which vary in such a striking manner, as to show manifestly that this society had no fixed views, nor had ever agreed upon any consistent form of doctrine. We learn, moreover, from many circumstances in the life and transactions of Lælius Socinus, that this man had not, when he left Italy, formed the plan of a regular system of religion; and it is well known, that, for many years afterwards, his time was spent in doubting, inquiring, and disputing; and that his ideas of religious matters were extremely fluctuating and unsettled; so that it seems probable to me, that the man died in this state of hesitation and uncertainty, before he had reduced his notions to any consistent form. As to Gribaldi and Alciat, who have been already mentioned, it is manifest that they inclined toward the Arian system, and did not entertain such low ideas of the person and dignity of Jesus Christ, as those which are adopted among the Socinians. From all this it appears abundantly evident, that these Italian reformers, if their famous society ever existed in reality, (which I admit as a probable supposition, rather than as a fact sufficiently attested,) were dispersed and obliged to seek their safety in a voluntary exile, before they had agreed about any regular system of religious doctrine: so that this account of the origin of Socinianism is rather imaginary than real, though it has been adopted by many writers. Fueslin has alleged several arguments against it in his German work, entitled, *Reformations Beytragen*, tom. iii. page 327.

[a] Lamy's Histoire du Socinianisme, part i. chap. vi. &c. page 16—Stoinii Epitome Originis Unitariorum in Poloniâ, apud Sandium, p. 183.—Georg. Schomanni Testamentum, apud eundem, p. 194.—Andr. Wissowatius de Separatione Unitar. a Reformatis, p. 211.—Lubieniecius, Histor. Reformat. Polonicæ, lib. ii. cap. vi. viii. lib. iii. cap. i.

[b] This will appear abundantly evident to all such as consult with a proper degree of attention, the writers mentioned in the preceding note. It is unquestionably certain, that all those, who then called themselves Unitarian Brethren, did not entertain the same sentiments concerning the Divine Nature. Some of the most eminent doctors of that sect adopted the notions relating to the person and dignity of Christ, that were in after-times peculiar to the Socinians; the greatest part of them, however, embraced the Arian system, and affirmed, that our blessed Saviour was created before the formation of the world, by God the Father, to whom he was much inferior, nevertheless, in dignity and perfection.

☞ [c] For a more particular account of the Farnovians, see sect. xxiv of this chapter.

[d] See the part of this chapter referred to in the preceding note.

☞ * Is such a supposition really so absurd? Is not a spirit of enthusiasm, or even an uncommon degree of zeal, adequate to the production of such an effect?

general law of nature, and that, consequently, he was no proper object of divine worship or adoration.[a] There were also among these people many fanatics, who were desirous of introducing into the society the discipline of the enthusiastic Anabaptists; such as a community of goods, an equality of rank, and other absurdities of the same nature.[b] Such were the disagreeable and perilous circumstances in which the Unitarians were placed, during the infancy of that sect, and which, no doubt, rendered their situation extremely critical and perplexing. But they were happily extricated out of these difficulties by the dexterity and resolution of some of their doctors, whose efforts were crowned with singular success, on account of the credit and influence which they had obtained in Poland. These divines suppressed, in a little time, the factions that threatened the ruin of their community, erected flourishing congregations at Cracow, Lublin, Pinczow, Luck, Smila,[c] (a town belonging so the famous Dudith,)[d] and in several other parts of Poland and Lithuania, and obtained the privilege of printing their productions, and those of their brethren, without molestation or restraint.[e] All these advantages were crowned by a signal mark of liberality and munificence which they received from Jo. Sienienius, palatine of Podolia, who gave them a settlement in the city of Racow, which he had himself built, in 1569, in the district of Sendomir.[f] This extraordinary favour was peculiarly adapted to better the state of the Unitarians, who were, at that time, scattered about in the midst of their enemies; and accordingly they now looked upon their religious establishment as permanent and stable, and presumed so far upon their good fortune, as to declare Racow the centre of their community, where their distant and dispersed members might unite their counsels, and hold their deliberations.

X. When they saw their affairs in this promising situation, the first thing that employed the attention and zeal of their doctors and spiritual rulers, was a translation of the Bible into the Polish language, which was accordingly published in 1572. They had, indeed, before this, a Polish version of the sacred writings, which they had composed jointly with the Helvetic doctors, in 1565, while they lived in communion with that church: but, after the breach of that communion, and the order they had received to separate themselves from the reformed church, this version lost its credit among them, as it did not seem proper to answer their views.[g] After they had finished their new version, they drew up a summary of their religious doctrine, which was published at Cracow, in 1574, under the title of *Catechism* or *Confession* of the *Unitarians*.[h] The system of religion that is contained in

[a] Vita Andr. Wissowatii in Sandii Biblioth. p. 226; also Sandius in Simone Budnæo, p. 54.

[b] Lubieniecius, lib. iii. cap. xii.

[c] Mart. Adelt, Historia Arianismi Smiglensis.

[d] This Dudith, who was certainly one of the most learned and eminent men of the sixteenth century, was born at Buda, in 1533; and, after having studied in the most famous universities, and visited almost all the countries of Europe, was named to the bishophric of Tinia by the emperor Ferdinand, and made privy counsellor to that prince. He had, by the force of his genius, and the study of the ancient orators, acquired such a masterly and irresistible eloquence, that in all public deliberations he carried every thing before him. In the council to which he was sent in the name of the emperor and of the Hungarian clergy, he spoke with such energy against several abuses of the church of Rome, and particularly against the celibacy of the clergy, that the pope, being informed thereof by his legates, solicited the emperor to recall him. Ferdinand complied; but, having heard Dudith's report of what passed in that famous council, he approved his conduct, and rewarded him with the bishopric of Chonat. He afterwards married a maid of honour of the queen of Hungary, and resigned his bishopric; the emperor, however, still continued to be his friend and protector. The papal excommunication was levelled at his head; but he treated it with contempt. Tiredof the fopperies and superstitions of the church of Rome, he retired to Cracow, where he publicly embraced the protestant religion, after having been for a considerable time its secret friend. It is said that he showed some inclination toward the Socinian system. Some of his friends deny this; others confess it, but maintain, that he afterwards changed his sentiments in that respect. He was well acquainted with several branches of philosophy and the mathematics, with physic, history, theology, and the civil law. He was such an enthusiastic admirer of Cicero, that he copied over three times, with his own hand, all the works of that immortal author. He had something majestic in his figure, and in the air of his countenance. His life was regular and virtuous, his manners were elegant and easy, and his benevolence warm and extensive.

[e] Sandii Biblioth. p. 20.

[f] Sandius, p. 201. Lubieniecius, p. 239.

[g] See a German work of Ringeltaube, entitled, Von den Pohlnischen Bibeln, p. 90, 113, 142, in which there is a farther account of the Polish interpretations of the Bible composed by Socinian authors.

[h] From this little performance, and indeed from it alone, we may learn with certainty the true state of the Unitarian religion before Faustus Socinus; yet I do not find that it has been so much as once quoted, or even mentioned by any of the Socinian writers, by any historians who have given an account of their sect, or by any of the divines that have drawn the pen of controversy against their religious system. I am almost inclined to believe, that the Socinians (when in process of time they had gained ground, acquired more dexterity in the management of their affairs, and drawn up a new, specious, and artful summary of their doctrine) were prudent enough to desire that this primitive catechism should disappear, that it might not furnish their adversaries with an occasion of accusing them of inconstancy in abandoning the tenets of their ancestors, nor excite factions and divisions among themselves, by inducing any of their people to complain that they had deviated from the ancient simplicity of the founders of their sect. These reasons, very probably, engaged the Socinian doctors to buy up all the copies they could find of this Confession, with a view to bury it in oblivion. It will not, therefore, be improper to give here some account of the form and matter of this first Socinian creed, which contained the doctrine of that sect before the Racovian Catechism was composed. This account will throw new light upon a period and branch of ecclesiastical history that are highly interesting. The original catechism now under consideration, which is extremely rare, has the following title prefixed to it: "Catechism, or Confession of Faith of the Congregation assembled in Poland, in the name of Jesus Christ our Lord, who was crucified, and raised from the dead—Deuter. vi. Hear, O Israel, the Lord our God is one God—John viii. 54. It is my Father—of whom ye say that he is your God. Printed by Alexander Turobinus, born in the year of Christ, the Son of God, 1574."* We find, by a passage at the end of the preface, that this curious catechism was printed at Cracow; for it is said to have been published in that city, in the year 1574 from the birth of Christ. Now it is known that the Unitarians had, at that time, a printing-house at Cracow, which was, soon after, removed to Racow. Turobinus, who is said to have been the printer of this little production, is mentioned by Sandius, under the denomination of Turobinczyck, which he undoubtedly derived from Turobin, a town in the Palatinate of Chelm, in Little or Red Russia, which was the place of his nativity. The author of this catechism was the famous George Schoman, as has been evidently proved from a piece entitled Schomanni Testamentum,† and other circumstances, by Jo Adam Möllerus, in his dissert. de Unitariorum Catechesi et Confessione omnium primâ.‡ The preface, composed in the name of the whole congregation, begins with the following salutation: "To all those who thirst after eternal salvation, the little and afflicted flock in Poland, which is baptized in the name of Jesus of Nazareth, sendeth greeting, praying most earnestly that grace and peace may be shed upon them by the one supreme God and Father, through his only begotten Son, our Lord Jesus Christ, who was crucified."§ After this general salutation, the prefacers give an account of the reasons that engaged them to compose and publish this confession. The principal motives arose from the re-

* The original title runs thus: "Cathechesis et Confessio fidei cœtus per Poloniam congregati in nomine Jesu Christi, Domini nostri crucifixi et resuscitati. Deut. vi. Audi, Israel, Dominus Deus noster Deus unus est. Johan. viii. dicit Jesus, Quem vos dicitis vestrum esse Deum, est pater meus. Typis Alexandri Turobini, anno nati Jesu Christi, filii Dei, 1574."

† This testament is published by Sandius, in his Bibliotheca Anti-Trin

‡ The dissertation of Möllerus is to be found in a collection of pieces published by Bartholomæus under the following title: "Fortgesezten nutzlichen Anmerckungen von allerhand Materien," part xxi. p. 758.

§ Omnibus salutem æternam sitientibus, gratiam ac pacem ab uno illo altissimo Deo patre, per unigenitum ejus filium, Dominum nostrum, Jesum Christum crucifixum, ex animo precatur cœtus exiguus et afflictus per Poloniam, in nomine ejusdem Christi Nazareni Baptizatus.

this catechism, is remarkable for its simplicity, and is neither loaded with scholastic terms nor with subtle discussions; but it breathes, in several places, the spirit of Socinianism, even in those parts of it which its authors look upon as most important and fundamental. Nor will this appear surprising to those who consider, that the papers of Lælius Socinus, which he undoubtedly left behind him in Poland, were in the hands of many; and that, by the perusal of them, the Arians, who had formerly the upper hand in the community of the Unitarians, were engaged to change their sentiments concerning the nature and mediation of Christ.[a] It is true, indeed, that the denomina-

proaches and aspersions that were cast upon the Anabaptists in several places; from which we learn, that, at this time, the denomination of Anabaptists was given to those, who, in after-times, were called Socinians. The rest of this preface is employed in besecching the reader to be firmly persuaded, that the designs of the congregation are pious and upright, to read with attention, that he may judge with discernment, and, "abandoning the doctrine of Babylon, and the conduct and conversation of Sodom, to take refuge in the ark of Noah," i. e. among the Unitarian Brethren.

In the beginning of the catechism itself, the whole doctrine of Christianity is reduced to six points. The first relates to the nature of God and his Son Jesus Christ; the second to justification; the third to discipline; the fourth to prayer; the fifth to baptism; and the sixth to the Lord's supper. These six points are explained at length, in the following manner. Each point is defined and unfolded, in general terms, in one question and answer, and is afterwards subdivided into its several branches in various questions and answers, in which its different parts are illustrated and confirmed by texts of Scripture. From this it appears, at first sight, that the primitive state of Socinianism was a state of real infancy and weakness; that its doctors were by no means distinguished by the depth or accuracy of their theological knowledge; and that they instructed their flock in a superficial manner, by giving them only some vague notions of certain leading doctrines and precepts of religion. In their definition of the nature of God, with which this catechism begins, the authors discover immediately their sentiments concerning Jesus Christ, by declaring that he is subject, with 'all other things,' to the Supreme Creator of the universe. It may also be observed, as a proof of the ignorance or negligence of these authors, that, in illustrating the nature and perfections of the Deity, they make not the least mention of his infinity, his omniscience, immensity, eternity, omnipotence, omnipresence, spirituality, or of those other perfections of the divine nature that surpass the comprehension of finite minds. Instead of this, they characterize the Supreme Being only by his wisdom, his immortality, his goodness, and unbounded dominion and empire over the creatures. By this it would seem, that, even at this early period of Socinianism, the rulers of that sect had adopted it as a maxim, that nothing incomprehensible or mysterious was to be admitted into their religious system. —Their erroneous notion concerning Christ is expressed in the following terms: "Our mediator before the throne of God is a man who was formerly promised to our fathers by the prophets, and was born in these latter days of the seed of David, and whom God the Father has made Lord and Christ; that is, the most perfect prophet, the most holy priest, and the most triumphant king, by whom he created the *new* world,* by whom he sent peace upon earth, restored all things, and reconciled them to himself; and by whom also he has bestowed eternal life upon his elect, to the end that, after the Supreme God, we should believe in him, adore and invoke him, hear his voice, imitate his example, and find in him rest to our souls."† It is here worthy of notice, that, although they call Christ *a most holy priest*, and justify this title by citations from Scripture, they no where explain the nature of that priesthood which they attribute to him.—With respect to the Holy Ghost, they plainly deny his being a divine *person*, and represent him as nothing more than a divine *quality*, or virtue, as appears from the following passage: "The Holy Ghost is the energy or perfection of God, whose fulness God the Father bestowed upon his only begotten Son, our Lord, that we, becoming his adopted children, might receive of his fulness."‡—They express their sentiments of justification in the ensuing terms: "Justification consists in the remission of all our past sins, through the mere grace and mercy of God, in, and by our Lord Jesus Christ, without our merits and works, and in consequence of a lively faith; as also in the certain hope of life eternal, and the true and unfeigned amendment of our lives and conversation, through the assistance of the divine Spirit, to the glory of God the Father, and the edification of our neighbours."§ As by this inaccurate definition justification comprehends in it amendment and obedience, so, in the explication of this point, our authors break in upon the following one, which relates to discipline, and lay down a short summary of moral doctrine, which is contained in a few precepts, and expressed for the most part in the language of Scripture. There is this peculiarity in their moral injunctions, that they prohibit the taking of oaths and the repelling of injuries. As to what regards ecclesiastical discipline, they define it thus: "Ecclesiastical discipline consists in calling frequently to the remembrance of every individual, the duties that are incumbent upon him; in admonishing, first privately, and afterwards, if that be ineffectual, in a public manner, before the whole congregation, such as have sinned openly against God, or offended their neighbour; and, lastly, in excluding from the communion of the church the obstinate and impenitent, that, being thus covered with shame, they may be led to repentance, or, if they remain unconverted, may be damned eternally."‖ By their farther explication of the point relating to ecclesiastical discipline, we see how imperfect and incomplete their notions of that matter were. For they treat, in the first place, concerning the government of the church and its ministers, whom they divide into bishops, deacons, elders, and widows. After this they enumerate, at length, the duties of husbands and wives, old and young, parents and children, masters and servants, citizens and magistrates, poor and rich; and conclude with what relates to the admonition of offenders, and their exclusion from the communion of the church, in case of obstinate impenitence. Their sentiments concerning prayer, are, generally speaking, sound and rational. But, in their notion of baptism, they differ from other Christian churches in this, that they make it to consist in immersion or dipping, and emersion or rising again out of the water, and maintain that it ought not to be administered to any but adult persons "Baptism," say they, "is the immersion into water, and the emersion of one who believes in the Gospel, and is truly penitent, performed in the name of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, or in the name of Jesus Christ alone; by which solemn act the person baptized publicly acknowledgeth, that he is cleansed from all his sins, through the mercy of God the Father, by the blood of Christ, and the operation of the Holy Spirit, to the end that, being engrafted into the body of Christ, he may mortify the old Adam, and be transformed into the image of the new and heavenly Adam, in the firm assurance of eternal life after the resurrection."¶ The last point handled in this performance is the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, of which the authors give an explication that will be readily adopted by those who embrace the doctrine of Zuingle on that head. At the end of this curious catechism there is a piece entitled, "Œconomia Christiana, seu Pastoratus Domesticus," which contains a short instruction to heads of families, showing them how they ought to proceed in order to maintain and increase in their houses a spirit of piety; in which also their devotion is assisted by forms of prayer, composed for morning, evening, and other occasions.

The copy of this catechism, which is now before me, was given in 1680, by Martin Chelmius, one of the most eminent and zealous Socinian doctors, to Mr. Christopher Heiligmier, as appears by a long inscription, written by the donor, at the end of the book. In this inscription Chelmius promises his friend other productions of the same kind, provided he receives the present one kindly, and concludes with these words of St. Paul: 'God hath chosen the weak things of the world to confound the strong.'

[a] This appears evidently from the following passage in Schoman's Testamentum, p. 194, 195. "Sub id fere tempus (A. 1566,) ex rhapsodiis

* This expression is remarkable; for these doctors maintained, that these declarations of Scripture, which represent the world as formed by Christ, do not relate to the visible world, but to the restoration of mankind to virtue and happiness by the Son of God. They invented this interpretation to prevent their being obliged to acknowledge the divine glory and creative power of Christ.

† Est homo, mediator noster apud Deum, patribus olim per prophetas promissus, et ultimis tandem temporibus ex Davidis semine natus, quem Deus pater fecit Dominum et Christum, hoc est, perfectissimum prophetam, sanctissimum sacerdotem, invictissimum regem, per quem mundum creavit, omnia restauravit, secum reconciliavit, pacificavit, et vitam æternam electis suis donavit; ut in illum, post Deum altissimum, credamus, illum adoremus, invocemus, audiamus, pro modulo nostro imitemur, et, in illo, requiem animabus nostris inveniamus.

‡ Spiritus sanctus est virtus Dei, cujus plenitudinem dedit Deus pater filio suo unigenito, Domino nostro, ut ex ejus plenitudine nos adoptivi acciperemus.

§ Justificatio est ex merâ gratiâ, per Dominum nostrum Jesum Christum, sine operibus et meritis nostris, omnium præteritorum peccatorum nostrorum in vivâ fide remissio, vitæque æternæ indubitata expectatio, et auxilio spiritus Dei vitæ nostræ non simulata sed vera correctio, ad gloriam Dei patris nostri et ædificationem proximorum nostrorum.

‖ Disciplina ecclesiastica est officii singulorum frequens commemoratio, et peccantium contra Deum vel proximum primum privata, deinde etiam publica, coram toto cœtu, commonefactio, denique pertinacium a communione sanctorum alienatio, ut pudore suffusi convertantur, aut, si id nolint, æternùm damnentur.

¶ Baptismus est hominis Evangelio credentis et pœnitentiam agentis, in nomine Patris, et Filii et Spiritus Sancti, vel in nomine Jesu Christi, in aquam immersio et emersio, quâ publice profitetur, se gratiâ Dei Patris, in sanguine Christi, operâ Spiritus Sancti, ab omnibus peccatis ablutum esse, ut, in corpus Christi insertus, mortificet veterem Adamum, et transformetur in Adamum illum cælestem, certus, se post resurrectionem consequuturum esse vitam æternam.

tion of *Socinian* was not as yet known. Those who were afterwards distinguished by this title, passed in Poland, at the time of which we now speak, under the name of Anabaptists, because they admitted to baptism adult persons only, and also rebaptized those who joined them from other Christian churches.[a]

XI. The dexterity and perseverance of Faustus Socinus gave a new face to the Unitarian sect, of which he became a zealous and industrious patron. He was a man of true genius, but of little learning; firm in his purposes, and steady in his measures; much inferior in knowledge to his uncle Lælius, while he surpassed him greatly in courage and resolution. This eminent sectary, after having wandered through several countries of Europe, settled, in 1579, among the Unitarians in Poland, and, at his arrival there, suffered many vexations and much opposition from a considerable number of persons, who looked upon some of his tenets as highly erroneous. And, indeed, it is evident, that his religious system, which he is said to have drawn from the papers of Lælius, was much less remarkable for its simplicity than that of the Unitarians. He triumphed, however, at last, over all the difficulties that had been laid in his way, by the power of his eloquence, the spirit and address that reigned in his compositions, the elegance and gentleness of his manner, the favour and protection of the nobility, which he had acquired by his happy talents and accomplishments, and also by some lucky hits of fortune. By seizing the occasions when it was prudent to yield, and improving the moments that demanded bold resistance and firm resolution, he stemmed dexterously and courageously the torrent of opposition, and beheld the Unitarians submitting to his doctrine, which they had before treated with indignation and contempt. They, in effect, laid aside all feuds and controversies, and formed themselves into one community under his superintendency and direction.[b]

XII. Thus did Socinus introduce a considerable change into the ancient Unitarian system, which, before his time, was ill digested, ill expressed, and chargeable in many places with ambiguity and incoherence. He disguised its inconsistencies, gave it an air of connexion, method, and elegance, and defended it with much more dexterity and art, than had ever been discovered by its former patrons.[c] And, accordingly, the affairs of the Unitarians put on a new face. Under the auspicious protection of such a spirited and insinuating chief, the little flock, that had been hitherto destitute of strength, resolution, and courage, grew apace, and suddenly arose to a high degree of credit and influence. Its number was augmented by proselytes of all ranks and orders. Of these some were distinguished by their nobility, others by their opulence, some by their address, and many by their learning and eloquence. All these contributed, in one way or another, to increase the lustre, and to advance the interests of this rising community, and to support it against the multitude of adversaries, which its remarkable prosperity and success had raised up against it from all quarters; the rich maintained it by their liberality, the powerful by their patronage and protection, and the learned by their writings. But now the system of the Unitarians, being thus changed and new-modelled, required a new confession of faith to make known its principles, and give a clear and full account of its present state. The ancient catechism, which was no more than a rude and incoherent sketch, was therefore laid aside, and a new form of doctrine was drawn up by Socinus himself. This form was corrected by some, augmented by others, and revised by all the Socinian doctors of any eminence; and, having thus acquired a competent degree of accuracy and perfection, was published under the title of the Catechism of Racow, and is still considered as the Confession of Faith of the whole sect. An unexpected circumstance crowned all the fortunate events that had happened to this sect, and seemed to leave them nothing farther to desire; and this was the zealous protection of Jacobus à Sienno, to whom Racow belonged. This new patron, separating himself from the reformed church, in 1600, embraced the doctrine and communion of the Socinians, and, about two years after, erected in his own city, which he declared their metropolis, a public school, designed as a seminary for their church, to form its ministers and pastors.[d]

XIII. From Poland, the doctrine of Socinus made its way into Transylvania, in 1563, principally by the credit and influence of George Blandrata, a celebrated physi-

---

Lælii Socini quidam fratres didicerunt, Dei filium non esse secundam Trinitatis personam, patri coëssentialem et coæqualem, sed hominem Jesum Christum, ex Spiritu Sancto conceptum, ex Virgine Mariâ natum, crucifixum, et resuscitatum: a quibus nos commoniti, sacras literas perscrutari persuasi sumus." These words show plainly, that the Unitarians, or Pinczovians, had, before their separation from the reformed church in 1565, believed in a Trinity of some kind or other, and had not gone so far as totally to divest Jesus Christ of his divinity. Schoman, now cited, was a doctor of great authority in this sect; and he tells us that, at the diet of Petricow, in 1565, he defended the unity of God the Father against the reformed, who maintained the existence of a threefold Deity. We learn nevertheless, from himself, that it was not till the year 1566, that a perusal of the papers of Lælius Sôcinus had engaged him to change his sentiments, and to deny the divine personality of Christ. Hence we may conclude, that, before the year last-mentioned, he and his Pinczovian flock were not Socinians, but Arians only.

[a] This the Unitarians acknowledge, and it is confirmed by the writer of the Epistola de Vitâ Andr. Wissowatii, who tells us, that his sect were distinguished by the denomination of Anabaptists and Arians, but that all other Christian communities and individuals in Poland were promiscuously called Chrzesciani, from the word Chrzest, which signifies Baptism.

[b] See Bayle's Dictionary.—Sandii Biblioth. Anti-Trin. p. 64.—Sam. Przypcopii Vita Socini, prefixed to the works of Socinus.—Lamy's Histoire du Socinianisme, part i. ii.

[c] Hence it appears, that the modern Unitarians are very properly called Socinians; for certainly the formation and establishment of that sect were entirely owing to the labours of Lælius and Faustus Socinus. The former, indeed, who was naturally timorous and irresolute, died at Zurich, in 1562, in the communion of the reformed church, and seemed unwilling to expose himself to danger, or to sacrifice his repose, by founding a new sect, that is, by appearing professedly and openly in this enterprise. Besides, many circumstances concur to render it highly probable, that he did not finish the religious system of which he had formed the plan, but died, on the contrary, in a state of uncertainty and doubt with respect to several points of no small importance. But, notwithstanding all this, he contributed much to the institution of the sect now under consideration. He collected the materials that Faustus afterwards digested and employed with such dexterity and success: he secretly and imperceptibly excited doubts and scruples in the minds of many, concerning several doctrines generally received among Christians; and, by several arguments against the divinity of Christ, which he left in writing, he so far seduced, even after his death, the Arians in Poland, that they embraced the communion and sentiments of those who looked upon Christ as a mere man, created immediately, like Adam, by God himself. What Lælius had thus begun, Faustus carried on with vigour and finished with success. It is indeed difficult, and scarcely possible, to determine precisely, what materials he received from his uncle, and what tenets he added himself; that he added several is plain enough. The difficulty arises from this circumstance, that there are few writings of Lælius extant; and of those that bear his name, some undoubtedly belong to other authors. We learn, however, from Faustus himself, that the doctrine he propagated, with respect to the person of Christ, was (at least, the greatest part of it) broached by Lælius.

[d] See Wissowatii Narratio de Separatione Unitariorum a Reformatis, p. 214.—Lubieniecius, lib. iii. cap. xii.

cian, whom Sigismund, at that time sovereign of the country, had invited to his court, in order to the restoration of his health. Blandrata was a man of uncommon address, had a deep knowledge of men and things, and was particularly acquainted with the manners, transactions, and intrigues of courts. He was accompanied by a Socinian minister, whose name was Francis Davides, who seconded his efforts with such zeal, that, by their united solicitations and labours, they engaged the prince, and the greatest part of the nobility, in their cause, infected almost the whole province with their errors, and obtained for the ministers and members of their communion, the privilege of professing and propagating their doctrines in a public manner. The Bathori, indeed, who were afterwards chosen dukes of Transylvania, were by no means prejudiced in favour of the Socinians; but that sect had become so powerful by its numbers and its influence, that they could not, in prudence, attempt to suppress it.[a] Such also was the case with the successors of the Bathori; they ardently wished to extirpate this society, but never could accomplish that object; so that to this day the Socinians profess their religion publicly in this province, and, indeed, in it alone; and, relying on the protection of the laws, and the faith of certain treaties that have been adjusted with them, have their churches and seminaries of learning, and hold their ecclesiastical and religious assemblies, though exposed to perpetual dangers and snares from the vigilance of their adversaries.[b] About the same time the Socinians endeavoured to form settlements in Hungary[c] and Austria;[d] but these attempts were defeated by the united and zealous opposition both of the Roman catholic and reformed churches.

XIV. No sooner had the Socinians obtained a solid and happy settlement at Racow, than the dictates of zeal and ambition suggested to them views of a still more extensive nature. Encouraged by the protection of men in power, and the suffrages of men of learning and genius, they began to form several plans for the enlargement of their community, and meditated nothing less than the propagation of their doctrine through all the states of Europe. The first step they took toward the execution of this purpose, was the publication of a considerable number of books, of which some were designed to illustrate and defend their theological system, and others to explain, or rather to pervert, the sacred writings into a conformity with their peculiar tenets. These books, which were composed by the most subtile and artful doctors of the sect, were printed at Racow, and dispersed with the utmost industry and zeal through different countries.[e] They also sent some of their brethren into various parts of Europe, toward the conclusion of this century, as we learn from authentic records, in order to make proselytes and erect new congregations. These missionaries seemed every way qualified to gain credit to the cause in which they had embarked, as some of them were distinguished by the lustre of their birth, and others by the extent of their learning, and the powers of their eloquence; and yet, notwithstanding these uncommon advantages, they failed, almost every where, in their attempts. A small congregation was founded at Dantzic, which subsisted for some time in a clandestine manner, and then gradually dwindled to nothing.[f] The first attempts to promote the cause of Socinianism in Holland, were made by a person whose name was Erasmus Johannis.[g] After him Christopher Ostorod, and Andrew Voidovius, who were the main pillars of the sect, used their utmost endeavours to gain disciples and followers in that country; nor were their labours wholly unsuccessful, though the zeal of the clergy, and the vigilance of the magistrates, prevented their forming any regular assemblies,[h] and thus hindered their party from acquiring any considerable degree of strength and stability.[i] Socinianism did not meet with a better reception in Britain than in Holland. It was introduced into Germany by Adam Neuser, and other emissaries, who infected the Palatinate with its errors, having entered into a league with the Transylvanians, at the critical period when the affairs of the Unitarians, in Poland, carried a dubious and unpromising aspect. But this pernicious league was soon detected, and the schemes of its authors were entirely disconcerted; upon which Neuser went into Turkey, and enlisted among the Janisaries.[k]

XV. Although the Socinians professed to believe that our divine knowledge is derived solely from the Holy Scriptures, they maintain in reality, that the sense of Scripture is to be investigated and explained by the dictates of right reason, to which, in consequence, they attribute a great influence in determining the nature, and unfolding the various doctrines of religion. When their writings are perused with attention, they will be found to attribute more to reason, in this matter, than most other Christian societies; for they frequently insinuate artfully, and sometimes declare plainly, that the sacred penmen were guilty of many errors, from a defect of memory, as well as a want of capacity; that they expressed their sentiments without perspicuity or precision, and rendered the plainest things obscure by their pompous and diffuse Asiatic style; and that it was therefore absolutely necessary to employ the lamp of human reason to cast a light upon their doctrine, and to explain it in a manner conformable to truth. It is easy to see what they had in view by maintaining propositions of this kind. They aimed at nothing less than the establishment of the following general rule, viz. That the history of the Jews, and also

[a] See Sandius, p. 28, 55.—Salig, vol. ii. lib. vi.—Debrezeni Hist. Ecclesiæ Reformatæ in Hungariâ, p. 147.—Mart. Schmeizelii de Statu Ec. Lutheranæ in Transylvaniâ, p. 55.—Lamy, His. du Socinianisme, part i. ch. xiii.

[b] Zeltneri Historia Crypto-Socinismi Altorfini, cap. ii. p. 357.

[c] Debrezeni Hist. p. 169.

[d] Henr. Spondani Continuat. Annal. Baronii, ad An. 1568.

[e] A considerable number of these books were republished, in 1656, in one great collection, consisting of six volumes in folio, under the title of Bibliotheca Fratrum Polonorum. In this collection, indeed, many pieces are not inserted, which were composed by the most eminent leaders of the sect; but what is there published, is sufficient to give the attentive reader a clear idea of the doctrine of the Socinians, and of the nature of their institution as a religious community.

[f] Zelterni Hist. p. 199.

[g] Sandius, p. 87.

[h] Brandt, in his History of the Reformation of the Netherlands, tells us, that Ostorod and Voidovius were banished, and that their books were condemned to be publicly burned by the hands of the common hangman. Accordingly the pile was raised, the executioner approached, and the multitude was assembled; but the books did not appear. The magistrates, who were curious to peruse their contents, had quietly divided them among themselves and their friends.

[i] Zeltnerus, p. 31, 178.

[k] Burch. Struvii Hist. Eccles. Palat. cap. viii. sect. liii.—Alting, Hist. Eccles. Palat. in Miegii Monum. Palat. p. 266—337.—La Croze, Dissertations Historiques, tom. i. p. 101, 127. compared with Bern. Raupachius' Presbyterologia Austriaca, p. 113, where there is an account of John Matthæus, who was concerned in these troubles.

that of Jesus Christ, were indeed to be derived from the books of the Old and New Testament, and that it was not lawful to entertain the least doubt concerning the truth of this history, or the authenticity of these books in general; but that the particular doctrines which they contain, were, nevertheless, to be understood and explained in such a manner as to render them consonant with the dictates of reason. According to this representation of things, it is not the scripture that declares clearly and expressly what we are to believe concerning the nature, counsels, and perfections of the Deity; but it is human reason, which shows us the system of religion that we ought to seek in, and deduce from, the divine oracles.

XVI. This fundamental principle of Socinianism will appear more dangerous and pernicious, when we consider the sense in which the word *Reason* was understood by this sect. The pompous title of *Right Reason* was given, by the Socinians, to that measure of intelligence and discernment, or, in other words, to that faculty of comprehending and judging, which we derive from nature. According to this definition, the fundamental rule of Socinianism necessarily supposes, that no doctrine ought to be acknowledged as true in its nature, or divine in its origin, all whose parts are not level to the comprehension of the human understanding; and that, whatever the Scriptures teach concerning the perfections of God, his counsels, and decrees, and the way of salvation, must be modified, curtailed, and filed down, in such a manner, by the transforming power of art and argument, as to answer the extent of our limited faculties. Those who adopt this singular rule, must at the same time grant that the number of religions must be nearly equal to that of individuals; for, as there is a great variety in the talents and capacities of different persons, so what will appear difficult and abstruse to one, will seem evident and clear to another; and thus the more discerning and penetrating will adopt, as divine truth, what the slow and superficial will look upon as unintelligible jargon. This consequence does not at all alarm the Socinians, who suffer their members to explain, in very different ways, many doctrines of the highest importance, and permit every one to follow his particular fancy in composing his theological system, provided that they acknowledge, in general, the truth and authenticity of the history of Christ, and adhere to the precepts which the gospel lays down for the regulation of our lives and actions.

XVII. In consequence of this leading maxim, the Socinians either reject without exception, or change and accommodate to their limited capacities, all those doctrines relating to the nature of God and of Jesus Christ, the plan of redemption, and the eternal rewards and punishments unfolded in the Gospel, which they either cannot comprehend, or consider as attended with considerable difficulties. The sum of their theology is as follows: "God, who is infinitely more perfect than man, though of a similar nature in some respects, exerted an act of that power by which he governs all things; in consequence of which an extraordinary person was born of the Virgin Mary. That person was Jesus Christ, whom God first translated to heaven by that portion of his divine power, which is called the Holy Ghost; and, having there instructed him fully in the knowledge of his will, counsels, and designs he sent him again into this sublunary world, to promulgate to mankind a new rule of life, more excellent than that under which they had formerly lived, to propagate divine truth by his ministry, and to confirm it by his death.

"Those who obey the voice of this Divine Teacher, (and this obedience is in the power of every one whose will and inclination lead that way), shall one day be clothed with new bodies, and inhabit eternally those blessed regions, where God himself immediately resides. Such, on the contrary, as are disobedient and rebellious, shall undergo most terrible and exquisite torments, which shall be succeeded by annihilation, or the total extinction of their being."

The whole system of Socinianism, when stripped of the embellishments and commentaries with which it has been loaded and disguised by its doctors, is really reducible to the few propositions now mentioned.

XVIII. The nature and genius of the Socinian theology have an immediate influence upon the moral system of that sect, and naturally led its doctors to confine their rules of morality and virtue to the *external* actions and duties of life. On one hand, they deny the influence of a divine spirit and power upon the minds of men; and, on the other, they acknowledge, that no mortal has such an empire over himself as to be able to suppress or extinguish his sinful propensities and corrupt desires. Hence they have no conclusion left but one, and that is, to declare all such true and worthy Christians, whose words and external actions are conformable to the precepts of the divine law. It is, at the same time, remarkable, that another branch of their doctrine leads directly to the utmost severity in what relates to life and manners, since they maintain, that the great end of Christ's mission upon earth was to exhibit to mortals a new law, distinguished from all others by its unblemished sanctity and perfection. Hence it is, that a great number of Socinians have fallen into the fanatical rigour of the ancient Anabaptists, and judge it absolutely unlawful to repel injuries, to take oaths, to inflict capital punishments on malefactors, to oppose the despotic proceedings of tyrannical magistrates, or even to acquire wealth by honest industry. But, in this, there is something extremely singular, and they are here, indeed, inconsistent with themselves; for while, in matters of doctrine, they take the greatest liberty with the expressions of Scripture, and pervert them, in a violent manner, to the defence of their peculiar tenets, they proceed quite otherwise, when they come to prescribe rules of conduct from the precepts of the Gospel; for then they understand these precepts literally, and apply them without the least distinction of times, persons, and circumstances.

XIX. It must carefully be observed, that the Catechism of Racow, which most people look upon as the great standard of Socinianism, and as an accurate summary of the doctrine of that sect, is, in reality, no more than a collection of the popular tenets of the Socinians, and by no means a just representation of the secret opinions and sentiments of their doctors.[a] The writings,

[a] We have an account of the authors of this famous catechism, and of the various success it met with, in the Commentatio de Catechesi Recoviensi, published by Schmidius in 1707. See also Kocheri Biblioth. —A new edition of the catechism itself, with a solid refutation of the doctrine it contains, was published in 1739, by the learned George Louis Oeder.

therefore, of these learned men must be perused with attention, in order to our knowing the hidden reasons and true principles from which the doctrines of the Catechism are derived. It is observable, besides, that, in this Catechism, many Socinian tenets and institutions, which might have contributed to render the sect still more odious, and to expose its internal constitution too much to public view, are entirely omitted; so that it seems to have been less composed for the use of the Socinians themselves, than to impose upon strangers, and to mitigate the indignation which the tenets of this community had excited in the minds of many.[a] Hence it never obtained, among the Socinians, the authority of a public confession or rule of faith; and hence the divines of that sect were authorized to correct and contradict it, or to substitute another form of doctrine in its place. It is also observable, that the most eminent writers and patrons of the Socinians, give no clear or consistent account of the sentiments of that sect in relation to ecclesiastical discipline and government, and the form of public worship. All that we know is, that they follow in these matters, generally speaking, the customs received in the protestant churches.[b]

XX. The founders and first patrons of this sect were eminently distinguished by their learning and genius. Their successors, however, did not follow their steps in this respect, nor retain the reputation they had universally obtained. The Unitarians in Poland seem to have had little ambition of science. They gave no encouragement to learning or talents; and appeared little solicitous of having in their community subtle doctors and learned disputants. But, when they perceived on the one hand, that the success of their community required as able defenders, as they had learned and ingenious adversaries, and were so fortunate, on the other, as to obtain the privilege of erecting seminaries of learning at Racow and Lublin, they changed their sentiments with respect to this matter, and became sensible of the necessity under which they lay, to encourage in their community a zeal for the sciences. This zeal increased greatly from the time that Faustus Socinus undertook the restoration of their declining credit, and put himself at the head of their tottering sect. At that time many persons, distinguished by their birth, education, and talents, embraced its doctrine, and contributed to promote the love of science among its members. Then the youth were instructed in the rules of eloquence and rhetoric, and the important branches of Oriental, Greek, and Latin literature. Even the secret paths of philosophy were opened, though their treasures were disclosed only to a few, who were selected, for that purpose, from the multitude. The Racovian doctors, in compliance with the spirit and taste of the age, chose Aristotle as their guide in philosophy, as appears evidently from the Ethics of Crellius, and other literary records of these times.

XXI. Notwithstanding this progress of philosophy among the Socinians, their doctors seemed to reject its aid in theology with obstinacy and disdain. They declare, in numberless places of their writings, that both in the interpretation of Scripture, and in explaining and demonstrating the truth of religion in general, clearness and simplicity are alone to be consulted, and no regard paid to the subtleties of philosophy and logic. And, indeed, had their doctors and interpreters followed, in practice, that rule which they have laid down with so much ostentation in theory, they would have saved their adversaries, and perhaps themselves, much trouble. But this is by no means the case. For, in the greatest part of their theological productions, their pretended simplicity is frequently accompanied with much subtlety, and with the most refined intricacies of scientific art. And, what is still more inexcusable, they reason with the greatest dexterity and acuteness upon those subjects, which (as they surpass the reach of the human understanding) are generally received, among other Christians, as facts confirmed by the most respectable testimony, and consequently as matters of pure faith, while they discover little sagacity, or strength of judgment, in those discussions which are within the sphere of reason, and are properly amenable to its tribunal. They are acute where they ought to be silent, and they reason awkwardly where sagacity and argument are required. These are certainly great inconsistencies; yet they proceed from one and the same principle, even the maxim universally received in this community, that all things which surpass the limits of human comprehension are to be entirely banished from the Christian religion.

XXII. It has been already observed, that the Unitarians had no sooner separated themselves from the Reformed churches in Poland, than they became a prey to intestine divisions, and were split into several factions. The points of doctrine that gave rise to these divisions, related to the dignity of Christ's nature and character, the unlawfulness of infant-baptism, and the personality of the Holy Ghost, to which were added several alterations, concerning the duties of life, and the rules of conduct that were obligatory on Christians. The sects, produced by these divisions, were not all equally obstinate. Some of them entertained pacific dispositions, and seemed inclined toward a reconciliation. But two, particularly, tenaciously maintained their sentiments, and persisted in their separation; these were the Budnæans and the Farnovians. The former were so called from their leader Simon Budnæus, a man of considerable acuteness and sagacity, who, more dexterous than the rest of his brethren in deducing consequences from their principles, and perceiving plainly the conclusions to which the peculiar principles of Lælius Socinus naturally led, peremptorily denied the propriety of offering any kind of religious worship to Jesus Christ. Nor did Budnæus stop here: in order to give a more specious colour to this capital error, and to maintain it upon consistent grounds, he asserted that Christ was not begotten by an extraordinary act of divine power, but that he was born like other men, in a natural way. This hypothesis, however conformable to the fundamental principles of Socinianism, appeared intolerable and impious to the major part even of that community. Hence Budnæus, who had gained over to his doctrine a great number of proselytes in Lithuania and

[a] This appears evident enough from their presenting a Latin translation of this catechism to James I. king of Great Britain, and a German one to the university of Wittenberg.

[b] This is manifest from a work which bears the following title: "Politia Ecclesiastica, quam vulgo Agenda vocant, sive forma Regiminis exterioris Ecclesiarum Christianarum in Poloniâ, quæ unum Deum Patrem, per filium ejus Unigenitum in Spiritu Sancto, confitentur." This work was composed in 1642 by Peter Morscovius or Morscowsky and published at Nuremberg by Oeder. It is mentioned by Sandius, who says that it was drawn up for the use of the Belgic churches.

Russian Poland, was deposed from his ministerial functions, in 1584, and publicly excommunicated with all his disciples. It is said, however, that he afterwards abandoned his peculiar and offensive sentiments, and was readmitted to the communion of that sect.[a]

XXIII. This heretical doctrine, which had created so much trouble to Budnæus, was soon after adopted by Francis Davides, a native of Hungary, who was the superintendent of the Socinian churches in Transylvania, and who opposed, with the greatest ardour and obstinacy, the custom of offering up prayers and divine worship to Jesus Christ. Several methods were used to reclaim him from this offensive error. Blandrata employed all the power of his eloquence for this purpose, and, to render his remonstrances still more effectual, sent for Faustus Socinus, who went accordingly into Transylvania, in 1573, and seconded his arguments and exhortations with the utmost zeal and perseverance. But Davides remained unmoved, and was, in consequence of this obstinate adherence to his error, apprehended by order of Christopher Bathori, prince of Transylvania, and thrown into prison, where he died in 1579, at an advanced age.[b] His unhappy fate did not, however, extinguish the controversy to which his doctrine had given rise; for he left behind him disciples and friends, who strenuously maintained his sentiments, stood firm against the opposition that was made to them, and created much uneasiness to Socinus and his followers in Lithuania and Poland. The most eminent of these were Jacob Palæologus, of the isle of Chio, who was burned at Rome in 1585; Christian Francken, who had disputed in person with Socinus; and John Somer,[c] who was master of the academy of Clausenburg.[d] This little sect is branded, by the Socinian writers, with the ignominious appellation of Semi-Judaizers.[e]

XXIV. The Farnovians were treated by the Socinians with much greater indulgence. They were neither excluded from the communion of the sect, nor obliged to renounce their peculiar tenets; they were only exhorted to conceal them prudently, and not publish or propagate them in their discourses from the pulpit.[f] This particular branch of the Socinian community was so named from Stantislaus Farnovius, or Farnesius, who was engaged by Gonesius to prefer the Arian system to that of the Socinians, and consequently asserted, that Christ had been engendered or produced out of nothing, by the Supreme Being, before the creation of this terrestrial globe. It is not so easy to say, what his sentiments were concerning the Holy Ghost; all we know upon that head is, that he warned his disciples against paying the tribute of religious worship to that divine Spirit.[g] Farnovius separated from the other Unitarians, in 1568, and was followed in this schism by several persons eminent on account of the extent of their learning, and the influence of their rank, such as Martin Czechovicius, Neimoiovius, Stanislaus Wisnowius, John Falcon, George Schoman, and others. They did not, however, form themselves into a stable or permanent sect. The lenity and indulgence of the Socinians, together with the dexterity of their disputants, brought many of them back into the bosom of the community they had deserted, and considerable numbers were dispersed or regained by the prudence and address of Faustus Socinus; so that at length the whole faction, being deprived of its chief, who died in 1615, was scattered abroad, and reduced to nothing.[h]

---

[a] See Sandii Biblioth. Anti-Trinit. p. 54, 55.—Epistola de Vitâ, Wissowatii, p. 226.—Ringeltaube's German Dissertation on the Polish Bibles, p. 144, 152.—Samuel Crellius, the most learned Socinian of our times, is of opinion that Adam Neuser,* who was banished on account of his erroneous sentiments, was the author of this doctrine, which is so derogatory from the dignity of Jesus Christ. See Crellii Thesaur. Epistol. Crozian.

[b] Sandius, Biblioth. Anti-Trinit. p. 55.—Faust. Socin. oper. tom. i. p. 353, 395; tom. ii. p. 713, 771, where there is an account of his conference and dispute with Francis Davides.—Stan. Lubieniecii Hist. Reform. Polonicæ, lib. iii. c. xi.

[c] See Sandius, Biblioth. p. 57. The dispute between Socinus and Francken is related at large in the works of the former, tom. ii. p. 767.

☞ [d] Clausenburg, otherwise Coloswar, is a town in Transylvania, extremely populous and well fortified. The Socinians have here a public school and a printing-house; and their community in this place is very numerous. Till the year 1603, they were in possession of the cathedral, which was then taken from them and given to the Jesuits, whose college and church they had pulled down.

[e] Faustus Socinus wrote a particular treatise against the Semi-Judaizers. It is, however, worthy of observation, that the motive which engaged him and his friends to employ so much pains and labour in the suppression of this faction, was not a persuasion of the pernicious tendency of its doctrines or peculiar notions. On the contrary, he expressly acknowledges, that this controversy turns upon matters of very little importance, by declaring it, as his opinion, that praying or offering up divine worship to Christ, is not necessary to salvation. Thus, in his answer to Wujeck, he expresses himself in the following manner: "The Christian, whose faith is so great, as to encourage him to offer his addresses habitually and directly to the Supreme Being, and who standeth not in need of the comfort that flows from the invocation of Christ, his brother, who was tempted in all things like as he is, is not obliged to call upon the name of Jesus, by prayer or supplication."† According therefore to the opinion of Socinus, those who lay aside all regard to Christ as an intercessor, and address themselves directly to God alone, have a greater measure of faith than others. But, if this be so, why did he oppose with such vehemence and animosity the sentiment of Davides, who, in effect, did no more than exhort all Christians to address themselves directly and immediately to the Father? Here there appears to be a striking inconsistency. We find also Lubieniecius, in his Reformat. Histor. Polonicæ, lib. iii. cap. xi. speaking lightly enough of this controversy, and representing it as a matter of very little moment; for he says that in Transylvania there was 'much ado about nothing.'‡ We may therefore conclude, that Socinus and his followers were more artful than ingenuous in their proceedings with respect to Davides. They persecuted him and his followers, lest, by tolerating his doctrine, they should increase the odium under which they already lay, and draw upon themselves anew the resentment of other Christian churches, while, in their private judgment, they looked upon this very doctrine, and its professors, as worthy of toleration and indulgence.

[f] Epistola de Vitâ Wissowatii, p. 226.—Sandius says, that a professor of divinity at Clausenburg was prohibited from saying any thing, in his public discourses, of Christ's having existed before the Virgin Mary.

[g] Sandius, Biblioth. p. 52, &c.

[h] We omit here an enumeration of the more famous Socinian writers who flourished in this century, because the greater part of them have already been mentioned in the course of this History. The rest may be easily collected from Sandius.

* See sect. xiv. of this chapter.

† Si quis tantâ est fide præditus, ut ad Deum ipsum perpetuo rectâ accedere audeat, nec consolatione, quæ ex Christi fratris sui per omnia tentati invocatione proficiscitur, indigeat, hic non opus habet ut Christum invocet.

‡ Fluctus in simpulo excitatos esse.

THE SEVENTEENTH CENTURY.

SECTION I.

THE GENERAL HISTORY OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH.

1. The arduous attempts of the pontiffs, in the preceding century, to advance the glory and majesty of the see of Rome, by extending the limits of the Christian church, and spreading the Gospel among distant nations, met with great opposition; and, as they were neither well conducted nor properly supported, their fruits were neither abundant nor permanent. But in this century the same attempts were renewed with vigour, and crowned with such success, as contributed not a little to give a new degree of stability to the tottering grandeur of the papacy. They were begun by Gregory XV., who, by the advice of his confessor Narni, founded at Rome, in 1622, the famous congregation for the Propagation of the Faith, and enriched it with ample revenues. This congregation, which consists of thirteen cardinals, two priests, one monk, and a secretary,[a] is designed to propagate and maintain the religion of Rome in all parts of the world. Its riches and possessions were so prodigiously augmented by the munificence of Urban VIII. and the liberality of an incredible number of donors, that its funds are, at this day, adequate to the most sumptuous undertakings.[b] And, indeed, the enterprises of this congregation are great and extensive: by it a vast number of missionaries are sent to the remotest parts of the world; books of various kinds published, to facilitate the study of foreign and barbarous languages; the sacred writings, and other pious productions, sent abroad to the most distant corners of the globe, and exhibited to each nation and country in their own language and characters; seminaries founded for the sustenance and education of a great number of young men, set apart for the foreign missions; houses erected for the instruction and support of the pagan youths who are yearly sent from abroad to Rome, that they may return thence into their respective countries, and become the instructors of their blinded brethren: not to mention the charitable establishments that are intended for the relief and support of those who have suffered banishment, or been involved in other calamities, on account of their steadfast attachment to the religion of Rome, and their zeal for promoting the glory of its pontiff. Such are the arduous and complicated schemes, with the execution of which this congregation is charged; but these, though the principal, are not the only objects of its attention; its views, in a word, are vast, and its exploits almost incredible. Its members hold their assemblies in a spacious and magnificent palace, whose delightful situation adds a singular lustre to its beauty and grandeur.[c]

II. To this famous establishment, another, less splendid indeed, but highly useful, was added, in 1627, by Urban VIII. under the denomination of a College or Seminary for the Propagation of the Faith. This seminary is appropriated to the education of those who are designed for the foreign missions; and they are here instructed, with the greatest care, in the knowledge of all the languages and sciences that are necessary to prepare them for propagating the Gospel among the distant nations. This excellent foundation was due to the zeal and munificence of John Baptist Viles, a Spanish nobleman, who resided at the court of Rome, and who began by presenting to the pontiff all his ample possessions, together with his house, which was a noble and beautiful structure, for this pious and generous purpose. His liberality excited a spirit of pious emulation, and is followed with zeal even to this day. The seminary was at first committed by Urban to the care and direction of three canons of the patriarchal churches; but this appointment was afterwards changed, and, ever since the year 1641, it has been governed by the *congregation* founded by Gregory XV.[d]

III. The same zealous spirit reached France, and produced in that country several pious foundations of a like nature. In 1663, the king instituted *the Congregation of Priests of the foreign Missions;* while an association of bishops and other ecclesiastics founded the Parisian Seminary for the Missions abroad, designed for the education of those who were set apart for the propagation of Christianity among the pagan nations. Hence apostolical vicars are still sent to Siam, Tonquin, Cochin-China, and Persia, bishops to Bagdad, and missionaries to other Asiatic nations; and all these spiritual envoys are supported by the ample revenues and possessions of the *congregation* and *seminary*.[e] These priests of the foreign missions,[f] and the apostles whom they send into foreign countries, are almost perpetually involved in altercations and debates with the Jesuits and their missionaries. The former are shocked at the methods which are ordinarily employed by the latter in converting the Chi-

[a] Such is the number appropriated to this Congregation by Gregory's original *Bull.* See Bullarium Roman. tom. iii.—Cerri mentions the same number, in his Etat Present de l'Eglise Romaine. But a different account is given by Aymon, in his Tableau de la Cour de Rome, p. iii. ch. iii. p. 279. for he makes this Congregation to consist of eighteen cardinals, one of the pope's secretaries, one apostolical proto-notary, one referendary, and one of the assessors or secretaries of the inquisition.

[b] This assertion was not strictly true at the time when it was hazarded; and to our own time it is very inapplicable.—*Edit.*

[c] The authors who have given an account of this Congregation, are mentioned by Fabricius, in his Lux Evangelii toti Orbi exoriens, cap. xxxiii. p. 566. Add to these, Dorotheus Ascanius, de Montibus Pietatis Ecclesiæ Roman. p. 522, where may be seen a complete list of the books that have been published by this congregation, from its first institution to the year 1667.

[d] Helyot, Histoire des Ordres, tom. viii. cap. xii.—Urb. Cerri, Etat. Present de l'Eglise Romaine, p. 293, where, however, the founder of this college is called, by mistake, Vives.

[e] See the Gallia Christiana Benedictinorum, tom. iv. p. 1024.—Helyot, Histoire des Ordres, tom. viii. chap. xii.

[f] These Ecclesiastics are commonly called, in France, *Messieurs des Missions Etrangeres.*

nese and other Asiatics to the Christian religion; and the Jesuits, in their turn, absolutely refuse obedience to the orders of the apostolical vicars and bishops, who receive their commission from the congregation above-mentioned, though this commission be issued out with the consent of the pope, or of the College *de propagandâ fide* residing at Rome. There was also another religious establishment formed in France, during this century, under the title of the Congregation of the Holy Sacrament, whose founder was Autherius, Bishop of Bethlehem, and which, in 1644, received an order from Urban VIII. to have always a number of ecclesiastics ready to exercise their ministry among the pagan nations, whenever they should be called upon by the pope, or the Congregation *de propagandâ fide*, for that purpose. It would be endless to mention other associations of less note, that were formed in several countries for promoting the cause of Christianity among the darkened nations; as also the care taken by the Jesuits, and other religious communities, to have a number of missionaries always ready for that service.

IV. These congregations and colleges sent forth those legions of missionaries, who, in this century, covered a great part of the globe, and converted to the profession of Christianity at least, if not to its temper and spirit, multitudes of persons among the fiercest and most barbarous nations. The religious orders, that made the greatest figure in these missions, were the Jesuits, Dominicans, Franciscans, and Capuchins, who, though concerned in one common cause, agreed very ill among themselves, publicly accusing each other, with the most bitter reproaches and invectives, of want of zeal in the service of Christ, and even of corrupting the purity of the Christian doctrine to promote their ambitious purposes. But none of these teachers of religion were so generally accused of sinster views and unworthy practices, in this respect, as the Jesuits, who were singularly odious in the eyes of all the other missionaries, and were looked upon as a very dangerous and pernicious set of apostles by a considerable part of the Romish church. Nor, indeed, could they be viewed in any other light, if the general report be true, that, instead of instructing their proselytes in the genuine doctrines of Christianity, they then taught, and still teach, a corrupt system of religion and morality, that is not burthensome to the conscience, and is reconcilable with the indulgence of gross appetites and passions;—that they not only tolerate, but even countenance, in new converts, several profane opinions and superstitious rites and customs;—that, by commerce, carried on with the most rapacious avidity, and various other methods, little consistent with probity and candour, they have already acquired an overgrown opulence, which they augment from day to day;—that they burn with the thirst of ambition, and are constantly gaping after worldly honours and prerogatives;—that they are perpetually employing the arts of adulation, and the seductions of bribery, to insinuate themselves into the friendship and protection of men in power;—that they are deeply involved in civil affairs, in the cabals of courts, and the intrigues of politicians;—and finally, that they frequently excite intestine commotions and civil wars, in those states and kingdoms, where their views are obstructed or disappointed, and refuse obedience to the Roman pontiff, and to the vicars and bishops that bear his commission. These accusations are indeed grievous, but they are perfectly well attested, being confirmed by the most striking circumstantial evidence, as well as by a prodigious number of unexceptionable witnesses. Among these we may reckon many of the most illustrious and respectable members of the church of Rome, whose testimony cannot be imputed to the suggestions of envy, on one hand, or be considered as the effect of temerity or ignorance on the other; such are the cardinals, the members of the Congregation *de propagandâ fide*, and even some of the popes themselves. These testimonies are supported and confirmed by glaring facts, even by the proceedings of the Jesuits in China, Abyssinia, Japan, and India, where they have dishonoured the cause of Christianity, and, by their corrupt practices, have injured, in the most sensible manner, the interest of Rome.[a]

V. The Jesuits exhausted all the resources of their peculiar artifice and dexterity to impose silence upon their accusers, confound their adversaries, and give a specious colour to their own proceedings. But all their stratagems were ineffectual. The court of Rome was informed of their odious frauds; and this information was, by no means, looked upon as groundless. Many circumstances concur to prove this, and among others the conduct of that congregation by which the foreign missions are carried on and directed; for it is remarkable, that, for many years past, the Jesuits have been much less employed by this congregation, than in former times, and are also treated, on almost every occasion, with a degree of circumspection that manifestly implies suspicion and diffidence. Other religious orders have evidently gained the ascendency which the Jesuits formerly held; and, in the nice and critical affairs of the church, especially in what relates to the propagation of the Gospel in foreign parts, much greater confidence is placed in the austere sobriety, poverty, industry, and patience of the Capuchins and Carmelites, than in the opulence, artifice, genius, and fortitude, of the disciples of Loyola. On the other hand it is certain, that, if the Jesuits are not much trusted, they are more or less feared since neither the powerful congregation, now mentioned, nor even the pontiffs themselves, venture to reform all the abuses, which they silently disapprove, or openly blame in the conduct of this insidious order. This connivance, however involuntary, is now a matter of necessity. The opulence of the Jesuits is so excessive, and their credit and influence are so extensive and formidable, in all those parts of the world which have embraced the Romish religion, that they carry their insolence so far as to menace often the pontiff himself, who cannot, without the utmost peril, oblige them to submit to his orders, when they are disposed to be refractory. Even the decisions of the pope are frequently suggested by this powerful society; and it is only in such a case that the society treats them with unlimited respect. When they come from any other quarter, they are received in a very different manner by the Jesuits, who trample upon some of them with impunity, and interpret others with their usual dexterity, in such a manner, as to answer the views and promote the interests of their ambitious order. Such, at least, are the accounts that are generally given of their proceedings;

[a] The reader will find an ample relation of these facts, in the preface to the Hist. de la Compagnie de Jesus, published at Utrecht in 1741.

accounts which, though contradicted by them, are supported by striking and palpable evidence.

VI. The rise of these dissensions between the Jesuits and the other Romish missionaries, may be ascribed to the methods of conversion used by the former, which are entirely different from those that are employed by the latter. The crafty disciples of Loyola judge it proper to attack the superstition of the Indian nations by artifice and stratagem, and to bring them gradually, with the utmost caution and prudence, to the knowledge of Christianity. In consequence of this principle, they interpret and explain the ancient doctrines of Paganism, and also those which Confucius taught in China, in such a manner as to soften and diminish, at least in appearance, their opposition to the truths of the Gospel; and whenever they find, in any of the religious systems of the Indians, tenets or precepts that bear even the faintest resemblance to certain doctrines or precepts of Christianity, they employ all their dexterity and zeal to render this resemblance more plausible and striking, and to persuade the Indians, that there is a great conformity between their ancient theology and the new religion they are exhorted to embrace. They go still farther; for they indulge their proselytes in the observance of all their national customs and rites, except such as are glaringly inconsistent with the genius and spirit of the Christian worship. These rites are modified a little by the Jesuits, and are directed toward a different set of objects, so as to form a sort of coalition between Paganism and Christianity. To secure themselves an ascendancy over the untutored minds of these simple Indians, they study their natural inclinations and propensities, comply with them on all occasions, and carefully avoid whatever may shock them; and, as in all countries the clergy, and men of eminent learning, are supposed to have a considerable influence on the multitude, so the Jesuits are particularly assiduous in courting the friendship of the Indian priests, which they obtain by various methods, in the choice of which they are far from being scrupulous. But the protection of men in power is the great object at which they principally aim, as the surest method of establishing their authority, and extending their influence. With this view, they study all the arts that can render them agreeable or useful to great men; apply themselves to the mathematics, physic, poetry, the theory of painting, sculpture, architecture, and other elegant arts; and persevere in studying men and manners, the interests of princes, and the affairs of the world, in order to prepare them for giving counsel in critical situations, and suggesting expedients in perplexing and complicated cases. It would be endless to enumerate all the circumstances that have been complained of in the proceedings of the Jesuits. These, now mentioned, have ruined their credit in the esteem of the other missionaries, who consider their artful and insiduous dealings as every way unsuitable to the character and dignity of the ambassadors of Christ, whom it becomes to plead the cause of God with an honest simplicity, and an ingenuous openness and candour, without any mixture of dissimulation or fraud. And, accordingly, we find the other religious orders, that are employed in the foreign missions, proceeding in a very different method in the exercise of their ministry. They attack openly the superstitions of the Indians, in all their connexions and in all their consequences, and are studious to remove whatever might tend to nourish them. They show little regard to the ancient rites and customs in use among the blinded nations, and little respect for the authority of those by whom they were established. They treat, with an indifference bordering upon contempt, the pagan priests, grandees, and princes; and preach, without disguise, the peculiar doctrines of Christianity, while they attack, without hesitation or fear, the superstitions of those nations they are called to convert.

VII. These missionaries diffused the fame of the Christian religion through a great part of Asia during this century. The ministerial labours of the Jesuits, Theatins, and Augustinians, contributed to introduce some rays of divine truth, mixed, indeed, with much darkness and superstition, into those parts of India which had been possessed by the Portuguese, before their expulsion by the Dutch. But, of all the missions that were established in those distant parts of the globe, no one has been more constantly and generally applauded than that of Madura, or is said to have produced more abundant and permanent fruit. It was undertaken and executed by Robert de Nobili,[a] an Italian Jesuit, who took a very singular method of rendering his ministry successful. Considering, on one hand, that the Indians beheld all Europeans with an eye of prejudice and aversion, and, on the other, that they held in the highest veneration the order of Brachmans or Bramins, as descended from the Gods; and that, impatient of other rulers, they paid an implicit and unlimited obedience to them alone; he assumed the appearance and title of a Bramin who had come from a distant country, and, by smearing his countenance, and imitating that most austere and painful method of living which the Sanianes or penitents observe, he at length persuaded the credulous people that he was, in reality, a member of that venerable order.[b] By this stratagem he gained over to Christianity twelve eminent Bramins, whose example and influence engaged a prodigious number of the people to hear the instructions, and to receive the doctrine of this famous missionary. On the death of Robert, this singular mission was for some time at a stand, and seemed even to be neglected;[c] but it was renewed by the zeal and industry of the Portuguese Jesuits, and is still carried on by several missionaries of that order, from France and Portugal, who have inured themselves to the terrible austerities that were practised by Robert, and which have thus become, as it were, the appendages

[a] Others call this famous missionary Robert de Nobilibus.

[b] Urban Cerri, Etat present de l'Eglise Romaine, p. 173.

☞ Nobili, who was looked upon by the Jesuits as the chief apostle of the Indians after Francis Xavier, took incredible pains to acquire knowledge of the religion, customs, and language of Madura, sufficient for the purposes of his ministry. But this was not all; for, to stop the mouths of his opposers, and particularly of those who treated his character of Bramin as an impostor, he produced an old, dirty parchment, in which he had forged, in the ancient Indian characters, a deed, showing that the Bramins of Rome were of much older date than those of India, and that the Jesuits of Rome descended, in a direct line, from the god Brama. Father Jouvenci, a learned Jesuit, tells us, in the History of his Order, something yet more remarkable; even that Robert de Nobili, when the authenticity of his smoky parchment was called in question by some Indian unbelievers, declared *upon oath*, before the assembly of the Bramins of Madura, that he really derived his origin from the god Brama. Is it not astonishing that this reverend father should acknowledge, is it not monstrous that he should applaud, as a piece of pious ingenuity, this detestable instance of perjury and fraud? See Jouvenci, Histoire des Jesuites; and Norbet, Memoires Historiques sur les Missions de Malab. tom. ii. p. 145.

[c] Urban Cerri, Etat present de l'Eglise Romaine, p. 173.

of that mission. These fictitious Bramins, who boldly deny their being Europeans or Franks,[a] and only give themselves out for inhabitants of the northern regions, are said to have converted a prodigious number of Indians to Christianity; and, if common report may be credited, the congregations which they have already founded in those countries grow more numerous from year to year. Nor, indeed, do these accounts appear, in the main, unworthy of belief,[b] though we must not be too ready to receive, as authentic and well attested, the relations which have been given of the intolerable hardships and sufferings sustained by these Jesuit-Bramins in the cause of Christ. Many imagine, and not without good foundation, that their austerities are (generally speaking) more dreadful in appearance than in reality; and that, while they outwardly affect an extraordinary degree of self-denial, they indulge themselves privately in a free, and even luxurious mode of living, have their tables delicately served, and their cellars exquisitely furnished, in order to refresh themselves after their labours.

VIII. The knowledge of Christianity was first conveyed to the kingdoms of Siam, Tong-king or Tonquin, and Cochin-China, by a mission of Jesuits, under the direction of Alexander of Rhodes, a native of Avignon,[c] whose instructions were received with uncommon docility by a prodigious number of the inhabitants of those countries. When an account of the success of this spiritual expedition was brought to pope Alexander VII. in 1658, he resolved to commit this new church to the inspection and government of a certain number of bishops, and chose for this purpose some French priests out of the Congregation of foreign Missions to carry his orders to the rising community, and to rule over it as his representatives and vicegerents. But the Jesuits, who can bear no superiors, and scarcely an equal, treated these pious men with the greatest indignity, loaded them with injuries and reproaches, and would not permit them to share their labours or partake of their glory.[d] Hence arose, in the court of Rome, a long and tedious contest, which served to show, in the plainest manner, that the Jesuits were ready enough to make use of the authority of the pope, when it was necessary to promote their interests, or to extend their influence and dominion; but that they did not hesitate, on the other hand, to treat the same authority with indifference and contempt in all cases, where it seemed to oppose their private views and personal interests. After this, Louis XIV. sent a solemn embassy,[e] in 1684, to the king of Siam, whose prime minister, at that time, was a

[a] The Indians distinguish all the Europeans by the general denomination of *Franks*, or (as they pronounce the word) *Franghis*.

[b] The Jesuits seem to want words to express the glory that has accrued to their order from the remarkable success and the abundant fruits of this famous mission, as also the dreadful sufferings and hardships which their missionaries sustained in the course of their ministry. See the Lettres Curieuses et Edifiantes, ecrites des Missions Etrangeres, tom. i. where Father Martin observes, that this mission surpasses all others; that each missionary baptises, at least, a thousand converts every year; that, nevertheless, baptism is not indiscriminately administered, or granted with facility and precipitation to every one who demands it; that those who present themselves to be baptized, are accurately examined until they exhibit sufficient proofs of their sincerity, and are carefully instructed during a period of four months in order to their reception; that, after their reception, they live like angels rather than like men; and that the smallest appearance of a mortal sin is scarcely, if ever, to be found among them. If any one is curious enough to inquire into the causes that produced such an uncommon degree of sanctity among these new converts, the Jesuits allege the two following: The first is modestly drawn from the holy lives and examples of the missionaries, who pass their days in the greatest austerity, and in acts of mortification that are terrible to nature; (see tom. xii. p. 206; tom. xv. p. 211;) who are not allowed, for instance, to take bread, wine, fish, or flesh, but are obliged to be satisfied with water and vegetables, dressed in the most insipid and disgusting manner, and whose clothing and other circumstances of life are answerable to their miserable diet. The second cause of this unusual appearance, alleged by the Jesuits, is the situation of these new Christians, by which they are cut off from all communication and intercourse with the Europeans, who are said to have corrupted, by their licentious manners, almost all the other Indian proselytes. Add, to all this, other considerations, which are scattered up and down, in the Letters above cited, tom. i. p. 16, 17; tom. ii. p. 1; tom. iii. p. 217; tom. v. p. 2; tom. vi. p. 119; tom. ix. p. 126. Madura is a separate kingdom situated in the midst of the Indian peninsula beyond the Ganges.* There is an accurate map of the territory comprehended in the mission of Madura, published by the Jesuits in the xvth tome of the Lettres Curieuses, p. 60. The French Jesuits set on foot, in the kingdom of Carnate and in the adjacent provinces, a mission like that of Madura; and, toward the conclusion of this century, other missionaries of the same order formed an enterprise of the same nature in the dominions of the king of Marava. The Jesuits themselves acknowledge that the latter establishment succeeded much better than the former. The reason of this may perhaps be, that the French Jesuits, who founded the mission of Carnate, could not endure, with such constancy and patience, the austere and mortified manner of living which an institution of this nature required, nor imitate the rigid self-denial of the Bramins, so well as the missionaries of Spain and Portugal. Be that as it may, all these missions, which formerly made such a noise in the world, were suspended and abandoned, in consequence of a mandate issued in 1754, by Benedict XIV., who declared his disapprobation of the mean and perfidious methods of converting the Indians that were practised by the Jesuits, and pronounced it unlawful to make use of frauds or insidious artifices in extending the limits of the Christian church. See Norbert's Memoires Historiques pour les Missions Orientales, tom. i. and iv. Mammachius has given an account of this matter, and also published the mandate of Benedict, in his Orig. et Antiq. Christian. tom. ii. p. 245. See also Lockman's Travels of the Jesuits.

[c] See the writings of Alexander de Rhodes, who was undoubtedly a man of sense and spirit, and more especially his Travels, which were published at Paris in 1666.

[d] There were several pamphlets and memorials published at Paris, in the years 1666, 1674, and 1681, in which these French missionaries, whom the Jesuits refused to admit as fellow-labourers in the conversion of the Indians, relate, in an eloquent and affecting strain, the injuries they had received from that jealous and ambitious order. The most ample and accurate narration of that kind was published in 1688 by Francis Pallu, whom the pope had created bishop of Heliopolis. The same subject is largely treated in the Gallia Christiana of the learned Benedictines, tom. vii. p. 1027; and a concise account of it is also given by Urban Cerri, in his Etat present de l'Eglise Romaine, p. 199. The latter author, though a secretary of the Congregation de propaganda fide, yet inveighs with a just severity and a generous warmth against the perfidy, cruelty, and ambition of the Jesuits, and laments it as a most unhappy thing, that the congregation now mentioned, had not sufficient power to set limits to the rapacity and tyranny of that arrogant society. He farther observes, toward the end of his narrative, which is addressed to the pope, that he was not at liberty to reveal all the abominations which the Jesuits had committed, during the course of this contest, but, by the order of his holiness, was obliged to pass them over in silence. His words are, *Votre Sainteté a ordonné qu'elles demeurassent sous le secret.*—See also, on this topic, Helyot's Histoire des Ordres, tom. viii.

[e] The French bishops of Heliopolis, Berytus, and Metellopolis, who had been sent into India about the year 1663, had prepared the way for this embassy, and, by an account of the favourable dispositions of the monarch then reigning at Siam, had encouraged the French king to make a new attempt for the establishment of Christianity in those distant regions. A fixed residence had been formed at Siam for the French missionaries, together with a seminary for instructing the youth in the languages of the circumjacent nations, who had all settlements (or *camps*, as they were called) at the capital. A church was also erected there, by the king's permission, in 1667; and that prince proposed several questions to the missionaries, which seemed to discover a propensity to inform himself concerning their religion. The bishop of Heliopolis, who had gone back to Europe on the affairs of the mission, returned to Siam in 1673, with letters from Louis and pope Clement IX., accompanied with rich presents, to thank his Siamese majesty for the favours bestowed on the French bishops. In a private audience to which he was admitted, he explained, in an answer to a question proposed to him by the king of Siam, the motive that had engaged the French bishops to cross so many seas, and the French king to send his

☞ * This is a mistake. Madura is in the Indian peninsula on this side of the Ganges, and not beyond it. Its chief produce is rice, which is one of the principal instruments used by the rich Jesuits in the conversion of the poor Indians.

Greek Christian, named Constantine Falcon, a man of an artful, ambitious, and enterprising spirit. The design of this embassy was to engage the pagan prince to embrace Christianity, and to permit the propagation of the Gospel in his dominions. The ambassadors were attended by a great retinue of priests and Jesuits, some of whom were well acquainted with such branches of science as were agreeable to the taste of the king of Siam. It was only, however, among a small part of the people, that the labours of these missionaries were crowned with any degree of success; for the monarch himself, and the great men of his kingdom, remained unmoved by their exhortations, and deaf to their instructions.[a] The king, indeed, though he chose to persevere in the religion of his ancestors, yet discovered a spirit of condescension and toleration towards the conductors of this mission; and his favourite Constantine had secretly invited the French to Siam to support him in his authority, which was beheld with an envious eye by several of the grandees. As long as this prince and his minister lived, the French retained some hopes of accomplishing their purpose, and of converting the nation to the faith; but these hopes entirely vanished in 1688, when, in a popular sedition, excited and fomented by some prince of the blood, both the king and his minister were put to death;[b] and then the missionaries returned home.

IX. China, the most extensive and opulent of all the Asiatic kingdoms, could not but appear, to the missionaries and their constituents, an object worthy of their pious zeal and spiritual ambition. And accordingly a numerous tribe of Jesuits, Dominicans, Franciscans, and Capuchins, set out about the commencement of this century, with a view to enlighten that immense region with the knowledge of the Gospel. All these, however they differed in other matters, agreed in proclaiming the astonishing success of their ministerial labours. It is nevertheless certain, that the principal honour of these religious exploits belonged to the Jesuits, who, with peculiar dexterity and address, removed the chief obstacles to the progress of Christianity, among a people whose natural acuteness and pride were accompanied with a superstitious attachment to the religion and manners of their ancestors. These artful missionaries studied the temper, character, taste, inclinations, and prejudices of the Chinese, with incredible attention; and perceiving that their natural sagacity was attended with an ardent desire of improvement, and that they took the highest pleasure in the study of the arts and sciences, and more especially in the mathematics, they lost no occasion of sending for such members of their order as, beside their knowledge of mankind, and prudence in transacting business, were also masters of the different branches of learning and philosophy. Some of these learned Jesuits acquired such a high degree of credit and influence by their sagacity and eloquence, the insinuating sweetness and facility of their manners, and their surprising dexterity and skill in all kinds of transactions, that they were at length gratified by the emperor with the most honourable marks of distinction, and were employed in the most secret and important deliberations and affairs of the cabinet. Under the auspicious protection of such powerful patrons, the other missionaries, though of a lower rank and of inferior talents, were delivered from all apprehension of danger in the exercise of their ministry, and were thus encouraged to exert themselves with spirit, vigour, and perseverance, in the propagation of the Gospel, in all the provinces of that mighty empire.

X. This promising scene was clouded for some time, when Xun-chi, the first Chinese emperor of the Mogol race, died, and left, as his only heir, a son, who was a minor. The grandees of the empire, to whose tuition and care this young prince was committed, had long entertained an aversion to Christianity, and only sought for a convenient occasion of venting their rage against it. This occasion was now offered and greedily embraced. The guardians of the young prince abused his power to execute their vindictive purposes, and, after using their utmost efforts to extirpate Christianity wherever it was professed, they persecuted its patrons, more especially the Jesuits, with great bitterness, deprived them of all the honours and advantages they had enjoyed, and treated them with the utmost barbarity and injustice. John Adam Schaal, their chief, whose advanced age and extensive knowledge, together with the honourable place which he held at court, seemed to demand some marks of exemp-

subjects to countries so far from home; observing, that a strong desire, in his prince, to extend the kingdom of the true God, was the sole reason of their voyage. Upon this we are told, that the king of Siam offered a port in any part of his dominions, where a city might be built to the honour of Louis the Great, and where, if he thought fit, he might send a viceroy to reside; and declared afterwards, in a public assembly of the grandees of his court, that he would leave all his subjects at liberty to embrace the Romish faith. All this raised the hopes of the missionaries to a very high pitch; but the expectations which they thence derived of converting the king himself were entirely groundless, as may be seen from a very remarkable declaration of that monarch in the following note. See the Relation des Missions et des Voyages des Eveques François.

☞ [a] When Monsieur de Chaumont, who was charged with this famous embassy, arrived at Siam, he presented a long memorial to the monarch of that country, intimating how solicitous the king of France was to have his Siamese majesty of the same religion with himself. Chaw Naraya, (for so was the latter named,) who seems to have always deceived the French by encouraging words, which administered hopes that he never intended to accomplish, answered this memorial in a very acute and artful manner. After asking who had made the king of France believe that he entertained any such sentiments, he desired his minister Falcon to tell the French ambassador, "That he left it to his most Christian majesty to judge, whether the change of a religion that had been followed in his dominions without interruption for 2229 years could be a matter of small importance to him, or a demand with which it was easy to comply;—that, besides, he was much surprised to find the king of France concern himself so zealously and so warmly in a matter which related to *God* and not to *him*; and in which, though it related to God, the Deity did not seem to interfere at all, but left it entirely to human discretion." The king asked, at the same time, "Whether the true God, who created heaven and earth, and had bestowed on mankind such different natures and inclinations, could not, when he gave to men the same bodies and souls, have also, if he had pleased, inspired them with the same religious sentiments, and have made all nations live and die in the same laws." He added, that, "since order among men, and unity in religion, depend absolutely on the divine will, which could as easily introduce them into the world as a diversity of sects, it is natural thence to conclude, that the true God takes as much pleasure to be honoured by different modes of religion and worship, as to be glorified by a prodigious number of different creatures, who praise him every one in his own way." He moreover asked, "Whether that beauty and variety, which we admire in the order of nature, be less admirable in the order of supernatural things, or less becoming in the wisdom of God?—However that may be, (continued the king of Siam,) since we know that God is the absolute master of the world, and we are persuaded that nothing comes to pass contrary to his will, I resign my person and dominions into the arms of his providence, and beseech his eternal wisdom to dispose thereof according to his good will and pleasure." See Tachard's Prem. Voyage de Siam, p. 218; as also the Journal of the Abbé Choisi.

[b] An account of this embassy, and of the transactions both of ambassadors and missionaries, is given by Tachard, Chaumont, and La Loubere. The relations, however, of the author last-mentioned, who was a man of learning and candour, deserve undoubtedly the preference.

tion from the calamities that pursued his brethren, was thrown into prison, and condemned to death, while the other missionaries were sent into exile. These dismal scenes of persecution were exhibited in 1664; but, about five years after this gloomy period, when Kang-hi assumed the reins of government, a new face of things appeared. The Christian cause, and the labours of its ministers, not only resumed their former credit and vigour, but even gained ground, and received such distinguished marks of protection from the throne, that the Jesuits usually date from this period the commencement of the golden age of Christianity in China. The new emperor, whose noble and generous spirit[a] was equal to the uncommon extent of his genius, and to his ardent curiosity in the investigation of truth, began his reign by recalling the Jesuits to his court, and restoring them to the credit and influence which they had formerly enjoyed. But his generosity and munificence did not stop here; for he sent to Europe for a still greater number of the members of that order, such of them particularly as were eminent for their skill in the arts and sciences. Some of these he placed in the highest offices of the state, and employed in civil negotiations and transactions of the greatest importance. Others he chose for his private friends and counsellors, who were to assist him with their advice in various points, and to direct his philosophical and mathematical studies. These private friends and counsellors were principally chosen from among the French Jesuits. Thus the order was raised, in a short time, to the very summit of favour, and invested with a degree of authority and lustre which it had not before attained. In such a state of things, it is natural to conclude, that the Christian religion would not want powerful patrons, and that its preachers would not be left destitute and unsupported. Accordingly a multitude of spiritual labourers from all parts of Europe repaired to China, allured by the prospect of a rich, abundant, and glorious harvest; and, indeed, the success of their ministry seemed to answer fully the extent of their expectations, since it is well known that, with very little pains, and still less opposition, they made a prodigious number of converts to the profession of the Gospel. At length Christianity seemed to triumph in 1692, when the emperor, from an excessive attachment to the Jesuits, issued that remarkable edict, by which he declared, that the Christian religion was in no wise detrimental to the safety or interests of the monarchy, as its enemies pretended; and by which also he granted to all his subjects an entire freedom of conscience, and a full permission to embrace the Gospel. This triumph was farther confirmed, when the same prince, in 1700, ordered a magnificent church to be built for the Jesuits within the precincts of the imperial palace.[b]

XI. This surprising success of the Christian cause may undoubtedly be attributed to the dexterity and perseverance of the Jesuits, as even the greatest enemies of that artful order are obliged to acknowledge. But it is quite another question, whether this success was obtained by methods agreeable to the dictates of reason and conscience, and consistent with the dignity and genius of the Christian religion. The latter point has been long debated, with great animosity and vehemence, on both sides. The adversaries of the Jesuits, whose opposition is as keen as their numbers are formidable, and more especially the Jansenites and Dominicans, assert boldly, that the success above-mentioned was obtained by the most odious frauds, and even, in many cases, by detestable crimes. They charge the Jesuits with having given a false exposition and a spurious account of the ancient religion of the Chinese, and with having endeavoured to persuade the emperor and the nobility, that the primitive theology of their nation, and the doctrine of their great instructor and philosopher Confucius, scarcely differed in any respect from the doctrine of the Gospel. The missionaries are farther charged with having invented a variety of historical fictions, in order to persuade the Chinese, (who are warmly attached to whatever carries the air of remote antiquity,) that Jesus Christ had been known and worshipped in their nation many ages ago; and these fictions are supposed to have prejudiced the emperor in favour of Christianity, and to have engaged certain grandees not only to grant their protection to the Jesuits, but even to become members of their society. The disciples of Loyola are also said to have lost sight of all the duties and obligations that are incumbent on the ministers of Christ, and the heralds of a spiritual kingdom, by not only accepting worldly honours and places of civil authority and power, but even aspiring to them with all the ardour of an insatiable ambition, by boasting, with an arrogant vanity, of the protection and munificence of the emperor, by deserting the simplicity of a frugal and humble appearance, and indulging themselves in all the circumstances of external pomp and splendour, such as costly garments, numerous retinues, luxurious tables, and magnificent houses. To all this is added, that they employed much more zeal and industry in the advancement of human science, especially the mathematics, than in promoting Christian knowledge and virtue; and that they even went so far as to interfere in military matters, and to concern themselves, both personally and by their counsels, in the bloody scenes of war. While these heavy crimes are laid to the charge of those Jesuits, who, by their capacity and talents, had been raised to a high degree of credit in the empire, the more obscure members of that same order, who were appointed more immediately to instruct the Chinese in the truths of the Gospel, are far from being considered as blameless. They are accused of having employed, in the practice of usury, and various kinds of traffic, the precious moments which ought to have been consecrated to the functions of their ministry, and of having used low and dishonourable methods of advancing their fortunes, and insinuating themselves into the favour of the multitude. The Jesuits acknowledge,

[a] See Joach. Bouveti Icon Monarchæ Sinarum, translated into Latin by the famous Leibnitz, and published in 1699, in the second part of his Novissima Sinica. See also Du Halde's Description de la Chine, and the Lettres Edifiantes, in which the Jesuits give an account of the success of their missions. In these productions, the virtues and talents of this emperor, which seem indeed to be universally acknowledged, are described and celebrated with peculiar encomiums.

[b] There is a concise but interesting account of these revolutions, given by Du Halde, in his Description de la Chine, tom. iii., and by the Jesuit Fontaney, in the Lettres Edifiantes et Curieuses, tom. viii.—They are related in a more diffuse and ample manner by other writers. See Suarez, de Libertate Religionem Christianam apud Sinas propagandi Narratio, published in 1698 by Leibnitz, in the first part of his Novissima Sinica. The other authors who have treated this branch of history are mentioned by Fabricius, in his Lux Evangelii, cap. xxxix. See also an Eccles. His. of China, which I published in German in 1748. ☞ This history was translated into English, and published in 1750 with this title: Authentic Memoirs of the Christian Church in China.

that some of these accusations are founded upon facts; but they give a specious colour to these facts, and use all their artifice and eloquence to justify what they cannot deny. Other articles of these complaints they treat as groundless, and as the fictions of calumny, invented with no other design than to cast a reproach upon their order. An impartial inquirer into these matters will perhaps find, that if, in several points, the Jesuits defend themselves in a very weak and unsatisfactory manner, there are others, in which their misconduct seems to have been exaggerated by envy and prejudice in the complaints of their adversaries.

XII. The grand accusation that is brought against the Jesuits in China, is this: That they make an impious mixture of light and darkness, of Chinese superstition and Christian truth, in order to triumph with the greater speed and facility over the prejudices of that people against the doctrine of the Gospel; and that they allow their converts to retain the profane customs and the absurd rites of their pagan ancestors. Ricci, who was the founder of the Christian Church in that famous monarchy, declared it as his opinion, that the greatest part of those rites, which the Chinese are obliged by the laws of their country to perform, might be innocently observed by the new converts. To render this opinion less shocking, he supported and explained it upon the following principle: that these rites were of a civil and not of a sacred nature; that they were invented from views of policy; and not for any purposes of religion; and that none but the very dregs of the populace in China, considered them in any other light.[a] This opinion was not only rejected by the Dominicans and Franciscans, who were associated with the Jesuits in this important mission, but also by some even of the most learned Jesuits both in China and Japan, and particularly by Nicolas Lombard, who published a memorial, containing the reasons[b] upon which his dissent was founded. This contest, which was long carried on in a private manner, was brought, by the Dominicans, before the tribunal of the pontiff, in the year 1645; and from that period it continued to produce great divisions, cabals, and commotions, in the church of Rome. Innocent X., in the year now mentioned, pronounced in favour of the Dominicans, and highly condemned the indulgence which the Jesuits had shown to the Chinese superstitions. But, about eleven years after, this sentence, though not formally reversed, was virtually annulled by Alexander VII., at the instigation of the Jesuits, who persuaded that pontiff to allow the Chinese converts the liberty of performing several of the rites to which they had been accustomed, and for which they discovered a peculiar fondness. This, however, did not prevent the Dominicans from renewing their complaints in 1661, and also in 1674, under the pontificate of Innocent XI., though the power and credit of the Jesuits seemed to triumph over all their remonstrances. This fatal dispute, which had been suspended for many years in China, broke out there again, in 1684, with greater violence than ever; and then the victory seemed to incline to the side of the Dominicans, in consequence of a decision pronounced, in 1693, by Charles Maigrot, a doctor of the Sorbonne, who acted as the delegate or vicar of the Roman pontiff, in the province of Fokien, and who was afterwards consecrated titular bishop of Conon. This ecclesiastic, by a public edict, declared the opinions and practices of the Jesuits, in relation to the affairs of the Chinese mission, absolutely inconsistent with the purity and simplicity of the Christian religion. But the pope, to whose supreme cognisance and decision Maigrot had submitted this important edict, refused to come to a determination before the matter in debate had been carefully examined, and the reasons of each party weighed with the utmost attention; and therefore, in 1699, he appointed a congregation of chosen doctors to examine and decide this tedious controversy. This resolution of the pontiff was no sooner made public, than all the enemies of the Jesuits, in all quarters of the church of Rome, and more especially those who wished ill to the order in France, came forth with their complaints, their accusations, and invectives, and loaded the transactions and reputation of the whole society with the most bitter reproaches.[c] The Jesuits, on the other hand, were not silent or inactive. They attacked their adversaries with vigour, and defended themselves with dexterity and spirit.[d] —But the conclusion of this critical and momentous contest belongs to the history of the following century.

XIII. If, in considering this controversy, which employed the ablest pens of the Romish church, we confine our attention to the merits of the cause, (passing over what personally concerns the Jesuits, with some other questions of a minute and incidental kind,) it will appear, that the whole dispute turns essentially upon two great points; the one relating to the Chinese notion of the Supreme Being; and the other to the nature of those honours which that people offer to certain persons deceased.

As to the former of these points, it is to be observed, that the Chinese call the supreme object of their religious worship Tien and Shang-ti, which, in their language, signify the *Heavens*, and that the Jesuits employ the same terms when they speak of the true God, who is adored by the Christians. Hence it is inferred, that they make no distinction between the supreme God of the Chinese, and the infinitely perfect Deity of the Christians; or (to express the same thing in other words) that they imagine the Chinese entertain the same notions concerning the Tien, or Heaven, that the Christians do concerning the God whom they adore. The question then relative to this point is properly as follows: "Do the Chinese understand, by the denominations above-mentioned, the visible and material heavens? or are these terms, on the contrary, employed

[a] See Mammachii Origines et Antiquitates Christianâ, tom. ii. p. 373.

[b] See Chr. Kortholti Præfatio ad Volumen II. Epistolar. Leibnitiar. sect. vi. To this work are subjoined the pieces composed against the Jesuits by Lombard and Antony de S. Maria, with the remarks of Leibnitz; and there is also inserted in this collection, p. 413, an ample dissertation on the Chinese philosophy, drawn up by Leibnitz, who pleads therein the cause of the Jesuits.

☞ [c] See the Lettres des Messieurs des Missions Etrangeres au Pape, sur les Idolatries et les Superstitions Chinoises—Revocation de l'Approbation donnée par M. Brisacier, Superieur des Missions Etrangeres, au Livre de la Defense des nouveaux Chretiens et des Missionaires de la Chine.—Deux Lettres d'un Docteur de l'Ordre de St. Dominique au R. P. Dez, Provincial des Jesuites, sur les Ceremonies de la Chine.

[d] Du Halde, Description de la Chine, tom. iii. p. 142.—See the enumeration of other writers on the same subject, given by Fabricius, in his Lux Evangelii, cap. xxxix. p. 665.—See also Voltaire's Siecle de Louis XIV. tom. ii. p. 318.—But the most ingenious patron of the Jesuits, on this occasion, was Father Daniel, himself a member of that famous order. See his Histoire Apologetique de la Conduite des Jesuites de la Chine, in the third volume of his Opuscules.

by them to represent the Lord of these heavens, i. e. an eternal and all perfect Being, who presides over universal nature, and, from heaven, the immediate residence of his glory, governs all things with unerring wisdom?" or, to express the object in fewer words, "Do the Chinese mean, by their Tien, such a Deity as the Christians adore?" This question the Jesuits answer in the affirmative. They maintain, that the ancient Chinese philosophers, who had an accurate knowledge of the great principles of natural religion, represented the Supreme Being almost under the very same characters that are attributed to him by Christians; and hence they not only allow their Chinese disciples to employ the terms already mentioned in their prayers to the Deity, and in their religious discourses, but even use these terms themselves, when they pronounce the name of God in their public instructions, or in private conversation. The adversaries of the Jesuits maintain the negative of this question, regard the ancient philosophy of the Chinese as an impure source of blasphemy and impiety, and affirm, that it confounded the Divine Nature with that of the universe. They assert farther, that the famous Confucius, whose name and writings are held in such veneration by the people of China, was totally ignorant of divine truth, destitute of religious principle, and referred the origin of all things that exist to an internal and inevitable necessity. This contest, concerning the first point that divided the missionaries, produced a multitude of learned dissertations on the manners, laws, and opinions of the ancient inhabitants of China, and gave rise to several curious discoveries. But all these were insufficient to serve the chief purpose they were designed to accomplish, since they were far from giving a clear and satisfactory decision of the matter in debate. It still remained a question, which were most to be believed,—the Jesuits or their adversaries? and the impartial inquirer, after long examination, thought it prudent to trust entirely to neither; since, if it appeared on the one hand, that the Tien, or supreme God of the Chinese, was much inferior, in perfection and excellence, to the God of the Christians, it was equally evident, on the other, that this Chinese Deity was looked upon by his adorers as entirely distinct from the material æther and the visible heavens.

XIV. As to the other point in dispute, it must be previously observed, that the ancient laws of China oblige the natives of that vast region to perform, annually, at a stated time, in honour of their ancestors, certain rites, which seem to be of a religious nature. It may also be observed, that it is a custom among the learned to pay, at stated times, to the memory of Confucius, whom the Chinese consider as the oracle of all wisdom and knowledge, certain marks of veneration that have undoubtedly a religious aspect, and which are, moreover, performed in a kind of temple erected to that great and illustrious philosopher. Hence arises a second question, which is thus proposed: "Are those honours that the Chinese, in general, pay to the memory of their ancestors, and which the learned, in particular, offer at the shrine of Confucius, of a *civil* or *sacred* nature? Are they to be considered as religious offerings, or are they no more than political institutions designed to promote some public good?" The Jesuits affirm, that the ancient Chinese law givers established these rites with no other view than to keep the people in order, and to maintain the tranquillity of the state; and that the Chinese did not pay any religious worship, either to the memory of Confucius, or to the departed souls of their ancestors, but only declared, by the performance of certain rites, their gratitude and respect to both, and their solemn resolution to imitate their virtues, and follow their illustrious examples. Hence these missionaries conclude, that the Chinese converts to Christianity might be permitted to perform these ceremonies according to the ancient custom of their country, provided they understood their true nature, and kept always in remembrance, the political views with which they were instituted, and the civil purposes they were designed to serve. By this specious account of things, the conduct of the Jesuits is, in some measure, justified. But, whether this representation be true or false, it will still remain evident, that, in order to render the Christian cause triumphant in China, some such concessions and accommodations as those of the Jesuits seem almost absolutely necessary; and they who desire the *end* must submit to the use of the *means*.[a] The necessity of concession arises from this remarkable circumstance, that, by a solemn law of ancient date, it is positively declared, that no man shall be esteemed a good citizen, or be looked upon as qualified to hold any public office in the state, who neglects the observance of the ceremonies now under consideration. On the other hand, the Dominicans, and the other adversaries of the Jesuits, maintain, that the rites in question form an important branch of the Chinese religion; that the honours paid by the Chinese to Confucius and to the souls of their ancestors, are not of a civil, but of a religious nature;[b] and consequently, that all who perform these rites are charge-

☞ [a] True; if the *means* be not either criminal in themselves, pernicious in their consequences, or of such a nature as to defeat, in a great measure, the benefits and advantages proposed by the *end*. And it is a very nice and momentous question, whether the concessions pleaded for in behalf of the Chinese converts, by the Jesuits, are not to be ranked among the means here characterized. See the following note.

[b] ☞ The public honours paid to Confucius twice a year, used to be performed before his statue, erected in the great hall or temple that is dedicated to his memory. At present they are performed before a kind of table, placed in the most conspicuous part of the edifice, with the following inscription: "The Throne of the Soul of the most holy and the most excellent chief Teacher Confucius." The literati, or learned, celebrate this famous festival in the following manner:—The chief mandarin of the place exercises the office of priest, and the others discharge the functions of deacons, sub-deacons, &c. A certain sacrifice, which consists of wine, blood, fruits, &c. is offered, after the worshippers have prepared themselves for this ceremony by fasting and other acts of abstinence and mortification. They kneel before the inscription, prostrate the body nine times before it, until the head touches the ground, and repeat many prayers; after which the priest, taking in one hand a cup full of wine, and in the other a like cup filled with blood, makes a solemn libation to the deceased, and dismisses the assembly with a blessing. The rites performed by families, in honour of their deceased parents, are nearly of the same nature.

Now, in order to know, with certainty, whether this festival and these rites be of a civil or religious nature, we have only to inquire whether they be the same with those ceremonies that are performed by the Chinese, in the worship they pay to certain celestial and terrestrial spirits, or *genii*, which worship is undoubtedly of a religious kind. The learned Leibnitz* undertook to affirm, that the services now mentioned were not of the same kind, and, consequently, that the Jesuits were accused unjustly. But that great man does not appear to have examined this matter with his usual sagacity and attention; for it is evident, from a multitude of relations every way worthy of credit, and particularly from the observations made on the Chinese missions by that learned and candid Franciscan, Antonio de S. Maria,† not only that Confucius was worshipped among the *idols*, and the celestial and terrestrial spirits of the Chinese, but that the oblations and ceremonies observed in honour of him, were perfectly the same with those that were performed as acts of worship to these idols and spirits. Those who

* See Præf. Novissim. Sinicorum.

† See vol. ii. Epist. Leibnitz.

able with insulting the majesty of God, to whom alone all divine worship is due, and cannot be considered as true Christians. This account of the affair is so specious and probable, and the consequences deducible from it are so natural and just, that the more equitable and impartial among the Jesuits have acknowledged the difficulties that attend the cause they maintain; and taking, at length, refuge in the plea of necessity, allege, that certain evils and inconveniences may be lawfully submitted to when they are requisite in order to the attainment of extensive, important, and salutary purposes.

XV. The ministerial labours of the Romish missionaries, and more especially of the Jesuits, were crowned in Japan with surprising success, about the commencement of this century, and made an incredible number of converts to the Christian religion.[a] But this prosperous and flourishing state of the church was somewhat interrupted by the prejudices that the priests and grandees of the kingdom had conceived against the new religion, prejudices which proved fatal in many places, both to those who embraced it, and to those who taught it. The cause of Christianity did not, however, suffer only from the virulence and malignity of its enemies; it was wounded in the house of its friends, and received some detriment from the intestine quarrels and contentions of those to whom the care of the rising church was committed. For the same scenes of fraternal discord, that had given such offence in the other heathen countries, were renewed in Japan, where the Dominicans, Franciscans, and Augustinians, were at perpetual variance with the Jesuits. This variance produced, on both sides, the heaviest accusations, and the most bitter reproaches. The Jesuits were charged, by the missionaries of the three orders now mentioned, with insatiable avarice, with showing an excessive indulgence, both to the vices and superstitions of the Japanese, with crafty and low practices unworthy of the ministers of Christ, with an ambitious thirst after authority and dominion, and other misdemeanors of a like nature. These accusations were not only exhibited at the court of Rome, but were spread abroad in every part of Christendom. The disciples of Loyola were by no means silent under these reproaches; but, in their turn, charged their accusers with imprudence, ignorance of the world, obstinacy, asperity of manners, and a disgusting rusticity in their way of living; adding, that these circumstances rendered their ministry rather detrimental than advantageous to the cause of Christianity, among a people remarkable for their penetration, generosity, and magnificence. Such then were the contests that arose among the missionaries in Japan; and nothing but the amazing progress that Christianity had already made, and the immense multitude of those who had embraced it, could have prevented these contests from being fatal to its interests. As the case stood, neither the cause of the Gospel, nor its numerous professors, received any essential damage from these divisions; and, if no other circumstance had intervened to stop its progress, an expedient might have probably been found out, either to heal these divisions, or at least to appease them so far as to prevent them from being attended with mischievous and calamitous consequences.[b]

XVI. But a new and dreadful scene of opposition arose, in 1615, to blast the hopes of those who wished well to the cause of Christianity in Japan; for, in that year, the emperor issued, against the professors and ministers of that divine religion, a persecuting edict, which was executed with a degree of barbarity unparalleled in the annals of the Christian history. This cruel persecution raged for many years with unrelenting fury, and only ended with the extinction of Christianity throughout that mighty empire. That religion, which had been suffered to make such a rapid and triumphant progress in Japan, was at length considered as detrimental to the interests of the monarchy, inconsistent with the good of the people, and derogatory from the majesty of their high priest, whom they revered as a person descended from the gods; and, on these accounts, it was judged unworthy not only of protection, but even of toleration. This judgment was followed by the fatal order, by which all foreigners that were Christians, and more especially the Spaniards and Portuguese, were commanded to quit the kingdom; and the natives, who had embraced the Gospel, were required to renounce the name and doctrine of Christ, on pain of death presented to them in the most dreadful forms. This tremendous order was the signal for the perpetration of such horrors as the most sanguine and atrocious imagination will scarcely be able to conceive. Innumerable multitudes of the Japanese Christians of each sex, and of all ages, ranks, and stations, expired with magnanimous constancy, amidst the most dreadful torments, rather than apostatize

desire a more ample account of this matter may consult the following authors: Budæi Annal. Histor. Philos. p. 287, where he treats *de superstitioso Demortuorum apud Sinenses Cultu.*—Wolfii Not. ad Casaubon. p. 342.—Nic. Charmos, Annot. ad Maigrotti Historiam Cultus Sinensis; and more especially Arnaud, Morale Pratique des Jesuites, tom. iii. vi. vii.; and a collection of historical relations, published in 1700, under the following title: Historia Cultus Sinensium, seu varia Scripta de Cultibus Sinarum inter Vicarios Apostolicos et P. P. S. I. controversis.

☞ [a] Two peculiar circumstances contributed to facilitate the progress of the Romish religion in Japan. The first was the uncharitable severity and cruelty of the Japanese *bonzas* or priests toward the sick and indigent, compared with the humanity, zeal, and beneficence of the missionaries. These *bonzas* represented the poor and infirm not as objects of pity but as wretches loaded with the displeasure of the gods, and abandoned to present and future misery by the judgments of Heaven; and inspired the rich with a contempt and abhorrence of them. The Christian religion, therefore, which declares that poverty and afflictions are often surer marks of the divine favour than grandeur and prosperity, and that the transitory evils which the righteous endure here, shall be crowned with everlasting glory and felicity hereafter, was every way proper to comfort this unhappy class of persons, and could not but meet with a most favourable reception among them. Add to this, that the missionaries were constantly employed in providing them with food, medicine, and habitations. A second circumstance that was advantageous to Christianity (that is, to such a form of Christianity as the popish missionaries preached in Japan,) was a certain resemblance or analogy between it and some practices and sentiments which prevailed among the Japanese. The latter look for present and future felicity only through the merits of Xaca Amida, and other of their deities, who, after a long course of severe mortifications freely undertaken, had voluntarily, also, put an end to their lives. They sainted many melancholy persons who had been guilty of suicide, celebrated their memories, and implored their intercession and good offices. They used processions, statues, candles, and perfumes in their worship; as also prayers for the dead, and auricular confession; and had monasteries founded for devout persons of both sexes, who lived in celibacy, solitude, and abstinence; so that the Japanese religion was not an inapplicable preparation for popery. Beside these two circumstances, another may be mentioned, which we take from the letters of the Jesuits themselves, who inform us, that the princes of the maritime parts of Japan were so fond of this new commerce with the Portuguese, that they strove who should oblige them most, and encouraged the missionaries, less perhaps from a principle of zeal, than from views of interest. See Varenius' Descrip. Japon. lib. iii. cap. vi. x. and the Modern Univ. History.

[b] See the writers on this subject enumerated by Fabricius, in his Lux Evangelii, p. 678, as also Charlevoix, Histoire Generale de Japon, tom. ii. liv. xi.

from the faith they had embraced. And here it may not be amiss to observe, that both the Jesuits and their adversaries in the missions expiated, in some measure, if I may so express myself, by the agonies they endured, and the fortitude with which they suffered, the faults they had committed in the exercise of their ministry. For it is well known, that the greatest part of them died magnanimously for the cause of Christ by the hands of the executioner, and that some of them even expired with triumphant feelings of satisfaction and joy.

Historians are not entirely agreed with respect to the real causes of this merciless persecution. The Jesuits consider it as having been occasioned, in part, by the imprudence of the Dominicans and Franciscans; while the latter impute it, in a great measure, to the covetous, arrogant, and factious spirit of the Jesuits.[a] Both parties accuse the English and Dutch of having excited in the emperor of Japan a strong prejudice against the Spaniards, Portuguese, and the Roman pontiff, to the end that they alone might engross the commerce of that vast monarchy, and be unrivalled in their credit among that powerful people. The English and Dutch allege, on the other hand, that they never attempted to undermine, by any false accusations, the credit of the Roman Catholics in that kingdom, but only detected the perfidious plots the Spaniards had laid against it. Almost all the historians, who have given accounts of this country, concur in affirming, that certain letters, intercepted by the Dutch, and other circumstances of a very striking and alarming kind, had persuaded the emperor, that the Jesuits, as also the other missionaries, had formed seditious designs against his government, and aimed at nothing less than exciting their numerous disciples to rebellion, with a view to reduce the kingdom of Japan under the dominion of Spain.[b] A discovery of this nature could not but make the most dreadful impressions upon a prince naturally suspicious and cruel, such as the emperor then reigning was; and, indeed, as soon as he had received this information, he concluded, with equal precipitation and violence, that he could not sit secure on his throne, while the smallest spark of Christianity remained unextinguished in his dominions, or any of its professors breathed under his government. It is from this remarkable period, that we must date the severe edict by which all Europeans are forbidden to approach the Japanese dominions, and in consequence of which all the terrors of fire and sword are employed to destroy whatever carries the remotest aspect or shadow of the Christian doctrine. The only exception from this general law is made in favour of some Dutch merchants, who are allowed to import annually a certain quantity of European commodities, and have a factory, or rather a kind of prison, allowed them, in one of the extremities of the kingdom, where they are strictly watched, and rigourously precluded from all communication with the natives, but what is essentially necessary to the commerce they are permitted to carry on.

XVII. The example of the Roman Catholic states could not but excite a spirit of pious emulation in Protestant countries, and induce them to propagate a still purer form of Christianity among those unhappy nations that lay grovelling in the darkness of Paganism and idolatry Accordingly the Lutherans were, on several occasions, solicited by persons of eminent merit and rank in their communion, to embark in this pious and generous undertaking. Justinian Ernest, baron of Wells, distinguished himself by his zealous appearance in this good cause, having formed the plan of a society that was to be intrusted with the propagation of the Gospel in foreign parts, and to bear the name of Jesus, the divine founder of that religion which its members were anxious to promote.[c] But several circumstances concurred to prevent the execution of this pious design, among which we may reckon, principally, the peculiar situation of the Lutheran princes, of whom very few had any territories, forts, or settlements, beyond the limits of Europe.

This was by no means the case with the princes and states who professed the reformed religion. The English and Dutch, more especially, whose ships covered the ocean, and sailed to the most distant corners of the globe, and who, moreover, in this century, had sent colonies to Asia, Africa, and America, had abundant opportunities of spreading abroad the knowledge of Christianity among the unenlightened nations. Nor were these opportunities entirely neglected, notwithstanding the reports that have generally prevailed, of their being much more zealous in engrossing the riches of the Indians than in effecting their conversion, though it may, perhaps, be granted, that neither of these nations exerted themselves, to the extent of their power, in this salutary undertaking. In 1647, the propagation of the Gospel in foreign parts was committed, by an act of the English parliament, to the care and inspection of a society composed of persons of eminent rank and merit. The civil wars that ensued suspended the execution of the plans that were laid for carrying on this salutary work. In 1661, under the sway of Charles II., the work was resumed, and the society re-established. In 1701, this respectable society received singular marks of protection and favour from king William III. who enriched it with new donations and privileges.[d] Since that period, even to the present time, it has been distinguished by ample marks of the munificence of the kings of England, and of the liberality of persons of all ranks and orders, and has been, and continues to be, eminently useful in facilitating the means of instruction to the nations immersed in pagan darkness, and more especially to the Americans. Nor are the laudable efforts of the United Provinces, in the advancement and propagation of Christian knowledge, to be passed over in silence, since they

[a] There is a concise and sensible account of this tedious dispute in the sixth discourse that is subjoined to the English edition of Kæmpfer's History of Japan, sect. iv. But it will also be proper to see what is said on the other side, by an author, who, in his long and circumstantial narration, has not omitted any incident, however minute, that tends, in the least, to exculpate the Jesuits, or to procure them indulgence; that author is Charlevoix; see his Histoire Generale de Japon, tom. ii. liv. xii. The other historians that may be consulted with utility on this subject, are enumerated by Fabricius, in his Lux Evangelii, cap. x. p. 678. Add to these the Acta Sanctorum, tom. i. Mens. Februar. p. 723, where we find not only a history of the commencement and progress of Christianity in Japan, but also an account of the lives and martyrdom of those who first suffered for the cause of the Gospel in that kingdom. See likewise Mammachii Origines et Antiquitat. Christian. tom. ii. p. 376.

[b] The discoveries made by the Dutch were against the Portuguese, with whom they were then at war; so that, instead of Spain, our author should have said Portugal. See Kæmpfer's Japan, and the the Modern Universal History.

[c] See Molleri Cimbria Literata, tom. iii. as also a German work of the learned Arnold, entitled, Kirchen und Ketzer Historie, part ii. book xvii. c. xv. sect. 23. part iii. cap. xv. sect. 18.

[d] See Humphrey's Account of the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts.

also are said to have converted to the Gospel a prodigious number of Indians, in the islands of Ceylon and Formosa, on the coast of Malabar, and in other Asiatic settlements, which they either had acquired by their own industry, or obtained by conquest from the Portuguese.[a] Some historians, perhaps, may have exaggerated, in their relations, the number of proselytes made by the Dutch; it is nevertheless most certain, that, as soon as that nation had gained a firm footing in the East Indies, they planned with wisdom, and executed, at a great expense, various schemes for instructing the natives of those distant regions in the doctrines of the Gospel.[b]

XVIII. The inward parts of Africa remain still in the darkness of Paganism, as they have been hitherto inaccessible to the most adventurous of the Europeans. But in the maritime provinces of that great peninsula, and more especially in those where the Portuguese have their settlements, there are several districts in which the religion of Rome has prevailed over the savage superstitions of that barbarous region. It is nevertheless acknowledged, by the more ingenuous historians, even among the Roman Catholics, who have given accounts of the African colonies, that, of the proselytes made there to the Gospel, a very small number deserve the denomination of Christians, since the greatest part of them retain the abominable superstitions of their ancestors, and the very best among them dishonour their profession by various practices of a most vicious and corrupt nature. Any progress that Christianity made in these parts must be chiefly attributed to the zealous labours of the Capuchin missionaries, who, in this century suffered the most dreadful hardships and discouragements in their attempts to bring the fierce and savage Africans under the Christian yoke. These attempts succeeded so far, as to gain over to the profession of the Gospel the kings of Benin and Awerri,[c] and also to engage the cruel and intrepid Anna Zingha, queen of Metamba, and all her subjects, to embrace, in 1652, the Christian faith.[d] The African missions were allotted to this austere order by the court of Rome, and by the society *de propaganda fide*, for wise reasons, since none could be so fitted for an enterprise attended with dreadful hardships, difficulties, and perils, as a set of men whose monastic institute had familiarized them to the severest acts of mortification, abstinence, and penance, and thus prepared them for the bitterest scenes of trial and adversity. Although the Capuchins seem to have been alone honoured with this sacred, but arduous commission, it does not appear that the other orders beheld, with the smallest sentiment of envy, their dear-bought glory.

XIX. The extensive continent of America swarms with colonies from Spain, Portugal, and France,[e] all which profess the Christian religion as it has been disfigured by the church of Rome. But it is abundantly known, that these colonists, more especially the Spaniards and Portuguese, are the most worthless and profligate set of men that bear the Christian name; and this fact is confirmed by the testimonies of Roman catholic writers of great merit and authority, who cannot be suspected of partiality in this matter. Even the clergy are not excepted from this general condemnation; but, as we learn from the same credible testimonies, surpass even the idolatrous natives in the ridiculous rites which they perform in the worship of God, as well as in the licentiousness of their manners, and the enormity of the crimes they commit without reluctance. Those of the ancient inhabitants of America, who either have submitted to the European yoke, or live near the colonies, have imbibed some faint knowledge of the Romish religion, from the Jesuits, Franciscans, and other ecclesiastics; but these feeble rays of instruction are totally clouded by the gloomy suggestions of their native superstition, and the corrupt influence of their barbarous customs and manners. As to those Indians who live more remote from the European settlements, and wander about in the woods without any fixed habitation, they are absolutely incapable either of receiving or retaining any adequate notions of the Christian doctrine, unless they be previously reclaimed from that irregular and desultory manner of life, and civilized by an intercourse with persons, whose humane and insinuating manners are adapted to attract their love, and excite their imitation. This the Jesuits, and other ecclesiastics who have been sent in later times to convert these wandering savages, have found by a constant and uniform experience.[f] Hence the former have erected cities, and founded civil societies, cemented by government and laws, like the European states, in several Indian provinces both in South and North America; and it is on this account that they discharge the double functions of magistrates and doctors among these their new subjects and disciples, whose morals and sentiments, it is said, they endeavour to preserve pure and uncorrupted, by permitting few or no Europeans to approach them.[g] These arduous and difficult attempts have furnished to the disciples of Loyola ample matter of boasting, and a lucky occasion of extolling the zeal, the dexterity, and industry of their order. But it has appeared, from relations worthy of credit, that these exploits of the Jesuits, in the internal and more inaccessible provinces of America, are not so much carried on with a view to the propagation of Christianity, as with an intention of gratifying their own insatiable avarice and boundless ambition;

[a] See Epist. de Successu Evangelii apud Indos Orientales, ad Johan. Leusdenium script.

[b] See Braun's Veritable Religion des Hollandois, p. 71, 267, &c. This treatise, which was published at Amsterdam, in 1675, was intended as an answer to a malignant libel of one Stoup, entitled la Religion des Hollandois, in which that writer proposed to persuade the world that the Dutch had scarcely any religion at all.

[c] Called by some *Ouverne*.

☞ [d] For a more ample account of this queen, and her conversion, Dr. Mosheim refers the reader (in his note [r]) to Urban Cerri's Etat present de l'Eglise Romaine, p. 222, and to the third and fourth volumes of Father Labat's Relation Historique de l'Afrique Occidentale, in the former of which, he tells us, there is a French translation of Ant. Cavazzi's account of Africa. All these citations are inaccurate. Cerri makes no mention of Zingha, or of Metamba; nor are they mentioned by Labat, in any of the five volumes of his Historical Relation; nor is Cavazzi's account translated in that work. In general it may be observed, that the missions in Africa were greatly neglected by the Portuguese, and that the few missionaries sent thither were men absolutely void of learning, and destitute of almost every qualification that was necessary to the prosecution of such an important undertaking See Labat's Preface, as also the Modern Universal History.

[e] See the authors mentioned by Fabricius, in his Lux Evangelii Orbem Terrarum collustrans, cap. xlviii. xlix. p. 769.—There is a cursory account of the state of the Romish religion, in that part of America which is possessed by the European catholics, in Cerri's work abovementioned.

[f] A great variety of facts are alleged as a proof of this, in the Letters in which the French Jesuits gave their friends in Europe an account of the success and fruits of their mission, and which were regularly published at Paris.

☞ [g] That this was by no means the only, nor even the principal reason of cutting off all communication between the Indians and Europeans, will appear evident from the contents of the following note.

and, accordingly, they are reported to send yearly to the members of their order, in Europe, immense quantities of gold, drawn from several American provinces where they have power and property, but chiefly from Paraguay, which belongs to them alone.[a]

XX. The cause of Christianity was promoted with greater wisdom, and consequently with better success, in those parts of America where the English formed settlements during this century; and, though it had the greatest ignorance, stupidity, and indolence to conquer, it quickly made a considerable progress. The English Independents who retired to America because they dissented from the established religion of their country, claimed the honour of carrying thither the first rays of divine truth, and of beginning a work that has been since continued with such pious zeal and such abundant fruit; and indeed this claim is founded in justice. Several families of this sect that had been settled in Holland, removed thence into America[b] in 1620, in order, as they alleged, to transmit their doctrine pure and undefiled to future ages; and there they laid the foundations of a new state.[c] The success that attended this first emigration engaged great numbers of the Puritans, who groaned under the oppression of the bishops, and the severity of a court by which this oppression was authorized, to follow the fortunes of these religious adventurers;[d] and this produced a second emigration in 1629. But, notwithstanding the success which at length crowned this enterprise, its commencement was unpromising, and the colonists, immediately after their arrival, laboured under such hardships and difficulties in the dreary and uncultivated wilds of this new region, that, for several years, they could make very little progress in instructing the Indians, their whole zeal and industry being scarcely sufficient to preserve the infant settlement from the horrors of famine. But, about the year 1633,[e] affairs assumed a better aspect: the colony began to flourish, and the new-comers, among whom the Puritans Mayhew, Shepherd, and Elliot, made an eminent figure, had the leisure, courage, and tranquillity of mind, that were necessary for the execution of such an important and arduous design. All these devout exiles were remarkably zealous, laborious, and successful in the conversion of the Indians; but none acquired such a shining reputation, in this pious career, as John Elliot, who learned their language, (into which he translated the Bible, and other instructive and edifying books,) collected the wandering savages, and formed them into regular congregations, instructed them in a manner suited to the dulness of their comprehen-

[a] While Father Labat was at Rome, Tamburini, at that time general of the Jesuits, asked him several questions relating to the progress of Christianity in America; to which, with equal courage and candour, he gave immediately this general answer: "that the Gospel had made little or no real progress in that country; that he had never met with one adult person among the Americans who could be regarded as a true proselyte to Christianity; and that the missionaries could scarcely pretend to any other exploits (*of a spiritual kind*) than their having baptized some children at the point of death." [Labat's Voyage en Espagne et en Italie, tom. viii.] He added, that, "in order to make the Americans *Christians*, it was previously necessary to make them *men*." This bold Dominican, who had been himself a missionary in the American islands, was inclined to give Tamburini some seasonable advice concerning the immense wealth and authority that the Jesuits had acquired in those parts of the world; but the cunning old man eluded artfully this part of the conversation, and turned it upon another subject. Labat gave, on another occasion, a still greater proof of his undaunted spirit and presence of mind; for when, in an audience granted him by Clement XI. that pontiff praised, in pompous terms, the industry and zeal of the Portuguese and Spanish missionaries in promoting the salvation of the Americans, and reproached the French with inactivity and indifference in a matter of such high importance, our resolute Dominican told him plainly, "that the Spaniards and Portuguese boasted of the success of their labours without any sort of foundation; since it was well known, that, instead of *converts*, they had only made *hypocrites*, all their disciples among the Indians having been forced, by the dread of punishment and the terrors of death, to embrace Christianity;" adding, "that such as had received baptism continued as open and egregious idolators as they had been before their profession of Christianity." To this account we might add the relations of a whole cloud of witnesses, whose testimonies are every way worthy of credit, and who declare unanimously the same thing. See, among others, a remarkable piece, entitled, Memoire touchant l'Etablissement considerable des Peres Jesuites dans les Indes d'Espagne, which is subjoined to Frezier's Relation du Voyage de la Mer du Sud. See also Voyage aux Indes Occidentales, par F. Coreal, tom. ii. p. 67, and Mammachius, Orig. et Antiquit. Christian. tom. ii. p. 337. There is a particular account of the Jesuits of Paraguay, given by Don Ulloa, in his Voyage d'Amerique, tom. i. p. 540; but this account is partial in their favour. They are also zealously and artfully defended in an account of the mission of Paraguay, published by Muratori.

☞ When Dr. Mosheim wrote this note, the important discovery that placed the ambitious, despotic, and rebellious proceedings of the Jesuits in Paraguay in the plainest and most striking light, had not been yet made. The book of Muratori deceived, for some time, the over-credulous, and induced even the enemies of the Jesuits to suspect that their conduct at Paraguay was not so criminal as it had been represented; so that, notwithstanding the accusations that had been brought against these missionaries by the writers mentioned by our historian: notwithstanding a memorial sent to the court of Spain in 1730, by Don Martin de Barua, at that time Spanish governor of Paraguay, in which the Jesuits are charged with the most ambitious projects and the most rebellious designs, represented as setting up an independent government, accused of carrying on a prodigious trade, and other things of that nature; and notwithstanding the circumstantial evidence of various known facts that supported these accusations in the strongest manner; a great proportion of the public had not just ideas upon the subject. The illusion, however, did not last long. In 1750, the courts of Madrid and Lisbon entered into a treaty for fixing the limits of their respective dominions in South-America. The Jesuits, who had formed an independent republic in the heart of those dominions, composed of the Indians, whom they had gained by the insinuating softness and affected mildness, humility, and generosity of their proceedings, were much alarmed at this treaty. It was one of the fundamental laws of this new state, (which was founded under the mask of a Christian mission,) that no bishop or governor, nor any officer, civil, military, or ecclesiastical, nor even any individual, Spaniard or Portuguese, should be admitted into its territories, to the end that the proceedings and projects of the Jesuits might still remain an impenetrable secret. The members of their order were alone to be instructed in this profound and important mystery. The use of the Spanish language was prohibited in this new territory, in order to prevent more effectually all communication between the Indians and that nation. The Indians were trained to the use of arms, furnished with artillery, instructed in the art of war, taught to behold the Jesuits as their sovereigns and their gods, and to look upon all white people, except the Jesuits, as demoniacs, atheists, and moreover, as their barbarous and mortal enemies. Such was the state of affairs when, in 1752, the united troops of Spain and Portugal marched toward the eastern borders of the river Uragai, to make the exchanges of certain villages that had been agreed upon in the treaty above-mentioned. Upon this, the Jesuits, not being sufficiently prepared for their defence, demanded a delay of the execution of the treaty under various pretexts. This delay was granted: but, as the Spanish general, Gomez Frere Andrada, perceived that the *holy fathers* employed this delay in arming the Indians, and confirming them in their rebellion, he wrote to his court, and thence received new orders to proceed to the execution of the treaty. A war ensued between the Spanish and the Portuguese on one side, and the Indians, animated by the Jesuits, on the other, in which the Spanish general lost his life, and of which the other circumstances are well known. This was the real and original cause of the disgrace of the Jesuits at the court of Portugal. Those who desire a more particular account of this matter, will find it in a famous pamphlet, drawn from an authentic memorial, published by the court of Lisbon, and printed in 1758, under the following title: *La Republique des Jesuites au Paraguay Renversée, ou Relation Authentique de la Guerre que ces Religieux ont osé soutenir contre les Monarques d'Espagne et de Portugal en Amerique, pour y defendre les domaines dont ils avoient usurpé la Souveraine au Paraguay sous pretexte de Religion.*

[b] This colony settled in that part of America which was afterwards called New Plymouth.

[c] See Neal's Hist. of the Puritans, vol. ii. p. 128; and also a German work entitled, Englische Refor. Hist. by Ant. W. Bohm, b. vi. c. v.

[d] See Mather's History of New-England, p. 126.—Neal, vol. ii.

☞ [e] Dr. Mosheim says in the year 1623; but this is probably an error of the press; for it is well known, that the emigration of Shepherd and Elliot happened between 1631 and 1634.

sion, and the measure of their respective capacities; and, by such eminent displays of his zeal, dexterity, and indefatigable industry, merited, after his death, the honourable title of the Apostle of the Indians.[a]

The unexpected success that attended these pious attempts toward the propagation of Christian knowledge, drew the attention of the parliament and people of England; and the advancement of this good cause appeared an object of sufficient importance to employ the deliberations, and to claim the protection, of the great council of the nation. Thus was formed that illustrious society, which derives its title from the great purpose of its institution, namely, the propagation of the Gospel in foreign parts, and which, in proportion to the increase of its number, influence, revenues, and prerogatives, has still renewed and augmented its efforts for the instruction of the Pagans in all parts of the world, particularly those of the American continent. It is true, that, after all its efforts, much is yet to be done; but it is also true, and must be acknowledged by all who have examined these matters with attention and impartiality, that much has been done, and that the pious undertakings of this respectable society have been followed by unexpected fruit.—With respect to the province of Pennsylvania, which receives in its bosom, without distinction, persons of all sects and all opinions, we shall have occasion to speak of its religious state in another place. The American provinces which were taken from the Portuguese by the Dutch, under the command of count Maurice of Nassau, became immediately an object of the pious zeal of their new masters, who began, with great ardour and remarkable success, to spread the light of the Gospel among the wretched inhabitants of those benighted regions.[b] But this fair prospect was clouded in 1644, when the Portuguese recovered the territories they had lost. As to the Dutch settlement in Surinam, we cannot say much, having never received the smallest information of any attempts made by the colonists to instruct the neighbouring Indians in the knowledge of Christianity.[c]

XXI. Religion in general, and the Christian faith in particular, had many enemies to encounter in this century, though their number has been studiously diminished in the accounts of some, and greatly exaggerated in the representations of others. The English complain of the reign of Charles II. as the fatal period, when corruption of manners, and vice, in the most licentious and profligate forms, over-ran their nation, engendered a spirit of scepticism and infidelity, and formed a set of unhappy men, who employed all the wantonness of inconsiderate wit, all the sallies of imagination, and even all the force of real talent and genius, to extinguish a sense of religion in the minds of mankind. That this complaint is far from being groundless, appears, on one hand, from the number of those writers among the English, who either directed their attacks against all religion, or endeavoured to confine the belief of men to natural religion alone; and, on the other from the still superior number of learned and ingenious treatises in which the divinity, dignity, and intrinsic excellence of the Gospel, were demonstrated and displayed in the most striking and conspicuous manner. But nothing is more adapted to confirm the accounts that have been given of the progress of infidelity and licentiousness at the period now under consideration, than the famous Lectures founded by that illustrious ornament of religion and humanity, Mr. Robert Boyle, who, in 1691, consecrated a considerable part of his large fortune to the service of Christianity, by leaving, in his last will, a sum to be distributed successively to a number of learned divines, who were to preach, in their turns, eight sermons every year, in defence of natural and revealed religion.[d] This pious and honourable task has been generally committed to men of the most eminent genius and abilities, and is still undertaken with zeal, and performed with remarkable dignity and success. The discourses that have been delivered in consequence of this admirable institution have always been published; and they form at this day a large and important collection, which is known throughout all Europe, and has done eminent service to the cause of religion and virtue.[e]

XXII. The leader of the impious band in England, which, so early as the reign of Charles II., attempted to obscure the truth, and to dissolve the solemn obligations of religion, was Thomas Hobbes of Malmesbury, a man whose audacious pride was accompanied with an uncommon degree of artifice and address, whose sagacity was superior to his learning, and whose reputation was more owing to the subtilty and extent of his genius, than to any progress he had made either in sacred or profane erudition.[f] This man, notwithstanding the pernicious nature and tendency of his principles, had several adherents in England; and found also, in foreign countries, more than one apologist, who, though they acknowledge that his sentiments were erroneous, yet deny that he went such an impious length as to introduce the disbelief, or to overturn the worship of a Supreme Being.[g] But if it should be granted, on one hand, that Hobbes was not totally destitute of all sense of a Deity, or of all impressions of religion, it must be allowed, on the other, by all who peruse his writings with a proper degree of attention, that his tenets lead, by natural consequences, to a contempt of

[a] Hornbeckius, de Conversione Indorum et Gentil. lib. ii. cap. xv. p. 260.—Crescentii Matheri Epistola de Successu Evangelii apud Indos Occidentales ad Joh. Leusdenium. ☞ The Letter to Leusden, by Increase Mather, is translated into English, and inserted in Cotton Mather's Life of Elliot, and in his History of New-England, book iii. N.

[b] Jo. Henr. Hottingeri Topographia Ecclesiastica, p. 47.—Janicon, Etat Present des Provinces Unies, tom. i. p. 396. The same author gives an account of Surinam, and of the state of religion in that colony, chap. xiv. p. 407.

☞ [c] There are three churches in that settlement for the use of the colonists; but no attempt has been made to spread the knowledge of the Gospel among the natives.

[d] See Ricotier's preface to his French translation of Dr. Clarke's Discourses on the Being and Attributes of God. For an account of the pious, learned, and illustrious Mr. Boyle, see Budgell's Memoirs of the Lives and Characters of the illustrious Family of the Boyles: see also the Bibliotheque Brittanique, tom. xii. ☞ But, above all, see the late learned Dr. Birch's Life of Boyle, and that very valuable collection of lives, the Biographia Britannica, Article *Boyle* (*Robert*) note [s]. See also the article *Hobbes*, in the same collection. N.

[e] There is a complete list of these learned discourses in the Bibliotheque Angloise, tom. xv. part ii. p. 416.—The late Reverend Mr. Gilbert Burnet published a judicious, comprehensive, and well-digested abridgment of such of the Lectures as had been preached before the year 1737. This abridgment comprehends the discourses of Bentley, Kidder, Williams, Gastrell, Harris, Bradford, Blackhall, Stanhope, Clarke, Hancock, Whiston, Turner, Butler, Woodward, Derham, Ibbot, Long, J. Clarke, Gurdon, Burnet, Berriman.

[f] See Bayle's Dictionary, and Wood's Athenæ Oxonienses.

[g] Among the patrons and defenders of Hobbes, we may reckon Nic. Hier. Gundlingius, in his Observationes Selectæ, and in his Gundlingiana, and also Arnold, in the second part of his German history of the church and of heresy. These writers are refuted by the learned Budeus, in his Theses de Atheismo et Superstitione.

religion and of divine worship; and that, in some of his productions, there are visible marks of an extreme aversion to Christianity. It has, indeed, been said of him, that, at an advanced age, he returned to a better mind, and condemned publicly the opinions and tenets he had formerly entertained;[a] but how far this recantation was sincere, we shall not pretend to determine, since the reality of his repentance has been strongly questioned.

The same thing cannot be said of John earl of Rochester, who had insulted the majesty of God, and trampled upon the truths of religion and the obligations of morality with a profane sort of phrensy, that far exceeded the impiety of Hobbes, but whose repentance and conversion were also as palpable as had been his folly, and much more unquestionable than the dubious recantation of the philosopher of Malmesbury. The earl was a man of uncommon sagacity and penetration, of a fine genius and an elegant taste; but these natural talents were accompanied with the greatest levity and licentiousness, and the most impetuous propensity to unlawful pleasure. As long as health enabled him to answer the demands of passion, his life was an uninterrupted scene of debauchery.[b] He was, however, so happy in the last years of a very short life, as to see the extreme folly and guilt of his past conduct, in which salutary view he was greatly assisted by the wise and pathetic reasonings and exhortations of Doctor Burnet, afterwards bishop of Sarum. This conviction of his guilt produced a deep contrition and repentance, an ardent recourse to the mercy of God, as it is manifested in the Gospel of Jesus Christ, and a sincere abhorrence of the offences he had committed against the Best of Beings. In these pious sentiments he died in 1680.[c]

In this list we may also place Anthony, earl of Shaftesbury, who died of a consumption at Naples, in the year 1713; not that this illustrious writer attacked openly and professedly the Christian religion, but that the most seducing strokes of wit and raillery, the most enchanting eloquence, and the charms of a genius, in which amenity, elegance, copiousness, and elevation, were happily blended, rendered him one of its most dangerous, though secret enemies; and so much the more dangerous, because his opposition was carried on under a mask. His works have been published in various forms, and have passed through many editions. They are remarkable for beauty of diction, and contain very noble and sublime sentiments; but they ought to be read with the utmost caution, as being extremely dangerous to inexperienced, youthful and unwary minds.[d] The brutal rusticity and uncouth turn of John Toland, a native of Ireland, who, toward the

[a] This recantation depends upon the testimony of Wood, who informs us, that Hobbes composed an apology for himself and his writings, in which he declared, that the opinions he had published in his Leviathan were by no means conformable to his real sentiments; that he had only proposed them as a matter of debate, to exercise his mind in the art of reasoning; that, after the publication of that book, he had never maintained them either in public or in private, but had left them entirely to the judgment and decision of the church; more especially that the tenets, in this and his other writings, which seemed inconsistent with the received doctrines concerning God and religion, were never delivered by him as *truths*, but proposed as *questions* to be decided by divines and ecclesiastical judges endued with a proper authority.—Such is the account that Wood gives of the apology now under consideration; but he does not tell us the year in which it was published, which is a proof that he himself had never seen it; nor does he inform us whether it appeared during the life of Hobbes, or after his death. As indeed it is placed in the catalogue of his writings, with a date posterior to the year 1682, it is natural to suppose that it was not published during his life, since he died in 1679. It is, therefore, no easy matter to determine what stress is to be laid upon this recantation of Hobbes, or what opinion we are to form of his supposed repentance. That the apology exists, we do not pretend to deny; but it may have been composed by some of his friends, to diminish the odium which, it was natural to think, his licentious principles would cast on his memory. But should it be granted, that it was drawn up and published by Hobbes himself, even this concession would contribute little to save, or rather to recover, his reputation, since it is well known, that nothing is more common among those who, by spreading corrupt principles and pernicious opinions, have drawn upon themselves the just indignation of the public, than, like Hobbes, to deceive the world by insidious and insincere declarations of the soundness of their belief, and the uprightness of their intentions. It is thus that they secure themselves against the execution of the laws that are designed to fence religion, while they persevere in their licentious sentiments, and propagate them, wherever they can do it with security.

[b] See an account of his life and writings in Wood's Athenæ Oxonienses, vol. ii. His poetical genius is justly celebrated by Voltaire, in his Melanges de Literature et de Philosophie.

[c] Bishop Burnet has given a particular account of this last and very affecting scene of the life of this nobleman, in a pamphlet written expressly on that subject, and entitled, Some Passages of the Life and Death of John, Earl of Rochester, written, at his desire, on his deathbed, by Gilbert Burnet, D. D. containing more amply their Conversations on the great principles of Natural and Revealed Religion.

[d] His works were first collected and published under the title of Characteristics, in 1711, and, since that time, have passed through many editions. See Le Clerc's account of them in his Bibliotheque Choise, tom. xxiii. The critical reflexions of the learned and ingenious Leibnitz on the philosophy of Lord Shaftesbury were published by Dez-Maizeaux, in the second volume of his Receuil de diverses Pieces sur la Philosophie, p. 245.—There are some writers who maintain, that this noble philosopher has been unjustly charged, by the greatest part of the clergy, with a contempt for revealed religion; and it is to be wished, that the arguments they employ to vindicate him from this charge were more satisfactory and solid than they really are. But, if I do not greatly mistake, whoever peruses his writings, and more especially his famous letter concerning enthusiasm, will be inclined to adopt the judgment that was formed of him by the ingenious Dr. Berkeley, bishop of Cloyne, in his Alciphron, or the Minute Philosopher, vol. i. p. 200.—Nothing is more easy than to observe, in the writings of Lord Shaftesbury, a spirit of raillery, mingling itself even with those of his reflexions upon religious subjects that seem to be delivered with the greatest seriousness and gravity. But, at the same time, this unseemly mixture of the solemn and the ludicrous, renders it difficult for those who are not well acquainted with his manner, to know whether he is in jest or in earnest. It may also be added, that this author has perniciously endeavoured to destroy the influence and efficacy of some of the great motives that are proposed in the Scriptures to render men virtuous, by representing these motives as mercenary, and even turning them into ridicule. He substitutes, in their place, the intrinsic excellence and beauty of virtue, as the great source of moral obligation, and the true incentive to virtuous deeds. But, however alluring this sublime scheme of morals may appear to certain minds of a refined, elegant, and ingenious turn, it is certainly little adapted to the taste, the comprehension, and the character of the multitude. Take away from the lower orders of mankind the prospects of reward and punishment, that lead them to virtue and obedience, by the powerful suggestions of hope and fear; and the great supports of virtue, and the most effectual motives to the pursuit of it will, with respect to them, be removed.

☞ Since Dr. Mosheim wrote this note, the very learned and judicious Dr. Leland published his View of the Principal Deistical Writers that have appeared in England during the last and present Century, &c. in which there is a full account of the free-thinkers and deists mentioned by our historian, with a review of the writings of the earl of Shaftesbury. This review merits a particular attention, as it contains an impartial account, an accurate examination, and a satisfactory refutation, of the erroneous principles of that great man. Like all other eminent innovators, the earl has been misrepresented both by his friends and his enemies. Dr. Leland has steered a middle course between the blind enthusiasm of the former, and the partial malignity of the latter. He points out, with singular penetration and judgment, the errors, inconsistencies, and contradictions, of that illustrious author; does justice to what is good in his ingenious writings; separates carefully the wheat from the chaff; and neither approves nor condemns in the lump, as too many have done. In a more particular manner he has shown, with his usual perspicuity and good sense, that the being influenced by the hope of the reward promised in the Gospel has nothing in it disingenuous and slavish, and is so far from being inconsistent with loving virtue for its own sake, that it tends, on the contrary, to heighten our esteem of its amiableness and worth. The triumphant manner in which the learned Dr. Warburton has refuted Shaftesbury's representation of raillery and ridicule as a test of truth, is too well known to be mentioned

conclusion of this century, was rendered famous by several injurious libels against Christianity, must naturally appear doubly disgusting, when compared with the amiable elegance and specious refinement of the author now mentioned. However, as those writers, who flatter the passions by endeavouring to remove all the restraints that religion imposes upon their excessive indulgence, will never want patrons among the licentious part of mankind; so this man, who was not destitute of learning, imposed upon the ignorant and unwary; and, notwithstanding the excess of his arrogance and vanity, and the shocking rudeness and ferocity of his manners, acquired a certain measure of fame.[a] It is not necessary to mention other authors of this class, who appeared in England, during this century, but are long since consigned to oblivion. The reader may, however, add, to those who have been already named, lord Herbert of Cherbury, a philosopher of some note, who, if he did not absolutely deny the divine origin of the Gospel,[b] maintained, at least, that it was not essentially necessary to the salvation of mankind;[b] and Charles Blount, who composed a book, entitled the Oracles of Reason, and, in 1693, died by his own hand.[c]

XXIII. Infidelity, and even atheism, shewed themselves also on the continent during this century. In France, Julius Cæsar Vanini, the author of two books, one entitled, the Amphitheatre of Providence,[d] and the other, Dialogues concerning Nature,[e] was publicly burned at

here. See also Dr. Brown's Three Essays on the Characteristics, in which that sensible author treats of ridicule considered as a test of truth; of the obligations of men to virtue, and of the necessity of religious principle, and of revealed religion and Christianity.

☞ [a] Dr. Mosheim, in a short note, refers to an account he had given of the Life and Writings of Toland, prefixed to his confutation of the Nazarenus of that contemptible author. He also quotes a life of Toland, prefixed to his posthumous works by Des-Maizeaux.—Dr. Mosheim says, that this man *was not destitute of learning*. Should that be granted, it must, nevertheless, be acknowledged that this learning lay quite undigested in his head, and that the use he made of it, in his works, was equally injudicious and impudent. His conference with M. Beausobre concerning the authenticity of the Holy Scriptures, which was holden at Berlin in presence of the queen of Prussia, and in which he made such a despicable figure, is a proof of the former; and his writings, to all but half-scholars and half-thinkers, will be a proof (as long as they endure) of the latter.—It is remarkable that (according to the maxim of Juvenal, *Nemo repente fuit turpissimus*) Toland arrived only gradually, and by a progressive motion, at the summit of infidelity. His first step was Socinianism, which appeared in his book, entitled, Christianity not Mysterious. This book procured him hard treatment from the Irish parliament, and was answered by Mr. Brown, afterwards bishop of Cork, who, unhappily, did not think good arguments sufficient to maintain a good cause, unless they were seconded by the secular arm, whose ill-placed succours he solicited with ardour. The second step that Toland made in the devious fields of religion, was in the publication of his Amyntor, which, in appearance, was designed to vindicate what he advanced in his Life of Milton, to prove that king Charles I. was not the real author of the *Eikon Basilikè*, but, in reality, was intended to invalidate the Canon of the New Testament, and to render it uncertain and precarious. This piece, as far as it attacked the authenticity of Scripture, was answered in a triumphant manner by Dr. Clarke, in his Reflections on that part of the Book called Amyntor, which relates to the Writings of the Primitive Fathers, and the Canon of the New Testament; by Mr. Richardson, in his learned and judicious Vindication of the Canon of the New Testament; and by Mr. Jones, in his new and full Method of settling the Canonical Authority of the New Testament. These learned writers have exposed, in the most striking manner, the disingenuity, the blunders, the false quotations, the insidious fictions, and ridiculous mistakes of Toland, who, on various accounts, may pass for one of the most harmless writers against the Christian religion. For an account of the Adeisidæmon, the Nazarenus, the Letters to Serena, the Pantheisticon, and the other irreligious works of this author, and also of the excellent answers that have been made to them, see his Life in the General Dictionary, or rather in Chauffepied's Supplement to Bayle's Dictionary, entitled, Nouveau Dictionnaire Historique et Critique, as this author has not only translated the articles added to Bayle's Dictionary by the English editors of that work, but has augmented and improved them by several interesting anecdotes drawn from the literary history of the continent.

☞ [b] Lord Herbert did not presume to deny the divinity of the Gospel; he even declared that he had no intention to attack Christianity. He expressly calls it the "best religion," and admits that it tends to establish the five great articles of that universal, sufficient, and absolutely perfect religion, which he pretends to deduce from reason and nature. But, notwithstanding these fair professions, his lordship loses no occasion of throwing out insinuations against all revealed religion, as absolutely uncertain, and of little or no use. But this same deist, who was the first, and, indeed, the least contemptible of that tribe in England, has left upon record one of the strongest instances of fanaticism and absurdity that perhaps ever were heard of, and of which he himself was guilty. This instance is preserved in a manuscript life of lord Herbert, drawn up from memorials penned by himself, which is now in the possession of a gentleman of distinction,* and is as follows: that lord, having finished his book *de Veritate*, apprehended that he should meet with much opposition, and was, consequently, dubious for some time, whether it would not be prudent to suppress it. "Being thus doubtful (says his lordship,) in my chamber (*at Paris, where he was ambassador, in* 1624,) one fair day in the summer, my casement being open towards the south, the sun shining clear, and, no wind stirring, I took my book *de Veritate* in my hands, and, kneeling on my knees, devoutly said these words: O thou Eternal God, author of this light that now shines upon me, and giver of all inward illuminations, I do beseech thee, of thine infinite goodness, to pardon a greater request than a sinner ought to make; I am not satisfied enough whether I shall publish this book; if it be for thy glory, I beseech thee, give me some sign from heaven; if not, I shall suppress it." What does the reader now think of this corner-stone of deism, who demands a supernatural revelation from heaven in favour of a book that was designed to prove all revelation uncertain and useless? But the absurdity does not end here; for our deist not only sought for this revelation, but also obtained it, if we are to believe him. "I had no sooner (says he) spoken these words, but a loud though yet gentle noise came forth from the heavens, (for it was like nothing on earth,) which did so cheer and comfort me, that I took my petition as granted." Rare credulity this in an unbeliever! but these gentlemen can believe even against reason, when it answers their purpose. His lordship continues, "This, however strange it may seem, I protest before the Eternal God, is true: neither am I superstitiously deceived herein," &c. See Leland's View of the Deistical Writers, vol. i.

[c] This is sufficiently known to those who have perused lord Herbert's book de Causis Errorum, as also his celebrated work de Religione Gentilium. This author is generally considered as the chief and founder of the sect or society that are called Naturalists from their attachment to natural religion alone. See Arnoldi Historia Eccles. at Hæret. part ii. p. 1083.—The peculiar tenets of this famous deist have been refuted by Musæus and Kortholt, two German divines of eminent learning and abilities. ☞ Gassendi also composed an answer to lord Herbert's book de Veritate. In England it was refuted by Mr. Richard Baxter, in a treatise entitled, More Reasons for the Christian Religion, and no Reason against it. Mr. Locke, in his Essay on the Human Understanding, shows, with great perspicuity and force of evidence, that the five articles of natural religion, proposed by this noble author, are not, as he represents them, common notices, clearly inscribed by the hand of God in the minds of all men, and that a divine revelation is necessary to indicate, develope, and enforce them. Dr. Whitby has also treated the same matter amply in his learned work, entitled, The Necessity and Usefulness of the Christian Revelation, by reason of the Corruptions of the Principles of Natural Religion among the Jews and Heathens.

[d] See the Nouveau Dictionnaire Historique et Critique of Chauffepied, who, however, has omitted the mention of this gentleman's unhappy fate, out of a regard, no doubt, to his illustrious family. ☞ Mr. Chauffepied only translated the article *Charles Blount*, from that of the English continuators of Bayle.

☞ This book was published at Lyons in 1615, was approved by the clergy and magistrates of that city, and contains many things absolutely irreconcilable with atheistical principles: its title is as follows: Amphitheatrum Æternæ Providentiæ, Divino-Magicum Christiano-Physicum Astrologico-Catholicum, adversus Veteres Philosophos, Atheos, Epicureos, Peripateticos, Stoicos, &c. This book has been deemed innocent by several writers, impious by others; but, in our judgment, it would have escaped reproach, had Vanini published none of his other productions, since the impieties it may contain, according to the intention of its author, are carefully concealed. This is by no means the case of the book mentioned in the following note.

☞ [e] This book, concerning the Secrets of Queen Nature, the Goddess of Mortals, was published with this suspicious title at Paris, in 1616, and contains glaring marks of impiety and atheism; and yet it was published with the king's permission, and the approbation of the Faculty of Theology. This scandalous negligence or ignorance is unaccountable in such a reverend body. The Jesuit Garasse pretends

* The translator probably alludes to Horace Walpole, earl of Orford, who afterwards published it.—EDIT.

Toulouse, 1629, as an impious and obstinate atheist. It is nevertheless to be observed, that several learned and respectable writers consider this unhappy man rather as a victim to bigotry and envy, than as a martyr to impiety and atheism; and maintain, that neither his life nor his writings were so absurd or blasphemous as to entitle him to the character of a despiser of God and religion.[a] But, if Vanini had his apologists, this was by no means the case of Cosmo Ruggieri, a native of Florence, whose atheism was as impudent as it was impious, and who died in the most desperate sentiments of irreligion at Paris, in 1615, declaring that he looked upon all the accounts that had been given of the existence of a Supreme Being, and of evil spirits, as idle dreams.[b] Casimir Leszynski, a Polish knight, was capitally punished at Warsaw, in 1689, for denying the Being and Providence of God; but whether this accusation was well founded, can only be known by reading his trial, and examining the nature and circumstances of the evidence adduced against him.[c] In Germany, a senseless and frantic man, called Matthew Knutzen, a native of Holstein, attempted to found a new sect, whose members, laying aside all considerations of God and religion, were to follow the dictates of reason and conscience alone, and thence were to assume the title of Conscientiarians. But this wrong-headed sectary was easily obliged to abandon his extravagant undertakings; and thus his idle attempt proved abortive.[d]

XXIV. The most acute and eminent of the atheists of this century, whose system represented the Supreme Author of all things as a Being bound by the eternal and immutable laws of necessity or fate, was Benedict de Spinosa, a Portuguese Jew. This man, who died at the Hague in 1677, observed in his conduct the rules of wisdom and probity, much better than many who profess themselves Christians; nor did he ever endeavour to pervert the sentiments or corrupt the morals of those with whom he lived, or to inspire, in his discourse, a contempt of religion or virtue.[e] It is true, indeed, that in his writings, more especially in those which were published after his death, he maintains openly, that God and the universe are one and the same Being, and that all things happen by the eternal and immutable law of *nature*, i. e. of an all-comprehending and infinite Being, that exists and acts by an invincible necessity. This doctrine leads directly to consequences equally impious and absurd; for, if the principle now mentioned be true, each individual is his own God, or, at least, a *part* of the universal Deity, and is, therefore, impeccable and perfect.[f] Be that as it may, it is evident that Spinosa was seduced into this monstrous system by the Cartesian philosophy, of which he was a passionate admirer, and which was the perpetual subject of his meditation and study. When he had adopted the general principle (about which philosophers of all sects are agreed) that all realities are possessed by the Deity in the most eminent degree, and has annexed to this principle, as equally evident, the opinion of Des-Cartes, that there are only two realities in nature, thought and extension, one essential to spirit, and the other to matter,[g] the natural consequence was, that he should attribute to the Deity both these realities, even thought and extension, in an eminent degree, or, in other words, should represent them as infinite and immense in God. Hence the transition seemed easy to that enormous system, which confounds God with the universe, represents them as one and the same Being, and supposes only one substance whence all things proceed, and into which they all return. It is natural to observe here, that even the friends of Spinosa are obliged to acknowledge, that this system is neither attended with that luminous perspicuity, nor with that force of evidence, which are proper to make proselytes. It is too dark, too intricate, to allure men from the belief of those truths relating to the Deity, which the works of nature, and the plainest dictates of reason, are perpetually enforcing upon the human mind. Accordingly, the followers of Spinosa tell us, without hesitation, that it is rather by the suggestions of a certain sense, than by the investigations of reason, that his doctrine is to be comprehended; and that it is of such a nature, as to be easily misunderstood even by persons of the greatest sagacity and penetration.[h] His disciples

that the Faculty was deceived by Vanini, who substituted another treatise in the place of that which had been approved. See a wretched book of Garasse, entitled, Doctrine Curieuse; as also Durand's Vie de Vanini.

[a] See Buddeus's Theses de Atheismo et Superstitione. The author of the Apologia pro Vanino, which appeared in Holland in 1712, was Peter Frederic Arp, a learned lawyer; and we may also place, among the defenders of Vanini, Elias Frederic Heister, author of the Apologia pro Medicis.

[b] See Bayle's Dictionary.

[c] See Arnold's History of the Church.—The famous library of Offenbach formerly contained a complete collection of all the papers relating to the trial of Leszynski, and a full account of the proceedings against him.

[d] See Molleri Cimbria Literata, tom. i. p. 304; and Isagoge ad Historiam Chersonesi Cimbr. part ii. cap. vi. sect. viii.—La Croze, Entretiens sur divers sujets d'Histoire, p. 400.

[e] The life of Spinosa was accurately written by Colerus, whose performance was published at the Hague in 1706. But a more ample and circumstantial account of this singular man was given by Lenglet du Fresnoy, and prefixed to Boulainvilliers' Exposition of the Doctrine of Spinosa. See Bayle's Dictionary. ☞ Lenglet du Fresnoy republished the work of Colerus, and added to it several anecdotes and circumstances, borrowed from a Life of Spinosa, written by an infamous profligate, whose name was Lucas, and who practised physic at the Hague. See the notes [e] and [d] p. 529.

[f] The learned Fabricius, in his Bibliotheca Græca, and Jenichen, in his Historia Spinosismi Lehnhofiani, have given us an ample list of the writers who have refuted the system of Spinosa. The real opinion which this subtle sophist entertained concerning the Deity, is to be learned in his Ethics, that were published after his death, and not in his Tractatus Theologico-Politicus, which was printed during his life. In the latter treatise, he reasons like one who was persuaded that there exists an eternal Deity, distinct from matter and the universe, who has sent upon earth a religion designed to form men to the practice of benevolence and justice, and has confirmed that religion by events of a wonderful and astonishing, though not of a supernatural kind; but in his Ethics he throws off the mask, explains clearly his sentiments, and endeavours to demonstrate, that the Deity is nothing more than the universe, producing a series of necessary movements or acts, in consequence of its own intrinsic, immutable, and irresistible energy. This diversity of sentiment, that appears in the different productions of Spinosa, is a sufficient refutation of those who, forming the estimate of his system from his Tractatus Theologico-Politicus alone, pronounce it less pernicious, and its author less impious, than they are generally supposed to be. But, on the other hand, how shall this diversity be accounted for? Are we to suppose that Spinosa proceeded to atheism by gradual steps, or is it more probable, that, during his life, he prudently concealed his real sentiments? Whether the former, or the latter, be the real case, it is not easy to determine. It appears, however, from testimonies, every way worthy of credit, that he never, during his whole life, either made, or attempted to make, converts to irreligion, and never said any thing in public that tended to encourage disrespectful sentiments of the Supreme Being, or of the worship that is due to him. It is well known, on the contrary, that, when subjects of a religious nature were incidentally treated in the course of conversation where he was present, he always expressed himself with the utmost decency on the occasion, and often with an air of piety and seriousness more adapted to edify than to give offence.

☞ [g] The hypothesis of Des-Cartes is not, perhaps, represented with sufficient accuracy and precision, by saying that he looked upon thought as essential to spirit, and extension as essential to matter, since it is well known that this philosopher considered thought as the very essence or substance of the soul, and extension as the very essence and substance of matter.

[h] There is certainly no man so little acquainted with the character of

assumed the denomination of Pantheists, choosing rather to derive their distinctive title from the nature of their doctrine, than from the name of their master.[a] The most noted members of this strange sect were a physician, whose name was Louis Meyer,[b] a person called Lucas,[c] count Boulainvilliers,[d] and some others, equally contemptible on account of their sentiments and morals.

XXV. The progressive and flourishing state of the arts and sciences, in the seventeenth century, is abundantly known; and we see the effects, and enjoy the fruits, of the efforts then made for the advancement of learning. No branch of literature seemed to be neglected. Logic, philosophy, history, poetry, and rhetoric; in a word, all the sciences that belong to the respective provinces of reason experience, observation, genius, memory, and imagination, were cultivated and improved with remarkable success throughout the Christian world. While the learned men of this happy period discovered such zeal for the improvement of science, their zeal was both inflamed and directed by one of the greatest and rarest geniuses that ever arose for the instruction of mankind. This was Francis Bacon, lord Verulam, who, toward the commencement of this century, opened the paths that lead to true philosophy in his admirable works.[e] It must be acknowledged, indeed,

Bayle as to think him void of discernment and sagacity; and yet this most subtle metaphysician has been accused by the followers of Spinosa, of misunderstanding and misrepresenting the doctrine of that Pantheist, and consequently of answering it with very little solidity. This charge is brought against Bayle, with peculiar severity, by L. Meyer, in his preface to the posthumous works of Spinosa, in which, after complaining of the misrepresentations that have been given of the opinions of that writer, he pretends to maintain, that his system was, in every point, conformable to the doctrines of Christianity. Boulainvilliers also, another of Spinosa's commentators and advocates, declares, in his preface to a book, whose perfidious title is mentioned below in note [d], that all the antagonists of that famous Jew either ignorantly misunderstood, or maliciously perverted, his true doctrine; his words are: Les refutations de Spinosa m'ont induit à juger, ou que leurs auteurs n'avoient pas voulu mettre la doctrine, qu'ils combattent, dans une evidence suffisante, ou qu'ils l'avoient mal entendue. If this be true, if the doctrine of Spinosa be not only far beyond the comprehension of the vulgar, but also difficult to be understood, and liable to be mistaken and misrepresented by men of the most acute parts and the most eminent abilities, what is the most obvious conclusion deducible from this fact? It is plainly this, that the greatest part of the Spinosists, whose sect is supposed by some to be very numerous in Europe, have adopted the doctrine of that famous atheist, not so much from a conviction of its truth, founded on an examination of its intricate contents, as from the pleasure they take in a system that promises impunity to all transgressions that do not come within the cognisance of the law, and thus lets loose the reins to every irregular appetite and passion; for it would be senseless, in the highest degree, to imagine, that the pretended multitude of the Spinosists, many of whom never once dreamed of exercising their minds in the pursuit of truth, or accustoming them to philosophical discussion, should all accurately comprehend a system, which, according to their own account, has escaped the penetration and sagacity of the greatest geniuses.

[a] Toland, unable to purchase a dinner, composed and published, in order to supply the sharp demands of hunger, an infamous and impious book under the following title: Pantheisticon, sive Formulæ celebrandæ Societatis Socraticæ, in tres Particulas divisæ, quæ Pantheistarum sive Sodalium continent, I. Mores et Axiomata; II. Numen et Philosophiam; III. Libertatem et non fallentem Legem neque fallendam, &c. The design of this book, which was published at London in 1720, appears by the title. It was intended to draw a picture of the licentious morals and principles of his brethren the *Pantheists* under the fictitious description of a Socratical Society, which they are represented as holding in all the places where they are dispersed. In the Socratical, or rather Bacchanalian Society, described in this pernicious work, the president and members are said to converse freely on several subjects. There is also a Form or Liturgy read by the president, who officiates as priest, and is answered by the assembly in suitable responses. He recommends earnestly to the members of the Society the care of truth, liberty, and health; exhorts them to guard against superstition, that is, religion; and reads aloud to them, by way of lesson, certain select passages out of Cicero and Seneca, which seem to favour irreligion. His colleagues promise solemnly to conform themselves to his injunctions and exhortations. Sometimes all the members, animated with enthusiasm and joy, raise their voices together, and sing, out of the ancient Latin poets, certain verses which are suitable to the laws and principles of their sect. See Des-Maizeaux, Life of John Toland, p. 77.—Bibliotheque Angloise, tom. viii. If the pantheistical community be really such as it is here represented, it is not so much the duty of wise and good men to dispute with or refute its members, as it is the business of the civil magistrate to prevent such licentious and turbulent spirits from troubling the order of society, and seducing honest citizens from their religious principles, and the duties of their respective stations.

[b] This Meyer was the person who translated into Latin the pieces that Spinosa had composed in the Dutch language; who assisted him in his last moments, after having attempted in vain to remove his disorder; and who published his Posthumous Works, with a preface, in which, with great impudence and little success, he endeavours to prove, that the doctrine of Spinosa differs in nothing from that of the Gospel. Meyer is also the author of a well-known treatise, entitled, Philosophia Scripturæ Interpres, in which the merit and authority of the sacred writings are examined by the dictates of philosophy, that is to say, of the philosophy of Mr. Meyer.

[c] Lucas was a physician at the Hague, and was as famous for what he called his Quintessences, as he was infamous on account of the profligacy of his morals. He left behind him a Life of Spinosa, from which Lenglet du Fresnoy took all the additions that he made to the life of that atheist written by Colerus. He also composed a work which is still handed about, and bought at an extravagant price, by those in whose judgment rarity and impiety are equivalent to merit. This work is entitled, l'Esprit de Spinosa, and surpasses infinitely, in atheistical profaneness, even those productions of Spinosa that are generally looked upon as the most pernicious; so far has this miserable writer lost sight of every dictate of prudence, and triumphed even over the restraints of shame.

[d] This fertile and copious, but paradoxical and inconsiderate writer, is abundantly known by his various productions relating to the history and political state of the French nation, by a certain prolix Fable, entitled, the Life of Mohammed, and by the adverse turns of fortune that pursued him. His character was so made up of inconsistencies and contradictions, that he is almost equally chargeable with superstition and atheism; for, though he acknowledged no other Deity than the universe, or nature, yet he looked upon Mohammed as authorized, by a divine commission, to instruct mankind; and he was of opinion, that the fate of nations, and the destiny of individuals, could be foreknown, by an attentive observation of the stars. Thus the man was, at the same time, an atheist and an astrologer. Now this medley of a man was greatly concerned (in consequence, forsooth, of his ardent zeal for the *public good*) to see the *admirable* doctrine of Spinosa so generally misunderstood, and therefore he formed the laudable design of expounding, illustrating, and accommodating it, as is done with respect to the doctrines of the Gospel in books of piety, to ordinary capacities. This design, indeed, he executed, but not so fortunately for his master as he might fondly imagine, since it appeared most evidently from his own account of the system of Spinosa, that Bayle and the other writers who had represented his doctrine as repugnant to the plainest dictates of reason, and destructive of all religion, had judged rightly, and were not misled by ignorance or by temerity. In short, the book of Boulainvilliers set the atheism and impiety of Spinosa in a much more clear and striking light than ever they had appeared before. This infamous book, which was worthy of eternal oblivion, was published by Lenglet du Fresnoy, who, that it might be bought with avidity, and read without reluctance, prefixed to it the attractive but perfidious title of a Refutation of the Errors of Spinosa; adding to it, indeed, some separate pieces, to which this title may, in some measure, be thought applicable. The whole title runs thus: Refutation des Erreurs de Benoit de Spinosa, par M. de Fenelon, Archeveque de Cambray, par le Pere Lâmi Benedictin, et par M. le Comte de Boulainvilliers, avec la Vie de Spinosa, ecrite par Jean Colerus, Ministre de l'Eglise Lutherienne de la Haye, augmentée de beaucoup de Particularités tirées d'une Vie Manuscrite de ce Philosophe, faite par un de ses Amis (this friend was Lucas, the atheistical physician mentioned in the preceding note,) à Bruxelles, chez Francois Foppens, 1731. Here we see the poison and the antidote joined, but the latter perfidiously distributed in a manner and measure every way insufficient to remove the noxious effects of the former: in a word, the wolf is shut up with the sheep. The account and defence of the philosophy of Spinosa, given by Boulainvilliers under the insidious title of a Refutation, take up the greatest part of this book, and are placed first, and not the last in order, as the title would insinuate. Besides, the whole contents of this motley collection are not enumerated in the title: for at the end of it we find a Latin treatise, entitled Certamen Philosophicum propugnatæ Veritatis divinæ et naturalis, adversus Jo. Bredenburgii Principia, in fine annexa. This *philosophical controversy* contains a Defence of the Doctrine of Spinosa, by Bredenburg, and a Refutation of that Defence by Isaac Orobio, a learned Jewish physician at Amsterdam, and was first published in 1703.

[e] More especially in his treatise de Dignitate et Augmentis Scientiarum, and in his Novum Organum. See the life of that great man, pre-

that the rules he prescribes, to direct the researches of the studious, are not all practicable amidst the numerous prejudices and impediments to which the most zealous inquirers are exposed in the pursuit of truth; and it appears plainly that this great man, to whose elevated and comprehensive genius all things seemed easy, was at certain times so far carried away by the vastness of his conceptions, as to require, from the application and abilities of men, more than they were capable of performing, and to desire the *end*, without always examining whether the *means* of attaining it were possible. At the same time it must be confessed that a great part of the improvements in learning and science, which distinguished Europe during this century, arose from the counsels and directions of this extraordinary man. This is more particularly true of the progress then made in natural philosophy, to which noble science Bacon did such important service, as is alone sufficient to render his name immortal. He opened the eyes of those who had been led blindfold by the dubious authority of traditionary systems, and the uncertain directory of hypothesis and conjecture. He led them to Nature, that they might consult that oracle directly and near at hand, and receive her answers; and, by the introduction of experimental inquiry, he placed philosophy upon a new and solid basis. It was thus undoubtedly that he removed the prejudices of former times, which led men to consider all human knowledge as circumscribed within the bounds of Greek and Latin erudition, and an acquaintance with the more elegant and liberal arts; and thus, in the vast regions of nature, he opened scenes of instruction and science, which, although hitherto unknown or disregarded, were infinitely more noble and sublime, and much more productive of solid nourishment to the minds of the wise, than the learning that was cultivated before his time.

XXVI. It is remarkable, in general, that the sciences of natural philosophy, mathematics, and astronomy, were carried in this century, in all the nations of Europe, to such a high degree of perfection, that they seemed suddenly to rise from the puny weakness of infancy to a state of full maturity. There is certainly no sort of comparison between the philosophers, mathematicians, and astronomers, of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. The former look like pygmies, when compared with the gigantic stature of the latter. At the head of the latter appears Galileo, the ornament of natural science in Italy, who was encouraged, in his astronomical researches and discoveries, by the munificence and protection of the grand dukes of Tuscany.[a] In France appeared Des-Cartes and Gassendi, who left behind them a great number of eminent disciples; in Denmark Tycho Brahe; in England Boyle and Newton; in Germany Kepler, Hevelius, and Leibnitz; and in Switzerland the brothers, James and John Bernoulli. These philosophers of the first magnitude, if I may use that expression, excited such a spirit of emulation in Europe, and were followed by such a multitude of admirers and rivals, that, if we except those countries which had not yet emerged from a state of ignorance and barbarism, there was scarcely any nation that could not boast of possessing a profound mathematician, a famous astronomer, or an eminent philosopher. Nor were the dukes of Tuscany, however distinguished by their hereditary zeal for the sciences, and their liberality to the learned, the only patrons of philosophy at this time, since it is well known that the monarchs of Great-Britain and France, Charles II. and Louis XIV., honoured the sciences, and those who cultivated them, with their protection and encouragement. It is to the munificence of those two princes that the Royal Society of London, and the Academy of Sciences at Paris, owe their origin and establishment, their privileges, honours and endowments, and that we, in consequence, are indebted for the interesting discoveries that have been made by these two learned bodies, the end of whose institution is the study and investigation of nature, and the culture of all those arts and sciences which lead to truth, and are useful to mankind.[b] These establishments, and the inquiries they were so naturally adapted to encourage and promote, proved not only beneficial, in the highest degree, to the civil interests of mankind, but were also productive of inestimable advantages to the cause of true religion. By these inquiries, the empire of superstition, which is always the bane of genuine piety, and often a source of rebellion and calamity in sovereign states, was greatly shaken; by them the fictitious prodigies, that had so long kept miserable mortals in a painful state of servitude and terror, were deprived of their influence; by them natural religion was built upon solid foundations, and illustrated with admirable perspicuity and evidence; as by them the infinite perfections of the Supreme Being were demonstrated with the utmost clearness and force from the frame of the universe in general, and also from the structure of its various parts.

XXVII. The improvements made in history, and more especially the new degrees of light that were thrown upon the ancient history of the church, were of eminent service to the cause of genuine Christianity; for thus the original sources and reasons of many absurd opinions and institutions, which antiquity and custom had rendered sacred, were discovered and exposed in their proper colours; and innumerable errors that had possessed and perplexed the anxious spirits of the credulous and superstitious multitude, were happily deprived of their authority and influence. Thus, in consequence, the cheerful light of truth, and the calm repose and tranquillity that attend it, arose upon the minds of many; and human life was delivered from the crimes that have been sanctified by superstition, and from the tumults and agitations in which it has so often involved unhappy mortals. The advantages that flowed from the improvement of historical knowledge were both innumerable and inestimable. By this many pious and excellent persons, whom ignorance or malice had stigmatised as heretics, were delivered from reproach, recovered their good fame, and thus were secured against

---

fixed to his works published in four volumes, in folio, 1740.—Bibliotheque Britannique, tom. xv.—In Mallet's Life of Bacon there is a particular and interesting account of his noble attempt to reform the miserable philosophy that prevailed before his time. See also Voltaire's Melanges de Literature et de Philosophie.

[a] See Heuman's Acta Philosophorum, the xivth, xvth, and xviith parts.

[b] The history of the Royal Society of London, was published by Dr. Sprat, in the year 1722.* Fontenelle composed the History of the Academy of Sciences at Paris. The reader will find a comparison between these learned bodies in Voltaire's Melanges de Literature et de Philosophie.

☞ * A much more interesting and ample history of this respectable society was afterwards composed, and published by Dr. Birch, its learned secretary.

the malignity of superstition. By this it appeared, that many of those religious controversies, which had divided nations, friends, and families, and involved so often sovereign states in bloodshed, rebellion, and crimes of the most horrid kind, were owing to the most trifling and contemptible causes, to the ambiguity and obscurity of certain theological phrases and terms, to superstition, ignorance, and envy, to spiritual pride and ambition. By this it was demonstrated with the fullest evidence, that many of those religious ceremonies, which had been long considered as of divine institution, were derived from the most inglorious sources, being either borrowed from the manners and customs of barbarous nations, or invented with a design to deceive the ignorant and credulous, or dictated by the idle visions of senseless enthusiasm. By this the ambitious intrigues of the bishops and other ministers of religion, who, by perfidious arts, had encroached upon the prerogatives of the throne, usurped a considerable part of its authority and revenues, and held princes in subjection to their yoke by the terrors of the church, were brought to light. And to mention no more instances, it was by the lamp of history that those councils, whose decrees had so long been regarded as infallible and sacred, and revered as the dictates of celestial wisdom, were exhibited to the attentive observer as assemblies, where an odious mixture of ignorance and knavery very frequently presided. Our happy experience, in these later times, furnishes daily instances of the salutary effects of these important discoveries on the state of the Christian church, and on the condition of all its members. Hence flow that lenity and moderation which are mutually exercised by those who differ in their religious sentiments; the prudence and caution that are used in estimating opinions and deciding controversies; the protection and support that are granted to men of worth, when attacked by the malice of bigotry; and the visible diminution of the errors, frauds, crimes, and cruelties, with which superstition formerly embittered the pleasures of human life, and the enjoyments of social intercourse.

XXVIII. Many of the doctors of this century applied themselves, with eminent success, to the study of Hebrew and Greek literature, and of the oriental languages and antiquities; and, as their progress in this kind of erudition was rapid, so, in many instances, was the use they made of it truly excellent and laudable; for they were thus enabled to throw light on many difficult passages of the sacred writings that had been ill understood and injudiciously applied, and which some had even employed in supporting erroneous opinions, and giving a plausible colour to pernicious doctrines. Hence it happened, that many patrons and promoters of popular notions, and of visionary and groundless fancies, were deprived of the fallacious arguments by which they maintained their errors. It cannot also be denied, that the cause of religion received considerable benefit from the labours of those, who either endeavoured to preserve the purity and elegance of the Latin language, or who, beholding with emulation the example of the French, employed their industry in improving and polishing the languages of their respective countries; for it must be evidently both honourable and advantageous to the Christian church, to have always in its bosom men of learning qualified to write and discourse upon theological subjects with precision, elegance, ease, and perspicuity, that so the ignorant and perverse may be allured to receive instruction, and also be able to comprehend with facility the instructions they receive.

XXIX. The rules of morality and practice, which were laid down in the sacred writings by Christ and his apostles, assumed an advantageous form, received new illustrations, and were supported upon new and solid principles, when that great system of law, which results from the constitution of nature, and the dictates of right reason, began to be studied with more diligence, and investigated with more accuracy and perspicuity than had been the case in preceding ages. In this sublime study of the law of nature the immortal Grotius led the way in his excellent book concerning the Rights of War and Peace: and, from the dignity and importance of the subject, his labours excited the zeal and emulation of men of the most eminent genius and abilities,[a] who turned their principal attention to this noble science. How much the labours of these great men contributed to assist the ministers of the Gospel, both in their discourses and writings concerning the duties and obligations of Christians, may be easily seen by comparing the books of a practical kind, published since the period now under consideration, with those which were in vogue before that time. [☞ There is scarcely a discourse upon any subject of Christian morality, how inconsiderable soever it may be, that does not bear some marks of the improvement which was introduced into the science of morals by those great men, who studied that science in the paths of nature, in the frame and constitution of rational and moral beings, and in the relations by which they are rendered members of one great family, under the inspection and government of one common and universal[b] Parent.] It is unquestionably certain, that since this period the dictates of natural law, and the duties of Christian morality, have been more accurately defined; certain evangelical precepts, whose nature and foundations were imperfectly comprehended in the times of old, have been more clearly illustrated; the superiority which distinguishes the morality of the Gospel from the course of duty that is deducible from the mere light of nature, has been more fully demonstrated; and those common notions and general principles, which are the foundations of moral obligation, and are every way adapted to dispel all doubts that may arise, and all controversies that may be started, concerning the nature of evangelical righteousness and virtue, have been established with greater evidence and certainty. It may also be added, that the impiety of those infidels who have had the effrontery to maintain that the precepts of the Gospel are contrary to the dictates of sound reason, repugnant to the constitution of our nature, inconsistent with the interests of civil society, adapted to enervate the mind, and to draw men off from the business, the duties, and enjoyments of life,[c] has been much more triumphantly refuted in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, than in any other period of the Christian church.

XXX. To these reflections upon the state of learning

[a] See Adam. Fred. Glafey's Historia Juris Naturæ; to which is subjoined his Bibliotheca Juris Naturæ et Gentium.

[b] This sentence, beginning with "*There is scarcely a discourse,*" and ending with "*common and universal Parent,*" is added by the translator.

[c] Le Contra Social, par Rousseau.

and science in general, it may not be improper to add a particular and separate account of the progress and revolutions of philosophy in the Christian schools. At the beginning of this century almost all the European philosophers were divided into two classes, one of which comprehended the *Peripatetics*, and the other the *Chemists*, or *Fire-Philosophers*, as they were often styled. These two classes, during many years, contended warmly for the pre-eminence; and a great number of laboured and subtile productions were published amidst this philosophical contest. The Peripatetics were in possession of the professorships in almost all the schools of learning, and looked upon all such as presumed, either to reject, or even amend the doctrines of Aristotle, as objects of indignation, little less criminal than traitors and rebels. It is, however, observable, that the greatest part of these supercilious and persecuting doctors, if we except those of the universities of Tubingen, Altorf, Juliers, and Leipsic, were less attached to Aristotle himself than to his modern interpreters and commentators. The Chemists spread themselves through almost all Europe, and assumed the obscure and ambiguous title of *Rosecrucian Brethren*,[a] which drew at first some degree of respect, as it seemed to be borrowed from the arms of Luther, which were a *cross* placed upon a *rose*. They inveighed against the Peripatetics with a singular degree of bitterness and animosity, represented them as corruptors both of religion and philosophy, and published a multitude of treatises against them, which discovered little else than their folly and their malice. At the head of these fanatics were Robert Fludd,[b] a native of England, and a man of surprising genius; Jacob Behmen, a shoemaker, who lived at Gorlitz; and Michael Mayer.[c] These leaders of the sect were followed by John Baptist Helmont, and his son Francis, Christian Knorrius de Rosenroth, Khulman, Jollius, Sperber, and many others of various fame. A uniformity of opinion, and a spirit of concord, seem scarcely possible in such a society as this; for, as a great part of its doctrine is derived from certain internal feelings and flights of imagination, which can neither be comprehended nor defined, and is supported by testimonies of the external senses, whose reports are illusory and changeable, so it is remarkable, that, among the more eminent writers of this sect, there are scarcely any two who adopt the same tenets and sentiments. There are, nevertheless, some common principles that are generally embraced, and which serve as a centre of union to the society. They all maintain, that the dissolution of bodies, by the power of fire, is the only way through which men can arrive at true wisdom, and come to discern the first principles of things. They all acknowledge a certain analogy and harmony between the powers of nature and the doctrines of religion, and believe that the Deity governs the kingdom of grace by the same laws with which he rules the kingdom of nature; and hence it is that they employ chemical denominations to express the truths of religion. They all hold, that there is a sort of divine energy, or soul, diffused through the frame of the universe, which some call Archæus, others the Universal Spirit, and which others mention under different appellations. They all talk in the most obscure and superstitious manner of what they call the signatures of things, of the power of the stars over all corporeal beings, and their particular influence upon the human race, of the efficacy of magic, and the various species and classes of demons. In fine, they all agree in throwing out the most crude and incomprehensible notions and ideas, in the most obscure, quaint, and unusual expressions.

XXXI. This controversy, between the Chemists and Peripatetics, was buried in silence and oblivion, as soon as a new and more seemly form of philosophy was presented to the world by two great men, who reflected a lustre upon the French nation,—Gassendi and Des-Cartes. The former, whose profound knowledge of geometry and astronomy was accompanied with the most engaging eloquence, and an acquaintance with the various branches of solid erudition and polite literature, was canon of Digne, and professor of mathematics at Paris. The latter, who was a man of quality and bred a soldier, surpassed the greatest part of his contemporaries in acuteness, subtlety, and extent of genius, though he was much inferior to Gassendi in point of learning. In 1624, Gassendi attacked Aristotle, and the whole body of his commentators and followers, with great resolution and ingenuity;[d] but the resentment and indignation which he drew upon himself from all quarters by this bold attempt, and the sweetness of his natural temper, which made him an enemy to dissention and contest, engaged him to desist, and to suspend an enterprise, that, by opposing the prejudices, was so adapted to inflame the passions of the learned. Hence no more than two books of the work he had composed against the Aristotelians were made public; the other five were suppressed.[e] He also wrote against Fludd, and, by refuting him, refuted at the same time

[a] The title of *Rosecrucians* evidently denotes the chemical philosophers, and those who blended the doctrines of religion with the secrets of chymistry. The denomination itself is drawn from the science of chymistry; and they only who are acquainted with the peculiar language of the chymists can understand its true signification and energy. It is not compounded, as many imagine, of the two words *rosa* and *crux*, which signify *rose* and *cross*, but of the latter of these words, and the Latin word *ros*, which signifies *dew*. Of all natural bodies, *dew*, is the most powerful dissolvent of gold. The *cross*, in the chymical style, is equivalent to *light*; because the figure of the cross (+) exhibits, at the same time, the three letters of which the word *lux*, i. e. *light*, is compounded. Now *lux* is called by this sect the seed or menstruum of the red dragon; or, in other words, that gross and corporeal light, which, when properly digested and modified, produces gold. From all this it follows, that a Rosecrucian philosopher is one who, by the intervention and assistance of the dew, seeks for light, or, in other words, the substance called the Philosopher's Stone. All other explications of this term are false and chimerical. The interpretations that are given of it by the chymists, who love, on all occasions, to involve themselves in intricacy and darkness, are invented merely to deceive those who are strangers to their mysteries. The true energy and meaning of this denomination of Rosecrucians did not escape the penetration and sagacity of Gassendi, as appears by his Examen Philosophiæ Fluddanæ, sect. xv. It was, however, still more fully explained by Renaudot, a famous French physician, in his Conferences Publiques, t. iv. A great number of materials and anecdotes relating to the fraternity, rules, observances, and writings, of the Rosecrucians, (who made such a noise in this century,) may be found in Arnold's Kirchen-und-Ketzer, Historie, part ii. p. 1114.

[b] See, for an account of this singular man, from whose writings Jacob Behmen derived all his mystical aud rapturous doctrine, Wood's Athenæ Oxonienses, vol. i. p. 610. and Histor. et Antiq. Academiæ Oxoniensis, lib. ii. p. 308.—For an account of Helmont, the father, see Hen. Witte, Memor. Philosoph.—Consult also Joach. Fred. Feller, in Miscellan. Leibnitian.—Several writers beside Arnold have given an account of Jacob Behmen.*

[c] See Molleri Cimbria Literata, tom. i. p. 376.

[d] The title of his book against the Aristotelians is as follows: Exercitationum paradoxicarum adversus Aristoteleos Libri VII. in his quibus præcipua totius Peripateticæ Doctrinæ Fundamenta excutiuntur, Opiniones vero, ut ex vetustioribus obsoletæ, stabiliuntur.

[e] See Bougerelle's Vie de Gassendi.

* See, also sect. ii. part ii. chap. i. sect. xl. of this century.

the Rosecrucian Brethren; and here the Aristotelians seemed to behold his labours with a favourable eye. After having overturned several false and visionary systems of philosophy, he began to think of substituting something more solid and satisfactory in their place, and in pursuance of this design he proceeded with the utmost circumspection and caution. He recommended to others, and followed himself, that wise method of philosophical investigation, which, with a slow and timorous pace, rises from the objects of sense to the discussions of reason, and arrives at truth by assiduity, experiment, and an attentive observation of the laws of nature; or, to express the same thing in other words, he struck out that judicious method, which, by an attention to facts, to the changes and motions of the natural world, leads by degrees to general principles, and lays a solid foundation for rational inquiry. In the application of this method, he had recourse chiefly to mathematical succours, from a persuasion that demonstration and certainty were the peculiar fruits of that accurate and luminous science. He drew no assistance from metaphysics, which he overlooked from an opinion that the greatest part of its rules and decisions were too precarious to satisfy a sincere inquirer, animated with the love of truth.[a]

XXXII. Des-Cartes followed a very different method in his philosophical researches. He abandoned mathematics, which he had at first looked upon as the tree of knowledge, and employed the science of abstract ideas, or metaphysics, in the investigation of truth. Having accordingly laid down a few plain and general principles, which seemed to be deduced immediately from the nature of man, his next business was to form distinct notions of the Deity, of matter, soul, body, space, the universe, and the various parts of which it is composed. From these notions, examined with attention, compared and combined according to their mutual relations, connexions, and resemblances, and reduced into a kind of system, he proceeded still farther, and made admirable use of them in reforming the other branches of philosophy, and giving them a new degree of stability and consistence. This he effected by connecting all his branches of philosophical reasoning in such a manner, that principles and consequences were placed in the most accurate order, and the latter seemed to flow from the former in the most natural manner. This method of pursuing truth could not fail to attract the admiration of many; and so indeed it happened; for no sooner had Des-Cartes published his discoveries in philosophy, than a considerable number of eminent men, in different parts of Europe, who had long entertained a high disgust to the inelegant and ambiguous jargon of the schools, adopted these discoveries with zeal, declared their approbation of the new system, and expressed their desire that its author should be substituted in the place of the Peripatetics, as a philosophical guide to the youth in the public seminaries of learning. On the other hand, the Peripatetics, or Aristotelians, seconded by the influence of the clergy, who apprehended that the cause of religion was aimed at, and endangered, by these philosophical innovations, made a prodigious noise, and left no means unemployed to prevent the downfall of their old system, and diminish the growing reputation of the new philosophy. To execute this invidious purpose with the greater facility, they not only accused Des-Cartes of the most dangerous and pernicious errors, but went so far, in the extravagance of their malignity, as to bring a charge of atheism against him. This furious zeal of the Aristotelians will not appear so extraordinary, when it is considered, that they contended, not so much for their philosophical system, as for the honours, advantages, and profits they derived from it. The Theosophists, Rosecrucians, and Chymists, entered into this contest against Des-Cartes, but conducted themselves with greater moderation than the Aristotelians, notwithstanding their persuasion that the Peripatetic philosophy, though chimerical and impious, was much less intolerable than the Cartesian system.[b] The consequences of this dispute were favourable to the progress of science; for the wiser part of the European philosophers, although they did not adopt the sentiments of Des-Cartes, were encouraged and animated by his example to carry on their inquiries with more freedom from the restraints of traditional and personal authority than they had formerly done, and to throw resolutely from their necks that yoke of servitude, under which Aristotle and his followers had so long kept them in subjection.

XXXIII. The most eminent contemporaries of Des-Cartes applauded, in general, the efforts he made toward the reformation of philosophy, and that noble resolution with which he broke the shackles of magisterial authority, and struck out new paths, in which he proceeded without a guide, in the search after truth. They also approved his method of rising, with caution and accuracy, from the most simple, and, as it were, the primary dictates of reason and nature, to truths and propositions of a more complex and intricate kind, and of admitting nothing as truth, that was not clearly and distinctly apprehended as such. They went still farther, and unanimously acknowledged, that he had made most valuable and important discoveries in philosophy, and had demonstrated several truths, which, before his time, were received upon no other evidence than that of tradition and conjecture. But these acknowledgments did not prevent some of those who made them with the greatest sincerity, from finding several essential defects in the philosophy of this great man. They considered his account of the causes and principles of natural things, as for the most part hypothetical, and founded on fancy, rather than experience. They even attacked the fundamental principles upon which the whole system of his philosophy was built, such as his ideas of the Deity, of the universe, of matter and spirit, of the laws of motion, and other points that were connected with these. Some of these principles they pronounced uncertain; others, they said, were of a pernicious tendency, and likely to engender the most dangerous errors; and they affirmed, that some were directly contrary to the language of experience. At the head of these objectors appeared his fellow-citizen, Gassendi, who had made war before him upon the Aristotelians and Chymists; who, in genius, was his equal; in learning, greatly his superior; and whose mathematical

[a] See Gassendi's Institutiones Philosophiæ; a diffuse production, which takes up the two first volumes of his works, and in which his principal design is to show, that those opinions, both of the ancient and modern philosophers, which are deduced from metaphysical principles, have little solidity, and are generally defective in point of evidence and perspicuity.

[b] See Baillet's Vie de René Des-Cartes, and also the General Dictionary.

knowledge was most uncommon and extensive. This formidable adversary directed his first attacks against the metaphysical principles which supported the whole structure of the Cartesian philosophy. He then proceeded still farther; and, for the physical system of Des-Cartes, substituted one that resembled not a little the natural philosophy of Epicurus, though far superior to it in solidity, much more rational, consistent, and perfect, being founded, not on the illusory visions of fancy, but on the testimony of sense and the dictates of experience.[a] This new and sagacious observer of nature had not many followers, and his disciples were much less numerous than those of Des-Cartes. But what he wanted in number, was sufficiently compensated by the merit and reputation of those who adopted his philosophical system; for he was followed by some of the most eminent men in Europe, by persons who were distinguished in the highest degree by their indefatigable application, and their extensive knowledge both of natural philosophy and mathematics. He had certainly few disciples in his own country; but, among the English, who in his time were remarkable for their application to studies of a physical and mathematical kind, a considerable number adopted his philosophical system. It may here be observed, that even those eminent philosophers and divines, such as Whichcot, Gale, Cudworth, and More, who entered the lists with Hobbes, (whose doctrine came nearer to the principles of Gassendi than to the system of Des-Cartes,) and revived ancient Platonism, in order to crush under its weight the philosopher of Malmesbury, placed Gassendi and Plato in the same class, and explained the sentiments of the latter in such a manner as to make them appear quite agreeable to the principles of the former.[b]

XXXIV. From this period must be dated the famous schism that divided the philosophical world into two great sects, which, though they almost agree upon those points that are of the greatest utility and importance in human life, differ widely about the principles of human knowledge, and the fundamental points whence the philosopher must proceed in his search of truth. Of these sects, one may properly be called *Metaphysical*, and the other *Mathematical*. The metaphysical sect follows the system of Des-Cartes; the mathematical one directs its researches by the principles of Gassendi. Philosophers of the former class look upon truth as attainable by abstract reasoning; those of the latter seek it by observation and experience. The follower of Des-Cartes attributes little to the external senses, and much to meditation and discussion. The disciple of Gassendi, on the contrary, places little confidence in metaphysical discussion, and principally has recourse to the reports of sense and the contemplation of nature. The Cartesian, from a small number of abstract truths, deduces a long series of propositions, in order to arrive at a precise and accurate knowledge of God and nature, of body and spirit; the Gassendian admits these metaphysical truths, but at the same time denies the possibility of erecting, upon their basis, a regular and solid system of philosophy, without the aid of assiduous observation and repeated experiments, which are the most natural and effectual means of philosophical progress and improvement. The one, eagle-like, soars with an intrepid flight to the first fountain of truth, and to the general relations and final causes of things; and thence descending, explains, by them, the various changes and appearances of nature, the attributes and counsels of the Deity, the moral constitution and duties of man, the frame and structure of the universe. The other, more difficult and cautious, observes with attention, and examines with assiduity, the objects that are before his eyes; and rises gradually from them to the first cause, and the primordial principle of things. The Cartesians suppose, that many things are known by man with the utmost certainty; and hence arises their propensity to form their opinions and doctrines into a regular system. The followers of Gassendi consider man as in a state of ignorance with respect to an immense number of points, and, consequently, think it incumbent upon them to suspend their judgment in a multitude of cases, until time and experience dispel their darkness; and hence it is also, that they consider a *system* as an attempt of too adventurous a nature, and by no means proportioned to the narrow extent of human knowledge; or, at least, they think, that the business of system-making ought to be left to the philosophers of future times, who, by joining the observations and experience of many ages, may acquire a more satisfactory and accurate knowledge of nature than has been yet attained.

These dissensions and contests concerning the first principles of human knowledge, produced various debates upon other subjects of the utmost moment and importance; such as, the nature of God, the essence of matter, the elements or constituent principles of bodies, the laws of motion, the manner in which the Divine Providence exerts itself in the government of the world, the frame and structure of the universe, the nature, union, and joint operations of soul and body. If we consider attentively the profound and intricate nature of these subjects, together with the limits, debility, and imperfections of the human understanding, we shall see too much reason to fear, that these contests will last as long as the present state of man.[c] The wise and the good, sensible of this, will carry on such debates with a spirit of mildness and mutual forbearance; and, knowing that differences in opinions are inevitable where truth is so difficult of access, will guard against that temerity with which too many disputants accuse their antagonists of irreligion and impiety.[d]

[a] See his Disquisitio Metaphysica, seu Dubitationes et Instantiæ adversus Cartesii Metaphysicam, et Responsa, in the third volume of his works.—Bernier, a celebrated French physician, has given an accurate view of the philosophy of Gassendi in his abridgment of it, published at Lyons, in 1684. This abridgment will give the reader a better account of this philosophy than even the works of Gassendi himself, in which his meaning is often expressed in an ambiguous manner, and which are, besides, loaded with superfluous erudition. The Life of Gassendi, accurately written by Bougerelle, a priest of the oratory, was published in 1737.—See Biblioth. Francoise, tom. xxvii. p. 353.

[b] See the preface to the Latin translation of Cudworth's Intellectual System; and also the *remarks* added to that translation. ☞ Dr. Mosheim is the author of that *translation* and of those *remarks*.

[c] Voltaire published, in 1740, at Amsterdam, a pamphlet, entitled, La Metaphysique de Newton, ou Parallele des Sentimens de Newton et de Leibnitz, which, though superficial and inaccurate, may be useful to those readers who have not application enough to draw from better sources, and are desirous of knowing how much these two philosophical sects differ in their principles and tenets.

[d] It is abundantly known that Des-Cartes and his metaphysical followers were accused by many of striking at the foundations of all religion; nor is this accusation entirely withdrawn even in our times. See, in the miscellaneous works of Father Hardouin, his Atheists Unmasked. Among these pretended atheists, Des-Cartes, and his two famous disciples, (Antoine Le Grand and Sylvain Regis,) hold, the first rank; nor is Father Malebranche, though he seems rather chargeable with fanaticism

XXXV. Those who had either adopted, without exception, the principles of Des-Cartes, or who, without going so far, approved the method and rules laid down by him for the investigation of truth, employed all their zeal and industry in correcting, amending, confirming, and illustrating, the metaphysical species of philosophy; and its votaries were exceedingly numerous, particularly in France and in the United Provinces. But among the members of this philosophical sect there were some who aimed at the destruction of all religion, more especially Spinosa, and others, who, like Balthasar Becker,[a] made use of the principles of Des-Cartes, to overturn some doctrines of Christianity, and to pervert others. This circumstance proved disadvantageous to the whole sect, and brought it into disrepute in many places. The metaphysical philosophy fell, however, afterwards into better hands, and was treated with great wisdom and acuteness by Malebranche, a man of uncommon eloquence and subtlety; and by Leibnitz, whose name is consigned to immortality as one of the greatest geniuses that ever appeared in the world.[b] Neither of these great men, indeed, adopted all the principles and doctrines of Des-Cartes; but both of them approved, upon the whole, his philosophical method, which they enlarged, amended, and improved, by several additions and corrections, that rendered its procedure more luminous and sure. This is more especially true of Leibnitz, who, rejecting the suggestions of fancy, seemed to follow no other guides than reason and judgment; for Malebranche, having received from nature a warm and exuberant imagination, was too much ruled by its dictates, and was thus often imperceptibly led into the visionary regions of enthusiasm.

XXXVI. The mathematical philosophy already mentioned, was much less studied and adopted than the metaphysical system, and its followers in France were very few in number. But it met with a favourable reception in Great Britain, whose philosophers perceiving, in its infant and unfinished features, the immortal lines of Verulam's wisdom, snatched it from its cradle, in a soil where it was ready to perish, cherished it with parental tenderness, and have still continued their zealous efforts to bring it to maturity and perfection. The Royal Society of London, which may be considered as the philosophical seminary of the nation, took it under their protection, and have neither spared expense nor pains to cultivate and improve it, and to render it subservient to the purposes of life. It owed, more especially, a great part of its progress and improvement to the countenance, industry, and genius of that immortal protector of science, the pious and venerable Robert Boyle, whose memory will be ever precious to the worthy and the wise, the friends of religion, learning, and mankind. The illustrious names of Barrow, Wallis, and Locke, may also be added to the list of those who contributed to the progress of natural knowledge. Nor were the learned divines of the British nation (though that order has often excited the complaints of philosophers, and been supposed to behold, with a jealous and suspicious eye, the efforts of philosophy as dangerous to the cause of religion) less zealous than the other patrons of science in this noble cause. On the contrary, they looked upon the improvement of natural knowledge not only as innocent, but as of the highest utility and importance; as admirably adapted to excite and maintain in the minds of men a profound veneration for the Supreme Creator and Governor of the world, and to furnish new supports to the cause of religion; and also as agreeable both to the laws and the spirit of the Gospel, and to the sentiments of the primitive church. And hence it was that those doctors, who, in the lectures founded by Mr. Boyle, attacked the enemies of religion, employed in this noble and pious attempt the succours of philosophy with the most happy and triumphant success. But the immortal man, to whose immense genius and indefatigable industry philosophy owed its greatest improvements, and who carried the lamp of knowledge into paths of nature that had been unexplored before his time, was Sir Isaac Newton,[c] whose name was revered, and whose genius was admired, even by his warmest adversaries. This great man spent, with uninterrupted assiduity, the whole of a long life in correcting, digesting, and enlarging, the new philosophy, and in throwing upon it the light of demonstration and evidence, both by observing the laws of nature, and by subjecting them to the rules of calculation; and thus he introduced a great change into natural science, and brought it to a very high degree of perfection.[d] The English look upon it as an unquestionable proof of the

than atheism, exempted from a place in this odious list. It is true that Hardouin, who gives so liberally a place in the atheistical class to these great men, was himself a visionary dreamer, whose judgment, in many cases, is little to be respected; but it is also true, that, in the work now under consideration, he does not reason from his own whimsical notions, but draws all his arguments from those followers of Aristotle and Gassendi, who have opposed, with the greatest success and acuteness, the Cartesian system. Even Voltaire, notwithstanding the moderation with which he expresses himself, seems plainly enough to give his assent to the accusers of Des-Cartes. On the other hand, it must be observed that these accusers are censured in their turns by several modern metaphysicians. Gassendi, for example, is charged by Arnauld with overturning the doctrine of the soul's immortality in his controversy with Des-Cartes, and by Leibnitz with corrupting and destroying the whole system of natural religion: see Des-Maizeaux, Recueil de diverses pieces sur la Philosophie, tom. ii.* Leibnitz has also ventured to affirm, that Sir Isaac Newton and his followers rob the Deity of some of his most excellent attributes, and sap the foundations of natural religion. In short, the controversial writings on both sides are filled with rash and indecorous reproaches of this kind.

☞ * See, for a farther account of the particular tenets and opinions of Becker, sect. ii. part ii. chap. ii. sect. xxxv. of this century.

[b] For an ample and interesting account of Malebranche and his philosophy, see Fontenelle's Eloges des Academiciens, tom. i. p. 317, and, for a view of the errors and defects of his metaphysical system, see Hardouin's Atheists Unmasked, in his Œuvres Melées, p. 43. Fontenelle has also given an account of the life and philosophical sentiments of Leibnitz, in the work already quoted, vol. ii,; but a much more ample one has been published in German by Charles Gunther Ludewig, in his history of the Leibnitian Philosophy. However, the genius and philosophy of this great man are best to be learned from his letters, published by Kortholt.

☞ [c] Mr. Hume's account of this great man is extremely just, and contains some peculiar strokes that do honour to this elegant painter of minds. "In Newton, (*says he,*) this island may boast of having produced the greatest and rarest genius that ever arose for the ornament and instruction of the species. Cautious in admitting no principles but such as were founded in experiment; but resolute to adopt every such principle, however new and unusual; from modesty, ignorant of his superiority above the rest of mankind, and thence less careful to accommodate his reasonings to common apprehensions; more anxious to merit than to acquire fame; he was, from these causes, long unknown to the world; but his reputation, at last, broke out with a lustre, which scarcely any writer, during his own life-time, had ever before attained. While Newton seemed to draw off the veil from some of the mysteries of nature, he showed, at the same time, the imperfections of the mechanical philosophy; and thereby restored her ultimate secrets to that obscurity, in which they ever did and ever will remain."

[d] The Mathematical Principles of Natural Philosophy, as also the other writings, whether philosophical, mathematical, or theological, of

☞ * It appears, on reference, that the censure is not conveyed in such strong terms as those employed by our historian; Leibnitz merely says, that Gassendi appeared to hesitate and waver too much concerning the nature of the soul, and the principles of natural religion.

solidity and excellence of the Newtonian philosophy, that its most eminent votaries were friends to religion, and have transmitted to posterity shining examples of piety and virtue; while, on the contrary, the Cartesian or metaphysical system has exhibited, in its followers, many flagrant instances of irreligion, and some demonstrations of the most horrid impiety.

XXXVII. The two famous philosophical sects now mentioned, deprived, indeed, all the ancient systems of natural science, both of their credit and their disciples; and hence it might have been expected that they would have totally engrossed and divided between them the suffrages of the learned. But this was not the case; the liberty of thinking being restored by Des-Cartes and Newton, who broke the fetters of prejudice, in which philosophical superstition had confined, in former times, the human understanding, a variety of sects sprang up. Some trusting to their superior genius and sagacity, and others, more remarkable for the exuberance of their fancy than for the solidity of their judgment, pretended to strike out new paths in the unknown regions of nature, and new methods of investigating truth; but of their disciples the number was small, and the duration of their inventions transitory; and therefore it is sufficient to have barely mentioned them. There appeared also another sort of men, whom mediocrity of genius, or an indolent turn of mind, indisposed for investigating truth by the exertion of their own talents and powers, and who, terrified at the view of such an arduous task, contented themselves with borrowing from the different sects such of their respective tenets as seemed to them most remarkable for their perspicuity and solidity, more especially those concerning which all the different sects were agreed. These they compiled and digested into a system, and pushed their inquiries no farther. The philosophers of this class are generally termed *Eclectics*. From these remarkable differences of sentiment and system that reigned among the jarring sects, some persons, otherwise distinguished by their acuteness and sagacity, took occasion to represent truth as unattainable by such a short-sighted being as man, and to revive the desperate and uncomfortable *doctrine* (shall I call it, or *jargon*) of the Sceptics, that had long been buried in the silence and oblivion which it deserved. The most eminent of these cloudy philosophers were Sanchez, a physician of Toulouse,[a] de la Mothe le Vayer,[b] Huet, bishop of Avranches,[c] to whom we may justly add Peter Bayle,[d] who, by the erudition and wit that abound in his voluminous works, acquired a distinguished reputation in the republic of letters.

this great man, are abundantly known. There is an elegant account of his life, and literary and philosophical merit, given by Fontenelle, in his Eloge des Academiciens, tom. ii. p. 293.—See also the Biblioth. Angloise, tom. xv. par. ii. p. 545, and Biblioth. Raisonée, tom. vi. par. ii. p. 478. ☞ See more especially the late learned and ingenious Mr. Maclaurin's Account of Sir Isaac Newton's Discoveries.

[a] There is still extant a famous book of this writer, entitled, *de eo quod nihil scitur*, which, with the rest of his works, and an account of his life, appeared at Toulouse, in 1636. See Bayle's Dictionary, and Villemandi Scepticismus debellatus, cap. iv.

[b] See Bayle's Dictionary for an account of this author.

[c] Huet's book concerning the Weakness of Human Reason was published after his death, in French, at Amsterdam, in 1723, and lately in Latin. It appears, however, that this eminent writer had, long before the composition of this book, recommended the sceptical method of conducting philosophical researches, and looked upon it as the best adapted to establish the truth of Christianity upon solid foundations. See the Commentarius de Rebus ad eum pertinentibus, lib. iv. p. 230; and Demonstrat Evangelicæ Præfat. sect. iv. p. 9, where he commends *their* manner of proceeding, *who*, by sceptical arguments, invalidate all philosophical principles, before they begin to prove the truth of Christianity to those who doubt of its evidence. It is well known that the Jesuits, who were particularly favoured by Huet, have, on many occasions, employed this method to throw dust in the eyes of the Protestants, and thus lead them blindfold into the Romish communion, and that they still continue to practise the same insidious instrument of seduction.

[d] Every thing relating to the life and sentiments of Bayle is abundantly and universally known. His life, composed by M. Des-Maizeaux, was published at the Hague in 1732.—The scepticism of this insidious and seducing writer was unmasked and refuted, with great learning and force of argument, by J. P. de Crousaz, in a voluminous French work, entitled, Traité du Pyrrhonisme, of which M. Formey gave an elegant and judicious abridgment under the title of Triomphe de l'Evidence.

SECTION II.

PART I.

THE HISTORY OF THE MORE ANCIENT CHURCHES.

CHAPTER I.

Containing the History of the Romish Church.

I. Hippolito Aldobrandini, under the papal name of Clement VIII. continued to rule the church of Rome at the commencement of this century, having been elected to that high dignity toward the conclusion of the preceding one. The eminent abilities and insidious dexterity of this pontiff, as also his ardent desire of extinguishing the Protestant religion, and extending the limits of the Romish church, are universally acknowledged; but it is much questioned, whether his prudence was equal to the arduous nature of his pontifical station, and the critical circumstances of an incidental kind that arose during his administration.[a] He was succeeded in 1605 by Leo XI. of the house of Medici, who died a few weeks after his election, and thus left the papal chair open to Camillo Borghese, by whom it was filled under the denomination of Paul V. This pontiff was of a haughty and violent spirit, jealous to excess of his authority, and insatiably furious in the execution of his revenge upon such as encroached on his pretended prerogative, as appears in a striking manner by his rash and unsuccessful contest with the Venetians.[b]—Gregory XV.,[c] who was raised to the pontificate in 1621, seemed to be of a milder disposition, though he was not less defective than his predecessor in equity and clemency toward those who had separated themselves from the church of Rome. An unjust severity against the friends of the Reformation is, indeed, the general and inevitable character of the Roman pontiffs; for, without this, they would be destitute of the predominant and distinctive mark of the papacy. A pope inspired with sentiments of toleration and charity toward those who refuse a blind submission to his opinions and decisions, is a contradiction in terms. Urban VIII., who previously bore the name of Meffei Barberini, and who, by his interest in the conclave, ascended the papal throne in 1623, was a man of letters, an eloquent writer, an elegant poet, and a generous and munificent patron of learning and genius;[d] but nothing could equal the rigour and barbarity with which he treated all who bore the name of Protestants. He may be indeed considered as a good and equitable ruler of the church, when compared with Innocent X. of the family of Pamphili, who succeeded him in 1644. This unworthy pontiff, to a profound ignorance of all those things which it was necessary for a Christian bishop to know, joined the most shameful indolence and the most notorious profligacy; for he abandoned his person, his dignity, the administration of his temporal affairs, and the government of the church, to the disposal of Donna Olympia,[e] a woman of corrupt morals, insatiable avarice, and boundless ambition.[f] His zealous endeavours to prevent the peace of Westphalia, however odious they may appear when considered in themselves, ought not to be reckoned among his personal crimes, since it is to be supposed, that any other pontiff, in his place, would have made the same attempts without hesitation or remorse. He was succeeded in the papal chair, in 1655, by Fabio Chigi, who assumed the title of Alexander VII. and who, though less odious than his predecessor, nevertheless possessed all the pernicious qualities that are necessary to constitute a true pope, and without which the papal jurisdiction and majesty cannot be maintained. The other parts of his character are drawn much to his disadvantage, by several ingenious and eminent writers of the Romish church, who represent him as a man of a mean genius, unequal to great or difficult undertakings, full of craft and dissimulation, and chargeable with the most shameful levity and the greatest inconsistency of sentiment and conduct.[g] The two Clements IX. and X. who were elected succes-

[a] This pontiff had an edition of the Vulgate published, which was very different from that of pope Sixtus; and this is one of the many instances of that *contrariety* of opinion which has prevailed amongst the *infallible* heads of the church of Rome.

☞ [b] This contest arose, partly from two edicts of the republic of Venice for preventing the unnecessary increase of religious buildings, and the augmentation of the enormous wealth of the clergy; and partly from the prosecution of two ecclesiastics for capital crimes, who had not been delivered up to the pope at his requisition. It is not surprising that these proceedings of the Venetians, however just and equitable, should inflame the ambitious fury of a pontiff, who called himself Vice-God, the Monarch of Christendom, and the Supporter of Papal Omnipotence. Accordingly, Paul subjected all the dominions of the republic to an interdict, while the Venetians, on the other hand, declared that unjust and tyrannical mandate null and void, and banished from their territory the Jesuits and Capuchins, who had openly disobeyed the laws of the state. Preparations for war were proceeding on both sides, when an accommodation, not very honourable to the pope, was brought about by the mediation of Henry IV. of France. This controversy between the pope and the Venetians produced several important pieces, composed by Sarpi on the side of the republic, and by Baronius and Bellarmine in behalf of the pontiff. The controversy concerning the nature and limits of the pope's pretended supremacy is judiciously stated, and the papal pretensions are accurately examined, by Sarpi, in his history of this tyrannical interdict, which, in Italian, occupies the fourth volume of his works, and was translated into Latin by William Bedell, of Cambridge.

—It was Paul V. that dishonoured his title of *Holiness*, and cast an eternal stain upon his *infallibility*, by an express approbation of the doctrine of Suarez, the Jesuit, in defence of the murder of kings.

☞ [c] His family name was Alexander Ludovisio.

[d] See Leonis Allatii Apes Urbanæ. This little work is a sort of index, or list, of all the learned and eminent men who adorned Rome, under the pontificate of Urban VIII. and experienced the munificence and liberality of that pontiff; and their number is far from being small. The Latin poems of Urban, which are not without a considerable portion of wit and elegance, have passed through several editions. ☞ These poems were composed while he was yet a cardinal. After his elevation to the pontificate, he published a remarkable edition of the Romish Breviary and several bulls; among which, that which abolishes the order of Female Jesuits and certain festivals, those relating to image-worship, and to the condemnation of Jansenius' Augustinus, and that which confers the title of Eminence upon the cardinal-legates, the three ecclesiastical electors, and the grand master of Malta, are the most worthy of notice.

☞ [e] This Donna Olympia Maldachini was his brother's widow, with whom he had lived, before his elevation to the pontificate, in an illicit commerce, in which his *holiness* continued afterwards.

[f] See the Memoires du Cardinal de Retz, tom. iii. and iv. of the last edition published at Geneva.—For an account of the disputes between this pontiff and the French, see Bougeant's Histoire de la Paix de Westphalie, tom. iv.

[g] See the Memoires du Cardinal de Retz, tom. iv. p. 16, 77.—Me

sively to the papacy in 1668 and 1669, were concerned in few transactions that deserve to be transmitted to posterity.[a] This was not the case of Benedict Odeschalchi, who is known in the list of pontiffs by the denomination of Innocent XI. and was raised to that high dignity in 1677.[b] This respectable pontiff acquired a very high and permanent reputation by the austerity of his morals, his uncommon courage and resolution, his dislike of the grosser superstitions that reigned in the Romish church, his attempts to reform the manners of the clergy, and to abolish a considerable number of those fictions and frauds that dishonour their ministry, and also by other solid and eminent virtues. But it appeared manifestly by his example that those pontiffs, who respect truth, and act from virtuous and Christian principles, may, indeed, form noble plans, but will never be able to carry them into execution, or at least to give them that measure of stability and perfection, which is the object of their wishes. By his example and administration it appeared, that the wisest institutions, and the most judicious establishments, will be unable to stand firm, for any considerable time, against the insidious stratagems, or declared opposition of a deluded multitude, who are corrupted by the prevalence of licentious morals, whose imaginations are impregnated with superstitious fictions and fables, whose credulity is abused by pious frauds, and whose minds are nourished, or rather amused, with vain rites and senseless ceremonies.[c] Be that as it may, all the wise and salutary regulations of Innocent XI. were suffered to go almost to ruin by the criminal indolence of Peter Ottoboni, who was raised to the head of the Romish church, in 1689, and assumed the name of Alexander VIII. A laudable attempt was made to revive them by Innocent XII., a man of uncommon merit and eminent talents, whose name was Pignatelli, and who, in 1691, succeeded Alexander in the papal chair; nor were his zealous endeavours absolutely destitute of success. But it was also his fate to learn, by experience, that the most prudent and resolute pontiffs are unequal to such an arduous task, such an Herculean labour, as the reformation of the church and court of Rome; nor were the fruits of this good pope's wise administration enjoyed long after his decease.[d] The pontiff, whose reign concluded this century, was John Francis Albani, who was raised to the head of the Romish church in 1699, and assumed the name of Clement XI. He surpassed in learning the whole college of cardinals, and was inferior to none of the preceding pontiffs in sagacity, lenity, and a desire, at least, to govern well; but he was very far from opposing, with a proper degree of vigour and resolution, the inveterate corruptions and superstitious observances of the church over which he presided; on the contrary, he inconsiderately aimed at, what he thought, the honour and advantage of the church (that is, the glory and interests of its pontiff) by measures that proved detrimental to both; and thus showed, by a striking example, that popes, even of the best disposition, may fall imperceptibly into the greatest mistakes, and commit the most pernicious blunders, through an imprudent zeal for extending their jurisdiction, and augmenting the influence and lustre of their station.[e]

II. The incredible pains that were taken by the pontiffs and clergy of the Romish church, to spread their doctrine and to erect their dominion among the nations that lay in the darkness of Paganism, have been already mentioned. We are, therefore, at present, to confine our narration to the schemes they laid, the cabals they formed, and the commotions they excited, with an uninterrupted and mischievous industry, in order to recover the possessions and prerogatives they had lost in Europe, to oppress the Protestants, and to extinguish the light of the glorious Reformation. Various were the stratagems and projects they formed for these purposes. The resources of genius, the force of arms, the seduction of the most alluring promises, the terrors of the most formidable threatenings, the subtle wiles of controversy, the influence of pious, and often of impious frauds, the arts of dissimulation, in short, all possible means, fair or disingenuous, were employed for the destruction of the reformed churches, but in most cases without success. The plan of a dreadful attack upon the friends of the Reformation had been, for some time, formed in secret; and the bigoted and persecuting house of Austria, at the pope's persuasion, undertook to put it in execution. However, as injustice, however arrogant, usually seeks some pretext to mask, or at least to diminish its deformity, so the church of Rome endeavored before-hand to justify the persecution, of which the flame was ready to break out. For this purpose, the pens of the perfidious and learned Scioppius,[f]

moires de M. Joly, tom. ii. p. 186, 210, 237.—Archenholtz, Memoires de la Reine Christine, tom. ii. p. 125. ☞ The craft and dissimulation attributed to this pontiff really constituted an essential part of his character; but it is not strictly true that he was a man of a mean genius, or unequal to great and difficult undertakings. He was a man of learning, and discovered very eminent abilities at the treaty of Munster, where he appeared in the character of nuncio. Some writers relate, that, while he was in Germany, he had formed the design of abjuring popery, and embracing the Protestant religion, but was deterred from the execution of this purpose by the example of his cousin count Pompey, who was poisoned at Lyons, on his way to Germany, after he had abjured the Romish faith. These writers add, that Chigi was confirmed in his religion by his elevation to the cardinalship. See Bayle, Nouvelles de la Repub. des Lettres, Oct. 1688.

☞ [a] Clement IX. was of the family of Rospigliosi, and the family name of Clement X. was Altieri. See Memoires de la Reine Christine, tom. ii. There are upon record several transactions of Clement IX. that do him honour, and prove his dislike of nepotism, and his love of peace and justice.

☞ [b] Some maintain, and with the strongest appearance of truth, that this pontiff had formerly been a soldier, though this report is treated as groundless by count Turrezonico, in his dissertation 'de suppositiis militaribus Stipendiis Bened. Odeschalchi.' See an interesting account of this pontiff in Bayle's Dictionary.

[c] See Journal Universel, tom. i. p. 441; tom. vi. p. 306. The present pope, Benedict XIV.,* attempted, in the year 1743, the *canonization* of Innocent XI.; but the king of France, instigated by the Jesuits, opposed this design, chiefly on account of the misunderstandings that always subsisted between Louis XIV. and Innocent, of which more will be said hereafter.

[d] For an account of the character, morals, and election of Innocent XII., see the Letters of cardinal Norris, published in the fifth volume of his Works, p. 362.

[e] In the year 1752, there appeared, at Padua, a Life of Clement XI., composed in French by the learned and eloquent M. Lafitau, bishop of Sisteron. In the same year M. Reboulet, chancellor of Avignon, published his Histoire de Clement XI. These two productions, and more epecially the latter, are written with uncommon elegance; but they abound with historical errors, which the French writers, in general, are at too little pains to avoid. Besides, they are both composed rather in the strain of panegyric than of history. An attentive reader will, however, easily perceive, even in these panegyrics, that Clement XI., notwithstanding his acknowledged sagacity and prudence, took several rash and inconsiderate steps, in order to augment the power, and multiply the prerogatives of the Roman pontiffs; and thus, through his own temerity, involved himself in various perplexities.

☞ [f] Scioppius seems rather to merit the titles of *malevolent* and *furious*, than that of *perfidious*, unless his turning papist be considered by Dr. Mosheim as an instance of perfidy. This is the intemperate and odious satirist who was caned by the servants of the English ambassador at Madrid, for the invectives he had thrown out against king James I.

* This note was written during the life of Benidict XIV.

of the Jesuits Tanner, Possevin, Hager, Hederic, and Forer, jurists of Dillingen, were employed to represent the treaty of peace, concluded between Charles V. and the protestants of Germany, as unjust, null, and even rendered void by the Protestants themselves, by their departing from, or at least perverting, by various changes and modifications, the confession of Augsburg.[a] This injurious charge was proved groundless by several Lutheran doctors who, of their own accord, defended their communion against this instance of popish calumny; and it was also refuted by public authority, by the express order of John George, elector of Saxony. The task was committed to Matthew Hoe, who, in the years 1628 and 1631, published an accurate and laborious defence of the Protestants, entitled, Defensio Pupillæ Evangelicæ. The mouth of calumny was not stopped by these performances. The accusers continued their clamours, multiplied their libels, and had recourse to the succours of indecent raillery and sarcastic wit, to cover as well as they were able, the striking defects of a bad cause. On the other hand, the Lutheran writers exerted themselves in exposing the sophistry, and refuting the arguments and invectives of their adversaries.

III. The first flames of that religious war, which the Roman pontiffs proposed to carry on by the arms of the Austrians and Spaniards, their servile and bigoted instruments, broke out in Austria, where, about the commencement of this century, the friends of the Reformation were cruelly persecuted and oppressed by their Roman catholic adversaries.[b] The solemn treaties and conventions, by which the religious liberty and civil rights of these Protestants had been secured, were trampled upon, and violated in the most shocking manner; nor had these unhappy sufferers resolution, vigour, or strength, sufficient to maintain their privileges. The Bohemians, who were involved in the same vexations, proceeded in a different manner. Perceiving plainly that the votaries of Rome earnestly wished to deprive them of that religious liberty which had been purchased by the blood of their ancestors, and so lately confirmed to them by an imperial edict, they came to a resolution of taking up arms to defend themselves against a set of men, whom, in consequence of the violence they offered to conscience, they could look upon in no other light than as the enemies of their souls. Accordingly a league was formed by the Bohemian Protestants; and they began to avenge, with great spirit and resolution, the injuries that had been committed against their persons, their families, their religion, and their civil rights and privileges. But it must be acknowledged, that, in this just attempt to defend what was dear to them as men and Christians, they lost sight of the dictates of equity and moderation, and carried their resentment beyond the bounds, both of reason and religion. Their adversaries were alarmed at a view of their intrepidity, but were not dismayed. The Bohemians, therefore, apprehending still farther opposition and vexations from bigotry, animated by a spirit of vengeance, renewed their efforts to provide for their security. The death of the emperor Matthias, which happened in 1619, furnished them, as they thought, with an opportunity of striking at the root of the evil, and removing the source of their calamities, by choosing a sovereign of the reformed religion; for they considered themselves as authorized by the ancient laws and customs of the kingdom, to reject any one who pretended to the throne by virtue of an hereditary right, and to demand a prince whose title to the crown should be derived from the free suffrages of the states. Accordingly, Frederic V., elector Palatine, who professed the reformed religion, was, in the same year, chosen king of Bohemia, and solemnly crowned at Prague.[c]

IV. This bold step, from which the Bohemians expected such signal advantages, proved to them a source of complicated misfortunes. Its consequences were highly detrimental to their new sovereign, and fatal to their own liberties and privileges; for by it they were involved in the most dreadful calamities, and deprived of the free exercise of the Protestant religion, the security of which was the ultimate end of all the measures they had pursued. Frederic was defeated, before Prague, by the Imperial army, in 1620, and by this unfortunate battle was not only deprived of his new crown, but also of his hereditary dominions. Reduced thus to the wretched condition of an exile, he was obliged to leave his fruitful territories, and his ample treasures, to the merciless discretion of the Austrians and Bavarians, who plundered and ravaged them with the most rapacious barbarity. The defeat of this unfortunate prince was attended with dreadful consequences to the Bohemians, and more especially to those who, from a zeal for religious liberty and the interests of the Reformation, had embarked in his cause. Some of them were committed to a perpetual prison, others banished for life; several had their estates and possessions confiscated; many were put to death; and the whole nation was obliged, from that fatal period, to embrace the religion of the victor, and bend an unwilling neck under the yoke of Rome. The triumph of the Austrians would neither have been so sudden nor so complete, nor would they have been in a condition to impose such rigourous and despotic terms on the Bohemians, had they not been powerfully assisted by John George I., elector of Saxony, who, partly from a principle of hatred toward the Reformed,[d] and partly from considerations of a political kind, reinforced with his troops the imperial army.[e] This

in a book which was burned by the hands of the common hangman at Paris.

[a] See Salig, Hist. August. Confessionis, t. i. lib. iv. cap. iii. p. 768.

[b] Raupachius, in his Austria Evangelica, (a German work with a Latin title,) has given an accurate account of this persecution and these commotions. The same learned and worthy author had formed the design of publishing an authentic and circumstantial relation of the sufferings of the Protestants in Styria, Moravia, and Carinthia, with an account of the perfidious snares that were laid for them, the whole drawn from unexceptionable records; but death prevented the execution of this scheme.

[c] Beside Caroli and Jagerus, who have composed the ecclesiastical history of this century, see Burch. Gotth. Struvii Syntagma Historiæ Germanicæ, p. 1487, 1510, 1523, 1538; as also the writers whom he recommends. See also the Histoire de Louis XIII., composed by the learned and accurate Le Vassor, tom. iii. p. 223.

[d] By the Reformed, as has been already observed, we are to understand the Calvinists, and also, in general, those Protestants who are not of the Lutheran persuasion. And here we see a Lutheran elector drawing his sword to support the cause of popery and persecution against a people generously struggling for the Protestant religion, and the rights of conscience.

[e] See the Commentarii de Bello Bohemico-Germanico, ab A. C. 1617 ad An. 1630.—Abraham Scultet, Narratio Apologetica de Curriculo Vitæ suæ, p. 86.—It is well known, that the Roman catholics, and more especially Martin Becan, a Jesuit, persuaded Matthew Hoe, who was an Austrian by birth, and the elector's chaplain, to represent to his prince the cause of the elector Palatine (which was the cause of the reformed religion) as not only unjust, but also as detrimental to the interest of

invasion of the Palatinate was the occasion of that long and bloody war, that was so injurious to Germany, and in which the greatest part of the princes of Europe were, in one way or another, unhappily engaged. It began by a confederacy formed between some German powers and the king of Denmark, in order to assert the rights of the elector Palatine, unjustly excluded from his dominions, against the despotic proceedings of the emperor. The confederates maintained, that the invasion of Bohemia, by this unhappy prince, was no just subject of offence to the emperor; and that the house of Austria, whose quarrel the emperor was not obliged by any means to adopt, was alone the sufferer in this case. However that may have been, the progress and issue of the war were unfavourable to the allies.

V. The success of the imperial arms filled the votaries of popery and Rome with the warmest transports of joy and exultation, and presented to their imaginations the most flattering prospects. They thought that the happy period was now approaching, when the whole tribe of heretics, that had withdrawn their necks from the papal yoke, should either perish by the sword, or be reduced under the dominion of the church. The emperor himself seemed to have imbibed no small portion of this odious spirit, which was doubly prepared, to convert or destroy. The flame of ambition that burned within him was nourished by the suggestions of bigotry. Hence he audaciously carried his arms through a great part of Germany, suffered his generals to harass, with impunity, such princes and states as refused a blind obedience to the court of Rome, and showed plainly, by all his proceedings, that a scheme had been laid for the extinction of the Germanic liberty, civil and sacred. The Saxon elector's zealous attachment to the emperor, which he had abundantly discovered by his warm and ungenerous opposition to the unfortunate Frederic, together with the lamentable discord that reigned among the German princes, persuaded the papal faction, that the difficulties which seemed to oppose the execution of their project, were far from being invincible. Accordingly, the persons concerned in this grand enterprise began to act their respective parts. In 1629, Ferdinand II., to give some colour of justice to this religious war, issued out the terrible *restitution-edict*, by which the Protestants were ordered to restore to the church of Rome all the possessions of which they had become masters in consequence of the religious peace, concluded in the preceding century.[a] This edict principally arose from the suggestions of the Jesuits. That greedy and ambitious order claimed a great part of these goods and possessions as a recompense due to their labours in the cause of religion; and hence arose a warm contest between them and the ancient and rea. proprietors.[b] This contest, indeed, was decided by the law of force. It was the depopulating soldier, who, sword in hand, gave weight and authority to the imperial edict, wresting out of the hands of the lawful possessor, without form of process, whatever the Romish priests and monks thought proper to claim, and treating the innocent and plundered sufferers with all the severity that the most barbarous spirit of oppression and injustice could suggest.[c]

VI. Germany groaned under these dismal scenes of tumult and oppression, and looked about for succour in vain. The enemy assailed her on all sides; and not one of her princes seemed qualified to stand forth as the avenger of her injuries, or the assertor of her rights. Some were restrained from appearing in her cause by the suggestions of bigotry, others by a principle of fear, and others again by an ungenerous attention to their own private interest, which choked in their breasts all concern for the public good. An illustrious hero, whose deeds even envy was obliged to revere, and whose name will descend with glory to the latest ages, came forth, nevertheless, at this critical season; Gustavus Adolphus took the field, and maintained the cause of the Germanic liberties against the oppression and tyranny of the house of Austria. At the earnest request of the French court, which beheld, with uneasiness, the overgrown power of that aspiring house, he set sail for Germany, in 1629, with a small army; and, by his repeated victories, blasted, in a short time, the sanguine hopes which the pope and emperor had entertained of suppressing the Protestant religion in the empire. These hopes, indeed, seemed to revive in 1632, when this glorious assertor of Germanic liberty fell in the battle of Lutzen;[d] but this very serious loss was, in some measure, made up in process of time, by the conduct of those who succeeded Gustavus at the head of the Swedish army. And, accordingly, the war was obstinately carried on in bleeding Germany, during many years, with various success, until the exhausted treasures of the contending parties, and the pacific inclinations of Christina, the daughter and successor of Gustavus, put an end to these desolations, and brought on a treaty of peace.

VII. Thus, after a war of thirty years, carried on with the most unrelenting animosity and ardour, the wounds of Germany were closed, and the drooping states of Europe revived, in 1648, by the peace of Westphalia, so called from the cities of Munster and Osnabrug, where the negotiations were prosecuted and concluded. The Protestants, indeed, did not derive from this treaty all the privileges they claimed, or all the advantages they had in view; for the emperor, among less important instances

---

Lutheranism, and to recommend to him the cause and interests of the house of Austria. See Unschuldige Nachricht, An. 1747, p. 858. ☞ What Dr. Mosheim observes here may be true; but then it is as true that Matthew Hoe must have been a great fool, or a great knave, to listen to such insinuations, not only on account of their glaring absurdity, but also considering the persons from whom they came. This is the same Hoe that is mentioned above, as a learned defender of the Lutheran faith.

[a] See, for an illustration of this matter, the authors mentioned by Struvius, in his Syntagma Histor. Germaniæ, p. 1553.

[b] See Salig, His. August. Confessionis, t. i. lib. iv. c. iii. § xxv. p. 810.

☞ [c] When the consequences of these iniquitous and barbarous proceedings were represented to this emperor, and he was assured that the country must be utterly ruined, if the Bohemians, rendered desperate by his enormous cruelty and oppression, should exert themselves in defence of their liberties, and endeavour to repel force by force, he is reported to have answered, with great zeal and calmness, *Malumus regnum vastatum, quam damnatum.* See the Historia Persecutionum Ecclesiæ Bohemicæ, published in 1648. This little book contains an ample recital of the deplorable effects of lawless power, inhuman bigotry, and blood-thirsty zeal, and proves, by numberless facts, that Dr. Mosheim had the strongest evidence for the account he gives of Ferdinand and his missionaries. It is impossible to reflect upon the sanguinary spirit of such converters, without expressing, at the same time, a generous detestation and abhorrence of their unjust and violent proceedings.

[d] See Archenholtz, Memoires de la Reine Christine, tom. i. in which are many very interesting anecdotes relating to the life, exploits, and death of Gustavus. The learned compiler of these *Memoires* has also thrown much light upon this period, and particularly upon the peace that terminated this long and dreadful war.

of obstinacy, absolutely refused to reinstate the Bohemian and Austrian protestants in their religious privileges, or to restore the Upper Palatinate to its ancient and lawful proprietor. Yet they obtained, by this peace, privileges and advantages which the votaries of Rome beheld with great displeasure and uneasiness; and it is unquestionably evident, that the treaty of Westphalia gave a new and remarkable degree of stability to the Lutheran and reformed churches in Germany. By this treaty the peace of Augsburg, which the Lutherans had obtained from Charles V. in the preceding century, was firmly secured against all the machinations and stratagems of the court of Rome; it abrogated the edict that commanded the protestants to restore to the Romish church the ecclesiastical revenues and lands of which they had taken possession after that peace; and it confirmed both the contending parties in the perpetual possession of whatever they had occupied in the beginning of the year 1624. It would be entering into a very long detail, were we to enumerate the advantages that accrued to the protestant princes from this treaty.[a] All this was a source of vexation to the court of Rome, and made its pontiff feel the severest pangs of disappointed ambition. He, accordingly, used various stratagems, without being very scrupulous in his choice, in order to annul this treaty, or elude its effects; but his attempts were unsuccessful, since neither the emperor, nor the princes that had embarked in this cause, thought it advisable to involve themselves anew in the tumults of war, whose issue is so uncertain, and whose most fatal effects they had lately escaped with so much difficulty. The treaty, therefore, was executed in all its parts; and all the articles that had been agreed upon at Munster and Osnabrug were confirmed and ratified, in 1650, at Nuremberg.[b]

VIII. After this period, the court of Rome and its creatures were laid under a considerable degree of restraint. They no longer dared to make war in an open and public manner upon the protestants, since the present state of affairs blasted all the hopes they had fondly entertained of extinguishing the light of the reformation, by destroying, or reducing under their spiritual yoke, the princes and states that had encouraged and protected it in their territories. But, wherever they could exert the spirit of persecution with impunity, they oppressed the protestants in the most grievous manner, and, in defiance of the most solemn conventions and the most sacred obligations, encroached upon their rights, privileges, and possessions. Thus, in Hungary, during the space of ten years,[c] both Lutherans and Calvinists were involved in an uninterrupted series of the most cruel calamities and vexations.[d] The injuries and insults they suffered from various orders of men, and more especially from the Jesuits, both before and after the period now under consideration, are not to be numbered. In Poland, all those who ventured to differ from the pope, found, by a bitter experience, during the whole course of this century, that no treaty or convention that tended to set bounds to the authority or rapacity of the church, was deemed sacred, or even regarded at Rome; for many of these were ejected out of their schools, deprived of their churches, robbed of their goods and possessions under a variety of perfidious pretexts, and frequently condemned to the most severe and cruel punishments, without having been even chargeable with the appearance of a crime.[e] The remains of the Waldenses, that lived in the valleys of Piedmont, were persecuted often with the most inhuman cruelty, (and more especially in the years 1632, 1655, and 1685,) on account of their magnanimous and steady attachment to the religion of their ancestors; and this persecution was carried on with all the horrors of fire and sword by the dukes of Savoy.[f] In Germany, the same spirit of bigotry and persecution produced almost every where flagrant acts of injustice. The infractions of the famous treaty above mentioned, and of the Germanic liberty that was founded upon it, would furnish matter for many volumes;[g] and all these infractions were occasioned by a preposterous and extravagant zeal for augmenting the authority, and extending the jurisdiction of the church of Rome. And, indeed, as long as that church and its assuming pontiff shall persist in maintaining that they have a right to extend their lordly sceptre over all the churches of the Christian world, so long must those who have renounced their authority, but are more or less within their reach, despair of enjoying the inestimable blessings of security and peace. They will always be considered as rebellious subjects, against whom the greatest acts of severity and violence are lawful.

IX. The over-zealous instruments of the court of Rome at length accomplished, in this century, (what had often been attempted without success,) the deliverance of Spain from the infidelity of the Moors, and of France from the heresy of the protestants. The posterity of the Moors or Saracens, who had formerly been masters of the greatest part of Spain, and hitherto lived in that kingdom, mixed with the other inhabitants of the country, and their number was still considerable. They were Christians, at least in their external profession and manners; industrious also, and inoffensive; and, upon the whole, good and useful subjects: but they were strongly suspected of a secret propensity to the doctrine

[a] An account of this whole matter, sufficient to satisfy the curiosity of the most inquisitive reader, may be found in that most elaborate and excellent work, compiled by the very learned and judicious John Godfrey de Meyern, under the following title: Acta Pacis Westphalicæ et Executionis ejus Norimbergensis. See also the more compendious, though valuable work of Adam Adami, bishop of Hierapolis, entitled, Relatio Historica de Pacificatione Osnabrugo-Monasteriensi, of which the illustrious author published a new edition in 1737, more accurate and ample than the preceding one. We must not omit here the ingenious Father Bougeant's elegant history of this treaty, which though chiefly drawn from the papers of the French ambassadors, is nevertheless (generally speaking) composed with accuracy, impartiality, and candour; it was published in 1746, under the title of Histoire de la Paix de Westphalie.

[b] Pope Innocent X. opposed, to this treaty of peace, in 1651, a flaming bull, on which Hornbeck published an ample and learned commentary, entitled, Examen Bulli Papalis, quâ Innocentius X. abrogare nititur Pacem Germaniæ. This *bull* might, perhaps, have produced some effect upon the emperor and his allies, had it been properly *gilded*.

[c] From 1671 to 1681.

[d] See Historia Diplomatica de Statu Religionis Evangelicæ in Hungariâ, p. 69.—Pauli Debrezeni Historia Ecclesiæ Reformatæ in Hungariâ, lib. ii. p. 447.—Schelhornius, in Museo Helvetico, tom. vii. page 46—90.

[e] See Ad. Regenvolscii Historia Ecclesiæ Sclavonicæ, lib. ii. cap. xv. p. 216, 235, 253. The grievances which the dissenters from the church of Rome suffered in Poland, after the death of Regenvolscius, may be learned from various memorials that have been published in our times.

[f] See Gilles' Histoire Ecclesiastique des Eglises Vaudoises, ch. xlviii. p. 339.

[g] The histories of the grievances suffered by the protestants of Germany on account of their religion, that have been composed by Struvius and Hoffman, contain ample details of this matter.

of Mohammed, which was the religion of their ancestors. Hence the clergy beset the monarch with their importunate solicitations, and never ceased their clamorous remonstrances before a royal edict was obtained to drive the Saracens out of the Spanish territories. This imprudent step was highly detrimental to the kingdom, and its pernicious effects are more or less visible even at the present time; but the church, whose interest and dominion are, in popish countries, considered as distinct from the interests and authority of the state, and of a much more sublime and excellent nature, acquired new accessions of wealth and power by the expulsion of the Moors.[a] In proportion as the community lost, the church gained; and thus the public good was sacrificed to the demands of bigotry and superstition.

In France, the persecuting spirit of the Romish church exhibited scenes still more shocking. The Huguenots, after having long groaned under various forms of cruelty and oppression, and seen multitudes of their brethren put to death, by secret conspiracies or open tyranny and violence, were, at length, obliged either to save themselves by a clandestine flight, or to profess, against their consciences, the Romish religion. This barbarous and iniquitous scene of French persecution, than which the annals of modern history present nothing more unnatural and odious, will find its place below, in the history of the Reformed Church.[b]

X. All the resources of inventive genius and refined policy, all the efforts of insinuating craft and audacious rebellion, were employed to bring back Great Britain and Ireland under the yoke of Rome. But all these attempts were without effect. About the beginning of this century, a set of desperate and execrable wretches, in whose breasts the suggestions of bigotry and the hatred of the protestant religion had suppressed all the feelings of justice and humanity, were instigated by three Jesuits, of whom Garnet, the superior of the society in England, was the chief, to form the most horrid plot that is known in the annals of history. The design of this conspiracy was nothing less than to destroy, at one blow, James I., the prince of Wales, and both houses of parliament, by the explosion of an immense quantity of gunpowder, which was concealed for that purpose, in the vaults situated under the house of lords. The sanguinary bigots concerned in it imagined, that, as soon as this horrible deed was performed, they would be at full liberty to restore popery to its former credit, and substitute it in the place of the protestant religion.[c] This odious conspiracy, whose infernal purpose was providentially discovered, when it was ripe for execution, is commonly known in Britain under the denomination of the *gun-powder plot*.[d]

This discovery did not suspend the efforts and stratagems of the court of Rome, which carried on its schemes in the succeeding reign, but with less violence, and more caution. Charles I. was a prince of a soft and gentle temper, and was entirely directed by the counsels of Laud, archbishop of Canterbury, a man who was neither destitute of learning nor of good qualities,[e] though he carried things to excessive and intolerable lengths through his warm and violent attachment to the ancient forms and ceremonies of the church. The queen also, Henrietta Maria, who was a princess of France, was warmly devoted to the interests of popery; and from all this it seemed probable, that, though treason and violence had failed, yet artifice and mild measures might succeed, and that a reconciliation might be brought about between England and Rome.[f] This prospect, which had smiled in the imaginations of the friends of popery, vanished entirely when the civil war broke out between the king and parliament. In consequence of these commotions, both the unfortunate Charles, and his imprudent and bigoted counsellor Laud, were brought to the scaffold; and Oliver Cromwell, a man of unparalleled resolution, dexterity, and foresight, and a declared enemy to every thing that bore even the most distant resemblance to popery, was placed at the helm of government, under the title of Protector of the Commonwealth.

The hopes of Rome and its votaries were nevertheless revived by the restoration of Charles II., and from that period grew more lively and sanguine from day to day. For that monarch, as appears from unquestionable authorities,[g] had been initiated, during his exile, into the mysteries of popery, and had secretly embraced that religion, while his only brother, the presumptive heir to the crown, professed it openly, and had publicly apostatized from the protestant faith. Charles, indeed, was not a proper instrument for the propagation of any theological system. Indolent and voluptuous on one hand, and inclined to infidelity and irreligion on the other, it was not from him that the Roman pontiff could expect the zeal and industry which were necessary to force upon the English nation, a religion so contrary as popery was to the tenor of the laws and the spirit of the people.[h] This zeal was found in his bigoted successor James II.;

[a] See the history of this impolitic expulsion by Michael Geddes, in his Miscellaneous Tracts, vol. i.

[b] In the second chapter of the second part of this section.

☞ [c] There is a letter extant written by Sir Everard Digby, one of the conspirators, to his wife, after his condemnation, which deserves an eminent place in the history of superstition and bigotry, and shows abundantly their infernal spirit and tendency. The following passage will confirm this judgment: "Now for my intention," says Digby, "let me tell you, that if I had thought there had been the least sin in the plot, I would not have been of it for all the world; and no other cause drew me to hazard my fortune and life, but zeal to God's religion." See the Papers relating to the popish plot, published by the orders of secretary Coventry.

[d] See Rapin's Hist. d'Angleterre, t. vii. livre xviii. and Heidegger's Historia Papatus.

☞ [e] Mr. Hume, speaking of Laud's learning and morals, expresses himself in the following manner: "This man was virtuous, if severity of manners alone, and abstinence from pleasure, could deserve that name. He was learned, if polemical knowledge could entitle him to that praise."

[f] See Cerri's Etat Present de l'Eglise Romaine, p. 315.—Neal's History of the Puritans, vol. iii. p. 194.

[g] Burnet's History of his Own Time vol. i. book iii.—Neal, vol. iv. —Rapin, livre. xxiii.

☞ [h] Such is the representation given of Charles II. by almost every historian; so that Dr. Mosheim is excusable in mistaking a part of this monarch's character, which was known to very few before him. Mr. Hume, whose history of the reign of that prince is a master-piece in every respect, gave a like account of Charles, as fluctuating between deism and popery. But this eminent historian having had occasion, during his residence at Paris, to peruse the manuscript memoirs of king James II. which were written by himself, and are kept in the Scottish college there, received from them new information with respect to the religious character of Charles, and was convinced that his zeal for popery went much farther than has been generally imagined. For it appears, with the utmost evidence, from these memoirs, that the king had laid with his ministry a formal plan for subverting the constitution in favour of popery; and that the introduction of popery, as the established religion, was the great and principal object which Charles had in view when he entered into the French alliance, which was concluded at Versailles in June 1670, by lord Arundel of Wardour. By this treaty, Louis was to give Charles 200,000 pounds a-year, in quarterly payments, in order to enable him to establish the Roman catholic religion in England; and he also engaged to supply him with 6000 men in case of any insurrection.

but it was accompanied with such excessive vehemence and imprudence as entirely defeated its own purposes; for that inconsiderate monarch, by his passionate attachment to the court of Rome, and his blind obsequiousness to the unseasonable and precipitate counsels of the Jesuits, who were the oracles of his cabinet, gave a mortal blow to that religion which he meant to promote, and lost that royalty which he was attempting to fix on the basis of despotism. He openly attempted to restore to its former vigour, both in England and Ireland, the authority of the pontiff, which had been renounced and annulled by the laws of both realms; and that he might accomplish with the more facility this most imprudent purpose, he trampled upon those rights and privileges of his people, that had ever been deemed most respectable and sacred, and which he had bound himself, by the most solemn engagements, to support and maintain. Justly exasperated and provoked by repeated insults from the throne upon their religion and liberties, and alarmed with natural apprehensions of the approaching ruin of both, the English looked about for a deliverer, and fixed their views, in 1688, on William prince of Orange, (son-in-law to their despotic monarch,) by whose wisdom and valour, affairs were so conducted that James was obliged to retire from his dominions, and to abdicate the crown; and the pope and his adherents were disappointed in the fond expectations they had formed of restoring popery in England.[a]

XI. When the more prudent defenders and patrons of the Romish faith perceived the ill success that attended all their violent and sanguinary attempts to establish its authority, they thought it expedient to have recourse to softer methods; and, instead of conquering the protestants by open force, proposed deluding them back into the church of Rome by the insinuating influence of secret artifice. This way of proceeding was approved by many of the votaries of Rome; but they did not all agree about the particular manner of employing it, and therefore followed different methods. Some had recourse to the appointment of public disputations or conferences between the principal doctors of the contending parties; and this from a notion, which past experience had rendered so vain and chimerical, that the adversaries of popery would either be vanquished in the debate, or at least be persuaded to look upon the Roman catholics with less aversion and disgust. Others declared it as their opinion, that all contest was to be suspended; that the great point was to find out the proper method of reconciling the two churches; and that, in order to promote this salutary purpose, as little stress as possible was to be laid upon those matters of controversy which had been hitherto looked upon as of the highest moment and importance. A different manner of proceeding was thought more adviseable by a third set of men, who, from a persuasion that their doctors had more zeal than argument, and were much more eminent for their attachment to the church of Rome, than for their skill in defending its cause, prepared their combatants with greater care for the field of controversy, taught them a new art of theological war, and furnished them with a new and artful method of vanquishing, or at least of perplexing, their heretical adversaries.

XII. A public conference took place at Ratisbon, in 1601, at the joint desire of Maximilian, duke of Bavaria, and Philip Louis, elector Palatine, between some eminent Lutheran doctors on one side, and three celebrated Jesuits on the other. The dispute turned upon the two great points, to which almost all the contests between the Protestants and Roman Catholics are reducible, namely, the rule of faith and the judge of controversies. In 1615, James Heilbronner, a learned Lutheran, held a conference at Neuburg with James Keller, a celebrated Jesuit, by the appointment of Wolfgang William, prince Palatine, who had recently embraced the Romish faith. But the most famous conference of this kind, was that which was holden in 1645, at Thorn, by the express order of Uladislaus IV. king of Poland, between several eminent doctors of the Romish, Lutheran, and Reformed churches. This meeting, which was designed to heal the division that reigned among these churches, and to find out some method of reconciling their differences, and bringing about their reunion, was thence called the *Charitable Conference.*

Some time after this, Ernest, landgrave of Hesse, in order to give a plausible colour to his apostasy from the Protestant religion, and make it appear to be the result of examination and conviction, obliged Valerianus Magnus, a learned Capuchin, to enter the lists with Peter Habercorn, a reformed minister, in the castle of Rheinfeld. Beside these public conferences, there were some of a private nature during this century, between the doctors of the contending churches. Of these the most remarkable was the famous dispute between John Claude, the most learned of the reformed divines in France, and Jaques Benigne de Bossuet, whose genius and erudition placed him at the head of the Romish doctors in that country. This dispute, which occurred in 1683, ended like all the rest. They all widened the breach instead of healing it. Neither of the contending parties could be persuaded to yield:[b] on the contrary, they both returned from the field of controversy more riveted in their own opinions, and more unfriendly to the tenets of their adversaries.

XIII. Those Roman catholics, whose views were turned toward union and concord, did not omit the use of *pious* artifice, in order to accomplish this salutary purpose. They endeavoured to persuade the zealous protestants and the rigid catholics, that their differences in opinion were less considerable, and less important, than they themselves imagined; and that the true way to put an end to their dissensions, and to promote union, was not to nourish

The division of the United Provinces between England and France was another article of this treaty. But we are told that the subversion of the protestant religion in England was the point that Charles had chiefly at heart, and that he insisted warmly on beginning with the execution of this part of the treaty; but the duchess of Orleans, in the interview at Dover, persuaded him to begin with the Dutch war. The king (says Mr. Hume) was so *zealous a papist*, that he *wept for joy* when he entertained the project of re-uniting his kingdom to the catholic church. See the Corrections and Additions to Mr. Hume's History of Charles II., and also Macpherson's Appendix to his History of Great Britain.

[a] The circumstances of this famous and ever-memorable revolution are accurately recorded by Burnet, in the second volume of his History of his own Times; and also by Rapin, in the tenth volume of his History of England. Add to these, Neal's History of the Puritans, vol. iv. ch. xi. p. 536.

[b] The reader who desires a more particular account of what passed in these conferences, may satisfy his curiosity by consulting the writers mentioned by Sagittarius, in his Introduct. in Historiam Ecclesiast. tom. ii. p. 1569, 1581, 1592, 1598. An account of the conference between Claude and Bossuet, was composed and published by each of these famous combatants.

the flames of discord by disputes and conferences, but to see whether their systems might not be reconciled, and apparent inconsistencies removed, by proper and candid explications. They imagined that a plausible and artful exposition of those doctrines of the church of Rome, which appeared the most shocking to the Protestants, would tend much to conquer their aversion to popery. Such was the general principle in which the Romish peace-makers agreed, and such the basis on which they proposed to carry on their pacific operations; but they differed so widely in their manner of applying this general principle, and pursued such different methods in the execution of this nice and hazardous stratagem, that the event did not answer their expectations. In the way they proceeded, instead of promoting the desired union by their representations of things, by their exhortations and counsels, this union seemed to be previously necessary, in order to render their explications and exhortations acceptable, or even supportable; so little were the means proportioned to the end!

The first, as well as the most eminent, of those who tried the force of their genius in this arduous enterprise, was cardinal Richelieu, that great minister, who employed all the influence of promises and threats, all the powers of sophistry and eloquence, all the arts of persuasion, in order to bring back the French protestants into the bosom of the Romish church.[a] The example of this illustrious prelate was followed, with less dignity and less influence, by Masenius, a German Jesuit,[b] Volusius, a theologian of Mentz,[c] Prætorius, a Prussian,[d] Gibbon de Burg, an Irish doctor, who was professor at Erfort,[e] Marcellus, a Jesuit,[f] and other divines of inferior note. But, of all modern adepts in controversy, none pursued this method with such dexterity and art as Bossuet, bishop of Meaux, a man of true genius, directed by the most consummate circumspection and prudence. The famous Exposition of the Roman Catholic Faith, that was drawn up by this subtle and insinuating author, was designed to show the protestants, that their reasons against returning to the bosom of the Romish church would be easily removed, if they would view the doctrines of that church in their true light, and not as they had been erroneously represented by protestant writers.[g] This notion was propagated, though with less dexterity and success, by Dezius, a Jesuit of Strasbourg, who wrote a book expressly to prove, that there was little if any difference between the doctrine of the council of Trent, and that of the confession of Augsburg, than which no two systems can be more irreconcilably opposite.[h] It is, however, remarkable, that all these pacific attempts to re-unite the two churches, were made by the persons now mentioned on their own private authority; they were not avowed by the higher powers, who alone were qualified to remove, modify, or explain away those doctrines and rites of the Romish church, that shocked the protestants and justified their separation. It is true, that, in 1686, this plan of reconciliation was warmly recommended by a person properly commissioned, or, at least, who gave himself out for such. This pacificator was Christopher de Roxas, bishop of Tinia, in the district of Bosnia; who, during several years, frequented, with these reconciling views, the courts of the protestant princes in Germany; intimated the assembling of a new council, that was to be more impartial in its decisions and less restrained in its proceedings than the council of Trent; and even assured the protestants, that they might obtain without difficulty whatever rights, privileges, and immunities, they should think proper to demand from the Roman pontiff, provided they would acknowledge his paternal authority, and no longer refuse submission to his mild and gentle empire. But the artifice and designs of this specious missionary were easily detected; the protestant doctors, and also their sovereigns, soon perceived that a fair and candid plan of reconciliation and union was not what the court of Rome had in view; but that a scheme was in agitation for restoring its pontiffs to their former despotic dominion over the Christian world.[i]

XIV. The Romish peace-makers found among the protestants, and more especially among those of the reformed church, certain doctors, who, by a natural propensity to union and concord, seconded perhaps, in some, by views of interest, or by the suggestions of ambition, were disposed to enter into their plan, and to assist them in the execution of it. These theologians maintained, that the points in debate between the churches were not

[a] Rich. Simon, Lettres Choisies, tom. i.—Bayle's Dictionary, at the articles Amyraut, Beaulieu, Ferry, and Milletiere.

[b] See F. Spanhemii Stricturæ ad Bossueti Expositionem Fidei Catholicæ, tom. iii. op. Theolog. pars ii. p. 1042.

[c] There is extant a book composed by this writer under the following title: Aurora Pacis religiosæ divinæ Veritate amica.

[d] In his Tuba Pacis, of which the reader may see a curious account in Bayle's Nouvelles de la Republique des Lettres for the year 1685.

[e] In a treatise, entitled, Luthero Calvinismus schismaticus quidem sed reconciliabilis.

[f] The book of Marcellus, entitled Sapientia Pacifica, was refuted by Seldius, at the express desire of the duke of Saxe-Gotha.

[g] This book might furnish topics for a multitude of reflexions. See a particular account of its history and its effects in Pfaff's Historia Literaria Theologiæ, tom. ii., and Le Clerc's Bibliotheque Universelle et Historique, tom. xi. ☞ It is remarkable, that nine years passed before this work could obtain the pope's approbation. Clement X. refused it positively; and several catholic priests were rigorously treated, and severely persecuted, for preaching the doctrine contained in the Exposition, which was, moreover, formally condemned by the university of Louvain, in 1685, and declared to be scandalous and pernicious. The Sorbonne also disavowed the doctrine contained in that book, though by a late edict we learn, that the fathers of that theological seminary have changed their opinion on that head, and thus given a new instance of the variations that reign in the Romish church, which boasts so much of its uniformity in doctrinal matters. The artifice that was employed in the composition of this book, and the tricks that were used in the suppression and alteration of the first edition that was given of it, have been detected with great sagacity and evidence by the learned and excellent archbishop Wake, in the Introduction to his Exposition of the Doctrine of the Church of England. See also his two Defences of that Exposition, in which the perfidious sophistry of Bossuet is unmasked and refuted in the most satisfactory manner. There was an excellent answer to Bossuet's book published by M. de la Bastide, one of the most eminent protestant ministers in France. Of this answer the French prelate took no notice during eight years; at the end of which, he published an advertisement in a new edition of his Exposition, which was designed to remove the objections of Bastide. The latter replied in such a demonstrative and victorious manner, that the learned bishop, notwithstanding all his eloquence and art, was obliged to quit the field of controversy. See a very interesting account of this insidious work of Bossuet, and the controversies it occasioned, in the Bibliotheque des Sciences published at the Hague, vol. xviii. This account, which is curious, accurate, ample, and learned, was given partly on occasion of a new edition of the Exposition, printed in 1761, and accompanied with a Latin translation by Fleury, and partly on occasion of Burigny's Life of Bossuet.

[h] This book is entitled, La Re-union des Protestans de Strasbourg à l'Eglise Romaine, and was published in 1689.—See Phil. Jac. Speneri Consilia Theol. German. in parte iii. p. 650, 662.

[i] See Jo. Wolf. Jaegeri Historia Ecclesiast. Sæculi XVII.—Christ. Eberhardi Weismanni. Hist. Ecclesiast. Sæc. XVII. p. 735. The reader will find, in the Commercium Epistolico-Leibnitianum of Gruberus, vol. i. an account of the particular conditions of reconciliation that were proposed to the German courts in 1660, by the elector of Mentz, authorized, as it is alleged, by the Roman pontiff.

of sufficient importance to justify their separation. Among the French protestants, Louis Le Blanch and his disciples were suspected of a strong inclination to go too far in this matter.[a] The same accusation was brought, with fuller evidence, against Huisseaux, professor of divinity at Saumur, Milletiere, Le Fevre, and others of less note.[b] Among the British divines, this excessive propensity to diminish the shocking absurdities of popery was less remarkable; William Forbes was the principal person who discovered an extreme facility to compose a considerable number of the differences that contributed to perpetuate the separation between the churches.[c] With respect to the Dutch, it is abundantly known, how ardently the great and learned Grotius desired the re-union of all Christian churches in one general bond of charity and concord, and with what peculiar zeal he endeavoured to reform some enormities of the church of Rome, and to excuse others. But these, and all the other arbitrators, whose names and whose efforts in this pacific cause it would be tedious to mention, derived no other fruit from their (perhaps, well-intended) labours, than the displeasure of both the contending parties, and the bitter reproaches of their respective churches.

In the number of the protestant doctors who betrayed an inconsiderate zeal for the re-union of these churches, many writers place George Calixtus, a man of eminent learning, and professor of divinity in the university of Helmstadt. It is nevertheless certain, that this great man discovered and exposed the errors and corruptions of popery with a degree of learning and perspicuity scarcely surpassed by any writer in this century, and persisted in maintaining that the decrees and anathemas of the council of Trent had banished all hopes of a reconciliation between the protestant churches and the see of Rome. He looked, indeed, upon some of the controversies that divided the two communions with much greater indulgence than was usually shown, and decided them in a manner that did not seem suited to the taste and spirit of the times; he was also of opinion that the church of Rome had not destroyed the genuine principles of Christianity, but had only deformed them with its senseless fictions, and buried them under a heap of rubbish, under a motley multitude of the most extravagant and intolerable doctrines and ceremonies. It was undoubtedly on this account, that he has been ranked by some in the class of the imprudent peace makers already mentioned.

XV. It was no difficult matter to defeat the purposes, and ruin the credit of these pacific arbitrators, who, upon the whole, made up but a motley and ill composed society, weakened by intestine discords. It required more dexterity and greater efforts of genius, to oppose the progress, and disconcert the sophistry of a set of men who had invented new methods of defending popery, and attacking its adversaries. This new species of polemic doctors were called Methodists, and the most eminent of them arose in France, where a perpetual scene of controversy, carried on with the most learned among the Huguenots, had augmented the dexterity, and improved the theological talents of the catholic disputants. The Methodists, from their different manner of treating the controversy in question, may be divided into two classes. In one we may place those doctors whose method of disputing was disingenuous and unreasonable, and who followed the examples of those military chiefs, who shut up their troops in entrenchments and strong-holds, in order to cover them from the attacks of the enemy. Such was the manner of proceeding of the Jesuit Veron, who was of opinion that the protestants should be obliged to prove the tenets of their church[d] by plain passages of Scripture, without being allowed to have the liberty of illustrating these passages, reasoning upon them, or drawing any conclusions from them.[e] In the same class may be ranked Nihusius, an apostate from the protestant religion,[f] the two Walenburgs, and other polemics, who, looking upon it as an easier matter to maintain their pretensions, than to show upon what principles they were originally founded,[g] obliged their adversaries to prove all their assertions and objections, whether of an affirmative or negative kind, and confined themselves to the mere business of answering objections, and repelling attacks. We may also place among this kind of Methodists cardinal Richelieu, who judged it the shortest and best way to attend little to the multitude of accusations, objections, and reproaches, with which the protestants loaded the various branches of the Romish government, discipline, doctrine, and worship, and to confine the whole controversy to the single article of the divine institution and authority of the church, which he thought it essential to establish by the strongest arguments, as the grand principle that would render popery impregnable.[h]

The *Methodists* of the second class were of opinion, that the most expedient manner of reducing the protestants to silence, was not to attack them partially, but to

[a] See a particular and interesting account of Le Blanc, in Bayle's Dictionary, at the article Beaulieu.

[b] See the above-mentioned Dictionary, at the article Miletiere. For an account of Huisseaux, and his pacific counsels, see Rich. Simon's Lettres Choisies, tom. iii., and Aymon's Synodes Nationaux des Eglises Reformées en France, tom. ii. The labours of Le-Fevre, father to the famous Madame Dacier, in the same cause, are mentioned by Morhoff, in his Polyhistor, tom. i.

[c] See Forbes' "Considerationes modestæ et pacificæ Controversiarum de Justificatione, Purgatorio," &c., which were published at London in 1658, and afterwards more correctly in Germany, under the inspection of John Fabricius, professor of divinity at Helmstadt. Forbes is mentioned by Grabe with the highest encomiums, in his Notæ ad Bulli Harmoniam Apostolicam; and, if we consider his probity, and the exemplary regularity of his life and conversation, he must be allowed to deserve the praise that is due to piety and good morals. Nevertheless, he had his infirmities, and the wiser part of the English doctors acknowledge, that his propensity toward a reconciliation with the church of Rome was carried too far. See Burnet's History of his own Time, vol. i. On this account he has been lavishly praised by the catholic writers; see R. Simon's Lettres Choisies, tom. iii. lettre xvii.—He was undoubtedly one of those who contributed most to spread among the English a notion, (the truth or falsehood of which we shall not here examine,) that king Charles I. and archbishop Laud had formed the design of restoring popery in England.

[d] More especially the doctrines that peculiarly oppose the decrees and tenets of the council of Trent.

[e] Musæus de Usu Principiorum Rationis in Controversiis Theologicis, lib. i. c. iv.—G. Calixti Digressio de Arte novâ, p. 125. Simon's Lettres Choisies, tom. i.

[f] See a particular account of this vain and superficial doctor in Bayle's Dictionary. His work, entitled Ars nova dicto Sacræ Scripturæ unico lucrandi a Pontificiis plurimas in partes Lutheranorum detecta, &c., was refuted in the most satisfactory manner by Calixtus, in his Digressio de Arte Novâ contra Nihusium, a curious and learned work, published at Helmstadt in 1634.

[g] That is to say, in other words, that they pleaded *prescription* in favour of popery, and acted like one who, having been for a long time in possession of an estate, refuses to produce his title, and requires that those who question it should prove its insufficiency or falsehood.

[h] For a more ample account of these methods of controversy, and of others used by the church of Rome, the curious reader may consult Fred. Spanheim's Strictur. ad Expositionem Fidei Bossueti, tom. iii. op. par. ii. p. 1037.—Heidegger's Histor. Papatus, Period. vii. sect. ccxviii. p. 316.—Walchii Introduct. ad Controvers. Theolog. tom. ii.—Weismanni Histor. Ecclesiastica, sæc. xvii. p. 726.

overwhelm them at once, by the weight of some general principle or presumption, some universal argument, which comprehended, or might be applied to, all the points contested between the churches. They imitated the conduct of those military leaders, who, instead of spending their time and strength in sieges and skirmishes, endeavour to put an end to a war by a general and decisive action. This method, if not invented,[a] was at least improved and seconded, with all the aids of eloquence and genius, by Nicole, a celebrated doctor among the Jansenists;[b] and it was followed by many of the disputants of the church of Rome, who were so fully persuaded of its irresistible influence, that they looked upon any one of the general points already mentioned as sufficient, when properly handled, to overturn the whole protestant cause. Hence it was, that some of these polemics rested the defence of popery upon the single principle of prescription; others upon the vicious lives of several of those princes who had withdrawn their dominions from the yoke of Rome; and some upon the criminal nature of religious schism, with which they reproached the promoters of the Reformation; and they were all convinced, that, by urging their respective arguments, and making good their respective charges, the mouths of their adversaries must be stopped, and the cause of Rome and its pontiff triumph.[c] The famous Bossuet stood foremost in this class, which he peculiarly adorned, by the superiority of his genius and the insinuating charms of his eloquence. His arguments, indeed, were more specious than solid, and the circumstances from which they were drawn were imprudently chosen. From the variety of opinions which had taken place among the protestant doctors, and the changes which had happened in their discipline and doctrine, he endeavoured to demonstrate, that the church founded by Luther was not the true church; and, on the other hand, from the perpetual sameness and uniformity that prevailed in the tenets and worship of the church of Rome, he pretended to prove its divine original.[d] Such an argument must indeed surprise, coming from a man of learning, who could not be ignorant of the temporising spirit of the Roman pontiffs, or of the changes they had permitted in their discipline and doctrine, according to the genius of time and place, and the different characters of those whom they were desirous to gain over to their interest. It was still more surprising in a French prelate, since the doctors of that nation generally maintain, that the leaden age does not differ more from the age of gold, than the modern church of Rome differs from the ancient and primitive church of that famous city.

XVI. These various attempts of the votaries of Rome, though they gave abundant exercise to the activity and vigilance of the protestant doctors, were not, however, attended with any important revolutions, or any considerable fruits. Some princes, indeed, and a few learned men, were thereby seduced into the communion of that church, from whose superstition and tyranny their ancestors had delivered themselves and others; but these defections were only personal, nor could any people or province be persuaded to follow these examples. Among the more illustrious deserters of the Protestant religion, we may place Christina, queen of Sweden,[e] who was a princess of great spirit and genius, but was precipitate and vehement in almost all her proceedings, and preferred her ease, pleasure, and liberty, to all other considerations;[f] Wolfgang William, count Palatine of the Rhine; Christian William, marquis of Brandenburg; Ernest, prince of Hesse;[g] John Frederic, duke of Brunswick; and Frederic Augustus, king of Poland.

☞ [a] This method certainly was not the invention of Nicole, for it seems to differ little, if at all, from the method of cardinal Richelieu. We may observe farther, that Richelieu seems rather to belong to the second class of Methodists than to the first, where Dr. Mosheim has placed him.

[b] Nicole is supposed to be the author of a book entitled, "Prejugez legitimes contre les Calvinistes," which was answered in a satisfactory manner by several learned men. ☞ It is very remarkable, that some of the principal arguments employed in this book against the protestants, are precisely the same that the deists make use of to show that it is impossible for the general body of Christians to believe upon a rational foundation. The learned Claude, in his Defence of the Reformation, showed in a demonstrative manner, that the difficulties arising from the incapacity of the multitude to examine the grounds and principles of the protestant religion, are much less than those which occur to a papist, whose faith is founded, not on the plain word of God alone, but on the dictates of tradition, on the decrees of councils, and a variety of antiquated records that are beyond his reach. The protestant divine goes still farther, and proves that there are arguments in favour of Christianity and the protestant faith, that are intelligible by the lowest capacity, and, at the same time, sufficient to satisfy an upright and unprejudiced mind.

[c] Fred. Spanhemii Diss. de Præscriptione, in Rebus Fidei, adversus novos Methodistas, tom. iii. par. ii. op. p. 1079.

[d] This is the purpose of Bossuet's Historie des Variations des Eglises Protestantes, which was published in 1688, and is still considered by the catholics as one of the strongest bulwarks of popery. Let them go on in their delusions, and boast of this famous champion and defender; but, if they have any true zeal for the cause he defends, or any regard for the authority of the supreme head of *their* church, they will bury in oblivion that maxim of this *their* champion, that "the church, which frequently modifies, varies, and changes its doctrines, is destitute of the direction of the Holy Spirit." ☞ This observation might be verified by numberless instances of variations in the doctrine and worship of Rome, that must strike every one who has any tolerable acquaintance with the history of that church.—But, without going any farther than one instance, we may observe, that Bossuet had a striking proof of the variations of his own church, in the different reception that his Exposition of the Roman Catholic Faith met with from different persons, and at different times. It was disapproved by one pope, and approved by another; it was applauded by the archbishop of Rheims, and condemned by the university of Louvain; it was censured by the Sorbonne in 1671, and declared by the same society a true exposition of the catholic faith in the following century. For a full proof of the truth of these and other variations, see Wake's Exposition, &c.—the Biblioth. Univ. of Le Clerc, tom. xi. p. 438.—the General Dictionary, at the article Wake, in the note, and the Biblioth. des Sciences, tom. xviii.

[e] See Archenholtz, Memoires de la Reine Christine, which contain a variety of agreeable and interesting anecdotes.

☞ [f] The candid and impartial writer, mentioned in the preceding note, has given an ample account of the circumstances that attended this queen's change of religion, and of the causes that might have contributed to determine her to a step so unexpected and inexcusable. It was neither the subtlety of Des-Cartes, nor the dexterity of Canut, that brought about this event, as Baillet would persuade us. The true state of the case seems to have been this: Christina, having had her sentiments of religion in general considerably perverted by the licentious insinuations of her favourite Bourdelot, was prepared for embracing any particular religion, that pleasure, interest, or ambition, should recommend to her. Upon this foundation, the Jesuits Macedo, Malines, and Cassati, under the immediate protection of Pimentel, and encouraged by the courts of Rome, Spain, and Portugal, employed their labours and dexterity in the conversion of this princess, whose passion for Italy, together with that taste for the fine arts and the precious remains of antiquity, which rendered her desirous of sojourning there, may have contributed not a little to make her embrace the religion of that country.

[g] This learned and well-meaning prince was engaged, by the conversation and importunities of Valerius Magnus, a celebrated monk of the Capuchin order, to embrace popery, in 1651. See Gruberi Commercium Epistol. Leibnitianum, t. i. p. 27, 35. Memoires de la Reine Christine, t. i. p. 216.—It is, however, to be observed, that this prince, with Anthony Ulric, duke of Brunswick, and several others, who went over to the church of Rome, did not go over to *that* church of Rome which is now exhibited to us in the odious forms of superstition and tyranny, but to another kind of church, which, perhaps, never existed but in their idea, and which at least has long ceased to exist. That this was the case appears evidently from the theological writings of prince Ernest.

The learned men that embraced the communion of the church of Rome were, baron Boineburg, secretary to the elector of Mentz, and a zealous patron of erudition and genius,[a] Christopher Ranzow, a knight of Holstein,[b] Caspar Scioppius, Peter Bertius, Christopher Besold, Ulric Hunnius, Nicolas Stenon, a Danish physician, of great reputation in his profession, John Philip Pfeiffer, professor at Konigsberg, Luke Holstenius, Peter Lambecius, Henry Blumius, professor at Helmstadt, a man of learning, and of excessive vanity,[c] Daniel Nesselius, Andrew Fromius, Barthold Nihusius, Christopher Hellwigius, Matthew Prætorius, and a few others of inferior rank in the learned world. But these conversions, when considered with the motives that produced them, will be found, in *reality*, less honourable to the church of Rome than they are *in appearance;* for if, from this list of princes and learned men, we efface those whom the temptations of adversity, the impulse of avarice and ambition, the suggestions of levity, the effects of personal attachments, the power of superstition upon a feeble and irresolute mind, and other motives of like merit, engaged to embrace the Romish religion, these proselytes will be reduced to a number too small to excite the envy of the protestant churches.[d]

XVII. The Christian churches in the East, which were not dependent on the yoke of Rome, did not stand less firm against the attempts of the papal missionaries than those of Europe. The pompous accounts which several Roman catholic writers have given of the wonderful success of the missionaries among the Nestorians and Monophysites, are little else than splendid fables, designed to amuse and dazzle the multitude; and many of the wisest and best of the Romish doctors acknowledge, that they ought to be considered in no other light. As little credit is to be given to those who mention the strong propensity discovered by several of the heads and superintendents of the Christian sects in those remote regions, to submit to the jurisdiction of the Roman pontiff.[e] It is evident, on the contrary, that Rome, in two remarkable instances, suffered a considerable diminution of its influence and authority in the eastern world during this century. One instance was the dreadful revolution in Japan, which has been already related, and which was unhappily followed by the total extinction of Christianity in that great monarchy. The other was the downfall of popery by the extirpation of its missionaries in the empire of Abyssinia, of which it will not be improper, or foreign from our purpose, to give here a brief account.

About the commencement of the seventeenth century, the Portuguese Jesuits renewed, under the most auspicious encouragement, the mission to Abyssinia that had been for some time interrupted and suspended; for the emperor Susneius or Socinios, who assumed the denomination of Sultan Segued, after the defeat of his enemies and his accession to the throne, covered the missionaries with his peculiar protection. Gained over to their cause, partly by the eloquence of the Jesuits, and partly by the hopes of maintaining himself upon the throne by the succours of the Portuguese, he committed the whole government of the church to Alphonso Mendez, a missionary from that nation; created him patriarch of the Abyssinians; and, in 1626, not only swore, in a public manner, allegiance to the Roman pontiff, but also obliged his subjects to abandon the religious rites and tenets of their ancestors, and to embrace the doctrine and worship of the Romish church. But the new patriarch, by his intemperate zeal, imprudence, and arrogance, ruined the cause in which he had embarked, and occasioned the total subversion of the Roman pontiff's authority and jurisdiction, which seemed to have been established upon solid foundations. He began his ministry with the most inconsiderate acts of violence and despotism. Following the spirit of the Spanish inquisition, he employed formidable threatenings and cruel tortures to convert the Abyssinians; the greatest part of whom, together with their priests and ministers, held the religion of their ancestors in the highest veneration, and were willing to part with their lives and fortunes rather than forsake it. He also ordered those to be rebaptized, who, in compliance with the orders of the emperor, had embraced the faith of Rome, as if their former religion had been nothing more than a system of Paganism.[f] This the Abyssinian clergy looked upon as a shocking insult to the religious discipline of their ancestors, as even more provoking than the violence and barbarities practised against those who refused to submit to the papal yoke. Nor did the insolent patriarch rest satisfied with these arbitrary and despotic proceedings in the church; he excited tumults and factions in the state, and, with an unparalleled spirit of rebellion and arrogance, encroached upon the prerogatives of the throne, and attempted to give law to the emperor himself. Hence arose civil commotions, conspiracies, and seditions, which excited in a little time the indignation of the emperor, and the hatred of the people against the Jesuits, and produced, at length, in 1631, a public declaration from the throne, by which the Abyssinian monarch annulled the orders he had formerly given in favour of popery, and left

[a] This eminent man, who had more learning than philosophy, and who was more remarkable for the extent of his memory than for the rectitude of his judgment, followed the example of the prince of Hesse, in 1653. See Gruberi Commercium Epistol. Leibnitianum, in which his letters, and those of Conringius, are published, tom. i.

[b] See Molleri Cimbria Literata, tom. i. p. 520.

[c] Blumius deserted the protestant church in 1654.—See Burckhardi Historia Biblioth. Augustæ, pars iii. p. 223.—Gruberi Comm. Epist. tom. i. p. 41, 95, &c. In some of these letters he is called Florus, probably in allusion to his German name Blum, which signifies a *flower*.

[d] See, for a particular account of these proselytes to popery, Weisman's Historia Eccles. sæc. XVII. p. 738.—Walchius' Introductio in Controversias, tom. ii. p. 728.—Arnold's Kirchen und Ketzer Historie, pars ii. p. 912, and other writers of civil and literary history.

[e] See the remarks made by Chardin in several places of the last edition of his travels. See also what Cerri, in his Etat Present de l'Eglise Romaine, says of the Armenians and Copts.—It is true, that, among these sects, the papal missionaries sometimes form congregations that are obedient to the see of Rome; but these congregations are poor, and composed only of a very small number of individuals. Thus the Capuchins, about the middle of the century now under consideration, founded a small congregation among the Monophysites of Asia, whose bishop resided at Aleppo. See Lequien, Oriens Christianus, t. ii. p. 1408

[f] The reader will recollect, that the Abyssinians differ very little from the Copts, and acknowledge the patriarch of Alexandria as their spiritual chief. They receive the old and new Testament, the three first Councils, the Nicene Creed, and the Apostolical Constitutions. Their first conversion to Christianity is attributed by some to the famous prime minister of their queen Candace, mentioned in the Acts of the Apostles: it is, however, probable, that the general conversion of that great empire was not perfected before the fourth century, when Frumentius, ordained bishop of Axuma by Athanasius, exercised his ministry among the people with the most astonishing success. They were esteemed a pure church before they fell into the errors of Eutyches and Dioscorus; and even since that period they still form a purer church than that of Rome.

his subjects at liberty, either to persevere in the doctrine of their ancestors, or to embrace the faith of Rome. This rational declaration was mild and indulgent toward the Jesuits, considering the treatment which their insolence and presumption had so justly deserved; but, in the following reign, much severer measures were employed against them. Basilides or Facilidas, the son of Segued, who succeeded his father in 1632, thought it expedient to free his dominions from these troublesome and despotic guests; and accordingly, in 1634, he banished from his territories the patriarch Mendez, with all the Jesuits and Europeans who belonged to his retinue, and treated the Roman Catholic missionaries with excessive severity.[a] From this period the very name of Rome, its religion, and its pontiff, were objects of the highest aversion among the Abyssinians, who guarded their frontiers with the greatest vigilance and the strictest attention, lest any Jesuit or Romish missionary should steal into their territories in disguise, and excite new tumults and commotions in the kingdom. The Roman pontiffs indeed made more than one attempt to recover the authority they had lost by the ill success and misconduct of the Jesuits. They began by sending two Capuchin monks to repair their loss; but these unfortunate wretches were no sooner discovered than they were stoned to death. They afterwards employed more artful and clandestine methods of reviving the missions, and had recourse to the influence and intercession of Louis XIV. to procure admission for their emissaries into the Abyssinian empire;[b] but, as far as we have learned, neither the pontiffs nor their votaries have yet been able to calm the resentment of that exasperated nation, or to conquer its reluctance against the worship and jurisdiction of the church of Rome.[c]

XVIII. Hitherto we have confined our views to the external state and condition of this church, and to the good or ill success that attended its endeavours to extend its dominion in the different parts of the world. It will be now proper to change the scene, to consider this establishment in its internal constitution, and to review its polity, discipline, institutions, and doctrine. Its ancient form of government still remained; but its pontiffs and bishops lost, in many places, no small part of that extensive authority which they had so long enjoyed. The halcyon days were now over, in which the papal clergy excited with impunity seditious tumults in the state, interfered openly in the transactions of government, struck terror into the hearts of sovereigns and subjects by the thunder of their anathemas, and, imposing burthensome contributions on the credulous multitude, filled their coffers by notorious acts of tyranny and oppression. The pope himself, though still honoured with the same pompous titles and denominations, frequently found, by a mortifying and painful experience, that these titles had lost a considerable part of their former signification, and that the energy of these denominations daily diminished. For now almost all the princes and states of Europe had adopted the important maxim, formerly peculiar to the French nation; that the power of the Roman pontiff is confined to matters of a religious and spiritual nature, and cannot, under any pretext whatever, extend to civil transactions or worldly affairs. In the schools, indeed, and colleges of Roman catholic countries, and in the writings of the Romish priests and doctors, the majesty of the pope was still exalted in the most emphatic terms, and his prerogatives were displayed with all imaginable pomp. The Jesuits also, who have been always ambitious of a distinguished place among the assertors of the power and preeminence of the Roman see, and who give themselves out for the pope's most obsequious creatures, raised their voices, in this ignoble cause, even above those of the schools and colleges. Even in the courts of sovereign princes, very flattering terms and high-sounding phrases were sometimes used, to express the dignity and authority of the head of the church. But as it happens in other cases, that men's actions are frequently very different from their language, so was this observation particularly verified in the case of *Rome's holy father*. He was extolled in words, by those who despised him most in reality; and, when any dispute arose between him and the princes of his communion, the latter respected his

[a] See Ludolfi Histor. Æthiopica, lib. iii. cap. xii.—Geddes' Church History of Ethiopia, p. 233.—La Croze, Histoire du Christianisme d'Ethiopie, p. 79.—Lobo, Voyage d'Abyssinie, p. 116, 130, 144, with the additions of Le Grand, p. 173, and the fourth Dissertation that is subjoined to the second volume. In this dissertation, Le Grand, himself a Roman Catholic, makes the following remark upon the conduct of the patriarch Mendez: "It is to be wished that the patriarch had never intermeddled in such a variety of affairs," (*by which mitigated expression the author means his ambitious attempts to govern in the cabinet as well as in the church.*) "or carried his authority to such a height, as to behave in Ethiopia as if he had been in a country where the inquisition was established: for, by this conduct, he set all the people against him, and excited in them such an aversion to the Roman Catholics in general, and to the Jesuits in particular, as nothing has been hitherto able to diminish, and which subsists in its full force to this day." ☞ The third book of La Croze's History, which relates to the progress and ruin of this mission, is translated by Mr. Lockman into English, and inserted in the Travels of the Jesuits, vol. i. p. 308, &c. as also is Poncet's Voyage, mentioned in the following note.

[b] These projects are mentioned by Cerri, and by Le Grand in his Supplement to Lobo's Itinerarium Æthiopicum.* The reader who would know what credit is to be given to what the Jesuits say of the attachment and veneration which the Asiatic and African Christians express for the church of Rome, will do well to compare the relations of Le Grand, who was a Roman Catholic, and no enemy to the Jesuits, and who drew his relations from the most authentic records, with those of Poncet, a French physician, who went into Ethiopia in 1698, accompanied by Father Brevedent, a Jesuit, who died during the voyage. This comparison will convince every ingenuous and impartial inquirer, that the accounts of the Jesuits are not to be trusted, and that they surpass the ancient Carthaginians themselves in the art of deceiving. Poncet's Voyage is published in the fourth volume of the Jesuitical work, entitled, Lettres Curieuses et Edifiantes des Missions Etrangeres.

[c] Lafitau and Reboulet, who have composed each a Life of pope Clement XI., tell us, that the emperor of Abyssinia desired that pontiff, in 1703, to send to his court missionaries and legates to instruct him and his people, and to receive their submission to the see of Rome. These biographers go still farther, and assert that this monarch actually embraced the communion of Rome, in 1712. But these assertions are idle fictions, forged by the Jesuits and their creatures. It is well known, on the contrary, that, not many years ago, the edict prohibiting the entrance of Europeans within the Abyssinian frontier, was still in force, and was executed with the greatest severity. Even the Turks are included in this prohibition; and what is still more remarkable, the Egyptian Monophysites, who have once entered within the Abyssinian territories, are not allowed to return into their own country. All these facts are confirmed by a modern writer of the most unquestionable authority, the learned and worthy M. Maillet, the French consul-general in Egypt, and ambassador from Louis XIV. to the emperor of Abyssinia, in his Description de l'Egypte, par. i. p. 325. See also Le Grand's Supplement. The last-mentioned author, after relating all the attempts that have been made in our times, by the French nation and the pope, to introduce Romish priests into Abyssinia, adds, that all such attempts must appear vain and chimerical to all those who have any knowledge of the empire of Abyssinia, and of the spirit and character of its

☞ * Father Lobo, who resided nine years in Ethiopia, has given an elegant and lively, though simple and succinct description, of that vast empire, in his Itinerarium Æthiopicum. This itinerary was translated into French by M. Le Grand, and enriched by him with curious anecdotes and dissertations. Hence Dr. Mosheim sometimes quotes the Itinerarium, under the title of Voyage d'Abyssinie, referring to Le Grand's French translation of it.

authority no farther than they found expedient for their own purposes, and measured the extent of his prerogatives and jurisdiction, not by the slavish adulation of the colleges and the Jesuits, but by a regard to their own interests and independence.

XIX. This the pontiffs learned by disagreeable experience, as often as they endeavoured, in this century, to resume their former pretensions, to interpose their authority in civil affairs, and encroach upon the jurisdiction of sovereign states. The conduct of Paul V. and its consequences furnish a striking example that abundantly verifies this observation. This haughty and arrogant pontiff, in 1606, laid the republic of Venice under an interdict. The reasons alleged for this insolent proceeding, were the prosecution of two ecclesiastics for capital crimes, and the promulgation of two edicts, one of which prohibited the erection of any more religious edifices in the Venetian territories, without the knowledge and consent of the senate, while the other forbade the alienation of any lay possessions or estates in favour of the clergy, without the express approbation of the republic.[a] The assembled senators received this papal insult with dignity, and conducted themselves under it with becoming resolution and fortitude. Their first step was to prevent their clergy from executing the interdict, by an act prohibiting that cessation of public worship, and that suspension of the sacraments, which the pope had so imperiously commanded. Their next step was equally vigorous; for they banished from their territories the Jesuits and Capuchins, who intended to obey the orders of the pope, in opposition to their express commands. In the process of this controversy they employed their ablest pens, and particularly that of the learned and ingenious Paul Sarpi, of the order of Servites, to demonstrate, on one hand, the justice of their cause, and to determine, on the other, after an accurate and impartial inquiry, the true limits of the pontiff's jurisdiction and authority. The arguments of these writers were so strong and cogent, that Baronius, and the other learned advocates whom the pope had employed in supporting his pretensions and defending his measures, struggled in vain against irresistible evidence. In the mean time all things tended toward a rupture; and Paul was assembling his forces in order to make war upon the Venetians, when Henry IV., king of France, interposed as mediator,[e] and adjusted a peace between the contending parties, on conditions not very honourable to the ambitious pontiff;[a] for the Venetians could not be persuaded either to repeal the edicts and resolutions they had issued against the court of Rome on this occasion, or to recall the Jesuits from their exile.[c] It is remarkable, that, at the time of this rupture, the senate entertained serious thoughts of a total separation from the church of Rome, in which the ambassadors of England and Holland did all that was in their power to confirm that assembly. But many considerations of a momentous nature intervened to prevent the execution of this design, which, as it would seem, had not the approbation of the sagacious and prudent Father Paul, notwithstanding his aversion to the tyranny and maxims of the court of Rome.[d]

XX. Had the Portuguese acted with the same wisdom and resolution that distinguished the Venetians, their contest with the court of Rome, which began under the pontificate of Urban VIII. in 1641, and was carried on until the year 1666, would have been terminated in a manner equally disadvantageous to the haughty pretensions of the pontiffs. The Portuguese, unable to bear any longer the tyranny and oppression of the Spanish government, threw off the yoke, and chose Don John, duke of Braganza, for their king. Urban and his successors obstinately refused, notwithstanding the most earnest and pressing solicitations, both of the French and Portuguese, either to acknowledge Don John's title to the crown, or to confirm the bishops whom that prince had named to fill the vacant sees in Portugal. Hence it happened, that the greatest part of the kingdom remained for a long time without bishops. The pretended vicar of Christ upon earth, whose character ought to set him above the fear of man, was so slavishly apprehensive of the resentment of the king of Spain, that, rather than offend that monarch, he violated the most solemn obligations of his station, by leaving such a number of churches without pastors and spiritual guides. The

inhabitants; his words are: "Toutes ces entreprises paroitront chimériques à ceux qui connoitront l'Abissinie et les Abissins."

☞ [a] It must be observed here, that it was at the request of the pope, and not of the Venetians, that Henry acted as mediator. The Venetians had nothing to fear. Their cause was considered as the common cause of all the sovereign states of Italy: and the dukes of Urbino, Modena, and Savoy, had already offered their troops and services to the republic. The rash pontiff, perceiving the storm that was gathering against him, took refuge in the French monarch's intercession.

[b] Beside De Thou and other historians, see Daniel's Histoire de la France, tom. x.—Heidegger's Historia Papatus, period. vii. sect. ccxx. —Jaeger's Historia Eccles. sæc. XVII. decenn. i.—More especially the writings of the famous Paul Sarpi, commonly called Fra-Paolo, and of the other divines and canonists that defended the cause of the republic, deserve a careful and attentive perusal; for these writings were composed with such solidity, learning, and eloquence, that they produced remarkable effects, and contributed much to open the eyes of several princes and magistrates, and to prevent their submitting blindly and implicitly, as their ancestors had done, to the imperious dictates of the pontiffs. Among the most masterly pieces written in this cause, we must place Fra-Paolo's Istoria delle Cose passate entre Paolo V. é la Republ. di Venetia, published at Mirandola in 1624, and his Historia Interdicti Veneti, which was published at Cambridge in 1626, by bishop Bedell, who, during these troubles, had been chaplain to the English ambassador at Venice. Paul V., by forcing the Venetians to expose, in these admirable productions, his arrogance and temerity, on one hand, and many truths unfavourable to the pretensions of the popes on the other, was the occasion of the greatest perplexities and oppositions that the court of Rome had to encounter in after-times.

[c] When peace was concluded between the Venetians and the pope, in 1607, the Capuchins and the other ecclesiastics, who had been banished on account of their partiality to the cause of Rome, were all re-instated in their respective functions, except the Jesuits; and even the latter were recalled in 1657, under the pontificate of Alexander VII. in consequence of the earnest and importunate requests of Louis XIV. king of France, and several other princes, who gave the Venetians no rest until they re-admitted these dangerous guests into their territories. It is, nevertheless, to be observed, that the Jesuits never recovered the credit and influence they had formerly enjoyed in that republic, nor, at this present time, are there any people of the Romish communion, among whom their society has less power than among the Venetians, who have never yet forgotten their rebellious behaviour during the quarrel now mentioned. See the Voyage Historique en Italie, Allemagne, Suisse, (published at Amsterdam in 1736,) tom. i. p. 291. It is farther worthy of observation, that, since this famous quarrel, the bulls and rescripts of the popes have just as much authority at Venice, as the senate judges consistent with the rules of wise policy, and the true interests and welfare of the community. For proof of this, we need go no farther than the respectable testimony of cardinal Henry Norris, who, in 1676, wrote to Magliabecchi in the following terms: *Poche Bulle passevano quelle acque verso la parte del Adriatico, per le massime lasciate nel Testamento di* Fra-Paolo; i. e. Few papal Bulls pass the Po, or approach the coasts of the Adriatic sea: the maxims bequeathed to the Venetians by Fra-Paolo, render this passage extremely difficult.

[d] This intention is particularly mentioned by Burnet, in his Life of Bishop Bedell, and by M. Courayer in his Defense de la Nouvelle Traduction de l'Histoire du Concile de Trente. The latter writer shows plainly, that Father Paul, though his sentiments differed in many

French, and other European courts, advised and exhorted the new king of Portugal to follow the noble example of the Venetians, and to assemble a national council, by which the new-created bishops might be confirmed, in spite of the pope, in their respective sees. Don John seemed disposed to listen to their counsels, and to act with resolution and vigour at this important crisis; but his enterprising spirit was checked by the formidable power of the court of inquisition, the incredible superstition of the people, and the blind zeal and attachment that the nation in general discovered for the person and authority of the pontiff. Hence the popes continued their insults with impunity; and it was not before peace was concluded between Portugal and Spain, five-and-twenty years after this revolution, that the bishops nominated by the king were confirmed by the pope. It was under the pontificate of Clement IX. that an accommodation was brought about between the courts of Portugal and Rome. It must, indeed, be observed, to the honour of the Portuguese, that, notwithstanding their superstitious attachment to the court of Rome, they vigorously opposed its ambitious pontiff in all his attempts to draw from this contest an augmentation of his power and authority in their kingdom; nor did the bishops permit, in their respective sees, any encroachment to be made, at this time, upon the privileges and rights enjoyed by their monarchs in former ages.[a]

XXI. There had subsisted, during many preceding ages, an almost uninterrupted variance between the French monarchs and the pontiffs, which had often occasioned an open rupture, and which produced more than once that violent effect during this century. The greatest exertions of industry, artifice, and assiduous labour, were employed by the popes, during the whole of this period, to conquer the aversion that the French had conceived against the pretensions and authority of the court of Rome, and to undermine imperceptibly, and enervate and destroy by degrees, the liberties of the Gallican church. In this arduous and important enterprise the Jesuits acted a principal part, and seconded, with all their dexterity and craft, the designs of the aspiring pontiffs. But these attempts and stratagems were effectually defeated and disconcerted by the parliament of Paris, while many able pens exposed the tyranny and injustice of the papal claims. Richer, Launoy, Peter de Marca, Natalis Alexander, Elias du-Pin, and others, displayed their learning and talents in this contest, though with different degrees of merit. They appealed to the ancient decrees of the Gallican church, which they confirmed by recent authorities, and enforced by new and victorious arguments. It will naturally be thought, that these bold and respectable defenders of the rights and liberties, both of the church and state, were amply rewarded, for their generous labours, by peculiar marks of the approbation and protection of the court of France. But this was so far from being always the case, that they received, on the contrary, from time to time, several marks of its resentment and displeasure, designed to appease the rage and indignation of the threatening pontiff, whom it was thought expedient to treat sometimes with artifice and caution. Rome, however, gained little by this mild policy of the French court; for it has been always a prevailing maxim with the monarchs of that nation, that their prerogatives and pretensions are to be defended against the encroachments of the pontiffs with as little noise and contention as possible, and that pompous memorials, and warm and vehement remonstrances, are to be carefully avoided, except in cases of urgent necessity.[b] Nor do these princes think it beneath their dignity to yield, more or less, to time and occasion, and even to pretend a great veneration for the orders and authority of the pontiffs, in order to obtain from them, by fair means, the immunities and privileges which they look upon as their due. But they are, nevertheless, constantly on their guard; and, as soon as they perceive the court of Rome taking advantage of their lenity to extend its dominion, and the lordly popes growing insolent in consequence of their mildness and submission, they then alter their tone, change their measures, and resume the language that becomes the monarchs of a nation, that could never bear the tyranny and oppression of the papal yoke. This appears evidently in the contests that arose between the courts of France and Rome, under the reign of Louis XIV., of which it will not be improper to give here some remarkable instances.[c]

XXII. The first of these contests happened in the pontificate of Alexander VII., and arose from the temerity and insolence of his Corsican guards, who, in 1662, insulted the French ambassador and his lady, the duke and duchess of Crequi, at the instigation, as it is supposed, of the pope's nephews. Louis demanded satisfaction for the insult offered to his representative; and, on the pope's delaying to answer this demand, actually ordered his troops to file off for Italy, and to besiege the arrogant pontiff in his capital. Alexander, terrified by these warlike preparations, implored the clemency of the incensed monarch, who granted pardon and absolution to the humble pontiff, and concluded a peace with him at Pisa, in 1664, upon the most inglorious and mortifying conditions. These conditions were, that the pope should send his nephew to Paris, in the character of a suppliant for pardon; that he should brand the Corsican guards with perpetual infamy, and break them by a public edict; and should erect a pyramid at Rome, with an inscription destined to preserve the memory of this audacious instance of papal insolence, and of the exemplary manner in which it was chastised and humbled by the French monarch. It is however to be observed, that, in this contest, Louis did not chastise Alexander, considered as head of the church, but as a temporal prince violating the law of nations.[d] Yet he

points from the doctrine of the church of Rome, did not approve all the tenets received by the protestants, or suggest to the Venetians the idea of renouncing the Romish faith.

[a] See Geddes' History of the Pope's Behaviour toward Portugal, from 1641 to 1666, in his Miscellaneous Tracts, vol. ii. p. 73—186.—The cause of the Portuguese, in this quarrel, is defended with great learning and sagacity by a French writer, whose name was Bulliald, in a book entitled, Pro Ecclesiis Lusitanis ad Clerum Gallicanum Libelli Duo.

☞ [b] It is with a view to this that Voltaire, speaking of the manner in which the court of France maintains its prerogatives against the Roman pontiff, says, pleasantly, that "the king of France kisses the pope's feet, and ties up his hands."

☞ [c] The long note [1] of the original, in which Dr. Mosheim has examined that interesting question, "Whether the papal authority gained or lost ground in France during the seventeenth century?" is transposed by the translator into the text, and placed at the end of our author's account of the quarrels of Louis XIV. with the pope, where it comes in with the utmost propriety. See sect. xxiii.

[d] See Jaegeri Histor. Eccles. sæc. XVII. decenn. vii. lib. ii. cap. ii. p. 180.—Voltaire, Siecle de Louis XIV. tom. i. p. 134. *Edit. de Dresde*, 1753.—Archenholtz, Memoires de la Reine Christine, tom. ii. p. 72.

showed, on other occasions, that, when seriously provoked, he was as much disposed to humble papal as princely ambition, and that he feared the head of the church as little as the temporal ruler of the ecclesiastical state. This appeared evidently by the important and warm debate he had with Innocent XI. considered in his spiritual character, which began about the year 1678, and was carried on for several years with great animosity and contention. The subject of this controversy was a right called in France the *regale*, by which the French king, upon the death of a bishop, claimed the revenues and fruits of his see, and also discharged several parts[a] of the episcopal function, until a new bishop was elected. Louis was desirous that all the churches in his dominions should be subject to the *regale*. Innocent pretended, on the contrary, that this claim could not be granted with such universality; nor would he consent to any augmentation of the prerogatives of this nature, that had formerly been enjoyed by the kings of France. Thus the claims of the prince and the remonstrances of the pontiff, both urged with warmth and perseverance, formed a sharp and violent contest, which was carried on by both parties with spirit and resolution. The pontiff sent forth his bulls and mandates. The monarch opposed their execution by the terror of penal laws, and the authority of severe edicts against all who dared to treat them with the smallest regard. When the pope refused to confirm the bishops who were nominated by the king, the latter took care to have them consecrated and inducted into their respective sees; and thus, in some measure, declared to the world, that the Gallican church could govern itself without the intervention of the Roman pontiff. Innocent, who was a man of a high spirit, and inflexibly obstinate in his purposes, did not lose courage at a view of these resolute and vigorous proceedings, but threatened the monarch with the divine vengeance, issued out bull after bull, and did every thing in his power to convince his adversaries, that the vigour and intrepidity, which formerly distinguished the lordly rulers of the Romish church, were not yet totally extinguished.[b] This obstinacy, however, only served to add fuel to the indignation and resentment of Louis; and accordingly that monarch summoned the famous assembly of bishops,[c] which met at Paris in 1682. In this convocation, the ancient doctrine of the Gallican church, that declares the power of the pope to be merely spiritual, and also inferior to that of a general council, was drawn up anew in four propositions,[d] which were solemnly adopted by the whole assembly, and were proposed to the whole body of the clergy and to all the universities throughout the kingdom, as a sacred and inviolable rule of faith. But even this respectable decision of the affair, which gave such a severe wound to the authority of Rome, did not shake the constancy of its resolute pontiff, or reduce him to silence.[e]

Another contest arose, some time after the one now mentioned, between these princes, whose mutual jealousy and dislike inflamed their divisions. This new dispute broke out in 1687, when Innocent wisely resolved to suppress the franchises, and the right of asylum, which had formerly been enjoyed by the ambassadors residing at Rome,[f] and had, on many occasions, proved a sanctuary for rapine, violence, and injustice, by procuring impunity for the most heinous malefactors. The marquis de Lavardin refused, in the name of the French king, to submit to this new regulation; and Louis took all the violent methods that pride and resentment could invent to oblige the pontiff to restore to his ambassador the immunities above mentioned.[g] Innocent, on the other hand, persisted in his purpose, opposed the king's demands in the most open and intrepid manner, and could not be induced by any consideration to yield, even in appearance, to his ambitious adversary.[h] His death, however, put an end to this long debate, which had proved really detrimental to both parties. His successors, being men of a softer and more complaisant disposition, were less averse to the concessions that were necessary to bring about a reconciliation, and to the measures that were adapted to remove the chief causes of these

☞ [a] The author means here undoubtedly the collation of all benefices, which became vacant in the diocese of a deceased bishop, before the nomination of his successor. The right of collation, in such cases, was comprehended in the *regale*. See note [c].

[b] See Jo. Hen. Heideggeri Historia Papatus, period. vii. sect. cccxli. p. 555. ☞ Voltaire's Siecle de Louis XIV. tom. i. p. 221. A great number of writers have either incidentally or professedly treated the subject of the *regale*, and have given ample accounts of the controversies it has occasioned. But no author has traced out more circumstantially the rise and progress of this famous right than cardinal Henry Norris, in his Istoria delle Investiture Ecclesiast. p. 547.

☞ [c] This assembly, which consisted of thirty-five bishops, and as many deputies of the second order, extended the *regale* to all the churches in France without exception. The bishops, at the same time, thought proper to represent it to the king, as their humble opinion, that those ecclesiastics whom he should be pleased to nominate, during the vacancy of the see, to benefices attended with cure of souls, were bound to apply for induction and confirmation to the grand vicars appointed by the chapters.

☞ [d] These four propositions were to the following purport:

1. That neither St. Peter nor his successors have received from God any power to interfere, directly or indirectly, in what concerns the temporal interests of princes and sovereign states; that kings and princes cannot be deposed by ecclesiastical authority, nor their subjects freed from the sacred obligation of fidelity and allegiance, by the power of the church, or the bulls of the Roman pontiff.

2. That the decrees of the council of Constance, which represent the authority of general councils as superior to that of the pope, in spiritual matters, are approved and adopted by the Gallican church.

3. That the rules, customs, institutions, and observances, which have been received in the Gallican church, are to be preserved inviolable.

4. That the decisions of the pope, in points of faith, are not infallible, unless they be attended with the consent of the church.

[e] This pope was far from keeping silence with respect to the famous propositions mentioned in the preceding note. As they were highly unfavourable to his authority, so he took care to have them refuted and opposed both in private and in public. The principal champion for the papal cause, on this occasion, was the cardinal Celestin Sfondrati, who, in 1684, published, under the feigned name of Eugenius Lombardus, a treatise, entitled, Regale Sacerdotium Romano Pontifici assertium, et quatuor Propositionibus explicatum. This treatise was printed in Switzerland, as appears evidently by the character or form of the letters. Several German, Flemish, Italian, and Spanish doctors, stood forth to support the tottering majesty of the pontiff against the court of France; and more especially the learned Nicolas du Bois, professor at Louvain, whose writings in defence of the pope are mentioned by Bossuet. But all these papal champions were defeated by the famous prelate last mentioned, the learned and eloquent bishop of Meaux, who, by the king's special order, composed that celebrated work, which appeared in 1730, under the following title: Defensio Declarationis celeberrimæ, quam de Potestate Ecclesiasticâ sanxit Clerus Gallicanus, xix Martii, MDCLXXXII, Luxemburgi. The late publication of this defence was owing to the prospect of a reconciliation between the courts of France and Rome, after the death of Innocent; which reconciliation actually took place, and engaged Louis to prohibit the publication of this work.

☞ [f] This right of asylum extended much farther than the ambassador's palace, whose immunity the pope did not mean to violate; it comprehended a considerable extent of ground which was called a *quarter*, and undoubtedly gave occasion to great and flagrant abuses.

☞ [g] The marquis de Lavardin began his embassy by entering Rome, surrounded with a thousand men in arms.

[h] See Jaegeri Historia Ecclesiastic. sæc. XVII. decenn. ix. p. 19, and Legatio Lavardini; but, above all, the Memoires de la Reine Christine, tom. ii. p. 248; for Christina took part in this contest, and adopted the cause of the French monarch.

unseemly contests. They were not, indeed, so far unmindful of the papal dignity, and of the interests of Rome, as to patch up an agreement on inglorious terms. On the one hand, the right of *asylum* was suppressed with the king's consent; on the other the right of the *regale* was settled, with modifications.[a] The four famous propositions, relating to the pope's authority and jurisdiction, were softened, by the king's permission, in private letters addressed to the pontiff by certain bishops; but they were neither abrogated by the prince, nor renounced by the clergy: on the contrary, they still remain in force, and occupy an eminent place among the laws of the kingdom.

XXIII. [b]Several protestant writers of great merit and learning, lament the accessions of power and authority which the Roman pontiffs are supposed to have gained in France during the course of this century. They tell us, with sorrow, that the Italian notions of the papal majesty and jurisdiction, which the French nation had, in former ages, looked upon with abhorrence, gained ground now, and had infected not only the nobility and clergy, but almost all ranks and orders of men; and hence they conclude, that the famous rights and liberties of the Gallican church have suffered greatly by the perfidious stratagems of the Jesuits. They are led into this opinion by certain measures that were taken by the French court, and which seemed to favour the pretensions of the Roman pontiff. They are confirmed in it by the declamations of the Jansenists, and other modern writers among the French, who complain of the high veneration that was paid to the papal bulls during this century; of the success of the Jesuits in instilling into the mind of the king and his counsellors the maxims of Rome, and an excessive attachment to its bishop; of the violence and ill treatment that were offered to all those who firmly adhered to the doctrine and maxims of their forefathers; and of the gradual attempts that were made to introduce the formidable tribunal of the inquisition into France. But it will perhaps appear, on mature consideration, that too much stress is laid, by many, on these complaints, and that the rights and privileges of the Gallican church were in this century, and are actually at this day, in the same state and condition in which we find them during those earlier ages, of which the writers and declaimers above mentioned incessantly boast. It might be asked, where are the victories that are said to have been obtained over the French by the popes, and which some protestant doctors, lending a credulous ear to the complaints of the Jansenists and Appellants, think they perceive with the utmost clearness? I am persuaded that it would be difficult, if not impossible, to give a satisfactory answer in the affirmative to this question.

It is true, indeed, that, as the transactions of government, in general, are now carried on in France, with more subtlety, secrecy, and art, than in former times, so, in particular, the stratagems and machinations of the pontiffs have been opposed and defeated with more artifice and less noise, than in those more rude and unpolished ages, when almost every contest was terminated by brutal force and open violence. The opposition between the court of France and the bishop of Rome still subsists; but the manner of conducting it is changed; and the contests are carried on with less clamour, though not with less animosity and vigour, than in former times. This new and prudent manner of disputing is not agreeable to the restless, fiery, and impatient temper of the French, who have an irresistible propensity to noisy, clamorous, and expeditious proceedings; and hence undoubtedly arise all the complaints we have heard, and still hear, of the decline of the liberties of the Gallican church, in consequence of the growing influence and perfidious counsels of the Jesuits. If those, however, who are accustomed to make these complaints, would for a moment suspend their prejudices, and examine with attention the history, and also the present state of their country, they would soon perceive that their ecclesiastical *liberties*,[c] instead of declining, or of being neglected by their monarchs, are maintained and preserved with greater care, resolution, and foresight, than ever. It must indeed be acknowledged, that, in France, there are multitudes of cringing slaves, who basely fawn upon the pontiffs, exalt their prerogatives, revere their majesty, and, through the dictates of superstition, interest, or ambition, are ever ready to hug the papal chain, and submit their necks blindly to the yoke of those spiritual tyrants; but it may be proved, by the most undoubted facts, and by innumerable examples, that these servile creatures of the pope abounded as much in France in former ages as they do at this day; and it must be also considered, that it is not by the counsels of this slavish tribe, that the springs of government are moved, or the affairs of state and church transacted. It must be farther acknowledged, that the Jesuits have attained a very high degree of influence and authority,[d] and sometimes have credit enough to promote measures that are by no means consistent with the rights of the Gallican church, and must consequently be considered as heavy grievances by the patrons of the ancient ecclesiastical liberty. But here it may be observed, on one hand, that many such measures were proposed and followed before the rise of the Jesuits; and, on the other, that many affairs of great consequence are daily transacted in a manner highly displeasing and detrimental to that society, and extremely disagreeable to the Roman pontiffs. If it be alleged, that those who defend with learning and judgment the ancient doctrines and maxims of the Gallican church, scarcely escape public censure and punishment, and that those who maintain them with vehemence and intemperate zeal are frequently rewarded with exile or a prison; and that even the most humble and modest patrons of these doctrines are left in obscurity without encouragement or recompense; all this must be granted. But it must be considered, that the cause they maintain, and the ancient doctrines and maxims they defend, are not condemned,

[a] See Fleury's Institutions du Droit Ecclesiastique François, which excellent work is translated into Latin. Dr. Mosheim refers to p. 454 of the Latin version.

[b] See Note [e], p. 550.

☞ [c] It is scarcely necessary to inform the reader, that by these *liberties* we do not mean that rational and Christian liberty which entitles every individual to follow the light of his own conscience and the dictates of his own judgment in religious matters; for no such liberty is allowed in France. The liberties of the Gallican church consist in the opposition which that church has made, at different times, to the overgrown power of the Roman pontiff, and to his pretended *persona.* infallibility.

☞ [d] Dr. Mosheim wrote this in 1753, before the suppression of the order of Jesuits in France. The downfall of that society, and the circumstances that attended it, seem both to illustrate and confirm his judicious notion with respect to the degree of credit and influence which the popes have had in that kingdom for some time past.

nor even deserted; the matter is only this, that the prince and his ministry have fallen upon a new method of maintaining and supporting them. It appears to them much more conducive to public peace and order, that the stratagems and attempts of the pontiffs should be opposed and defeated by secret exertions of resolution and vigour, without noise or ostentation, than by learned productions and clamorous disputes; which, for the most part, excite factions in the kingdom, inflame the spirits of the people, throw the state into tumult and confusion, exasperate the pontiffs, and alienate them still more and more from the French nation. In the mean time the doctors and professors, who are placed in the various seminaries of learning, are left at liberty to instruct the youth n the ancient doctrine and discipline of the church, and o explain and inculcate those maxims and laws by which, in former times, the papal authority was restrained and confined within certain limits. If these laws and maxims are infringed, and if even violent methods are employed against those who firmly adhere to them, this happens very rarely, and never but when their suspension is required by some case of extreme necessity, or by the prospect of some great advantage to the community. Besides, those who sit at the political helm, always take care to prevent the pope's reaping much benefit from this suspension or neglect of the ancient laws and maxims of the church. This circumstance, which is of so much importance in the present question, must appear evident to such as will be at the pains to look into the history of the debates that attended, and the consequences that followed the reception of the *Bull Unigenitus* in France, than which no papal edict could seem more repugnant to the rights and liberties of the Gallican church. In the business of this bull, as in other transactions of a like nature, the court proceeded upon this political maxim, that a smaller evil is to be submitted to, when a greater may be thereby prevented.

In a word, the kings of France have almost always treated the Roman pontiffs as the heroes, who are said in pagan story to have descended into Tartarus, behaved toward the triple-jawed guardian of that lower region: sometimes they offered a soporiferous cake to suppress his grumbling and menacing tone; at others they terrified him with their naked swords, and the din of arms; and this with a view to stop his barking, and to obtain the liberty of directing their course in the manner they thought proper. There is nothing invidious designed by this comparison, which certainly represents, in a lively manner, the caresses and threatenings that were employed by the French monarchs, according to the nature of the times, the state of affairs, the characters of the pontiffs, and other incidental circumstances, in order to render the court of Rome favourable to their designs. We have dwelt, perhaps, too much upon this subject; but we thought it not improper to undeceive many protestant writers, who, too much influenced by the bitter complaints and declamations of certain Jansenists, and not sufficiently instructed in the history of these ecclesiastical contentions, have formed erroneous notions concerning that point which we have here endeavoured to examine and discuss.

XXIV. The corruptions that had been complained of in preceding ages, both in the higher and inferior orders of the Romish clergy, were rather increased than diminished during this century, as the most impartial writers of that communion candidly confess. The bishops were rarely indebted for their elevation to eminent learning, or superior merit. The intercession of potent patrons, services rendered to men in power, connexions of blood, and simoniacal practices, were, generally speaking, the steps to preferment; and, what was still more deplorable, their promotion was sometimes obtained by their vices. Their lives were such, as might be expected from persons who had risen in the church by such unseemly means; for, had they been obliged by their profession, to give public examples of those vices which the holy laws of the Gospel so solemnly and expressly condemn, instead of exhibiting patterns of sanctity and virtue to their flock, they could not have conducted themselves otherwise than they did.[a] Some indeed there were, who, sensible of the obligations of their profession, displayed a true Christian zeal, in administering useful instruction, and exhibiting pious examples to their flock, and exerted their utmost vigour and activity, in opposing the vices of the sacred order in particular, and the licentiousness of the times in general. But these rare cultivators of virtue and piety were either ruined by the resentment and stratagems of their envious and exasperated brethren, or were left in obscurity, without that encouragement and support which were requisite to enable them to execute effectually their pious and laudable purposes. The same treatment fell to the lot of those among the lower order of the clergy, who endeavoured to maintain the cause of truth and virtue. But the number of sufferers in this noble cause was small, compared with the multitude of corrupt ecclesiastics, who were carried away with the torrent, instead of opposing it, and whose lives were spent in scenes of pleasure, or in the anxiety and toils of avarice and ambition. While we acknowledge, that, among the bishops and inferior clergy, there were several exceptions from that general prevalence of immorality and licentiousness with which the sacred order was chargeable, it is also incumbent upon us to do justice to the merit of some of the Roman pontiffs, in this century, who used their most zealous endeavours to reform the manners of the clergy, or, at least, to oblige them to observe the rules of external decency in their conduct and conversation. It is however matter of surprise, that these pontiffs did not perceive the insurmountable obstacles to the success of their counsels, and the fruits of their wise and salutary edicts, that arose from the internal constitution of the Romish church, and the very nature of the papal government; for, if the pontiffs were even divinely inspired, and really infallible, yet, unless this inspiration and infallibility were attended with a miraculous power, and with the supernatural privilege of being present in many places at the same time, it is not conceivable how they should ever entertain a notion of the possibility of restoring or maintaining order, or good morals, among the prodigious multitude of persons of all classes and characters that are subject to their jurisdiction.

XXV. Though the monks, in several places, behaved with much more circumspection and decency than in former times, yet they had every where departed, in a great

[a] The reader may see these disagreeable accounts of the corruptions of the clergy confirmed by a great number of unexceptionable testimonies, drawn from the writings of the most eminent doctors of the Romish church, in the Memoires de Port Royal, tom. ii. p. 308.

measure, from the spirit of their founders, and the primitive laws of their respective institutions. About the commencement of this age, their convents and colleges made a most wretched and deplorable figure, as we learn from the accounts of the wisest and most learned, even of their own writers. But, in the progress of the century several attempts were made to remove this disorder. Some wise and pious Benedictines, in France and other countries, reformed several monasteries of their order, and endeavoured to bring them back, as near as was possible, to the laws and discipline of their founders.[a] Their example was followed by the monks of Clugni, the Cistercians, the regular canons, the Dominicans, and Franciscans.[b] It is from this period that we are to date the division of the monastic orders into two general classes. One comprehends the reformed monks, who, reclaimed from that licentiousness and corruption of manners which had formerly dishonoured their societies, lead more strict and regular lives, and discover in their conduct a greater regard to the primitive laws of their order. The other is composed of the un-reformed orders, who, forgetting the spirit of their founders, and the rules of their institutes, spend their days in ease and pleasure, and have no taste for the austerities and hardships of the monastic life. The latter class is evidently the most numerous; and the majority, even of the reformed monks, not only fall short of that purity of manners which their rules enjoin, but are moreover gradually and imperceptibly relapsing into their former indolence and disorder.

XXVI. Among the reformed monks, a particular degree of attention is due to certain Benedictine societies, or congregations, who surpass all the other monastic orders, both in the excellence and utility of their rules and constitution, and in the zeal and perseverance with which they adhere to them. Of these societies the most distinguished is the congregation of St. Maur,[c] which was founded in 1620 by the express order of Gregory XV., and was enriched by Urban VIII. in 1627, with various donations and privileges. It does not indeed appear, that even this society adheres strictly to the spirit and maxims of Benedict, whose name it bears, nor is it beyond the reach of censure in other respects; but these imperfections are compensated by the great number of excellent rules and institutions that are observed in it, and by the regular lives and learned labours of its members. For, in this congregation, a select number of men of genius and talent are set apart for the study of sacred and profane literature, and more especially of history and antiquities; and these learned members are furnished with all the means and materials of knowledge in a rich abundance, and with every thing that can tend to facilitate their labours and render them successful.[d] It must be abundantly known, to those who have any acquaintance with the history and progress of learning in Europe, what signal advantages the republic of letters has derived from the establishment of this famous Congregation, whose numerous and admirable productions have cast a great light upon the various branches of philology and the *belles lettres*, and whose researches have embraced the whole circle of science, philosophy excepted.[e]

---

[a] Le Bœuf, Memoires sur l'Histoire d'Auxerre, tom. ii. p. 513, where an account is given of the first *reforms* made in the convents during this century.—See Martenne's Voyage Literaire de deux Benedictins, par. ii. p. 97.

[b] There is an account of all the convents reformed in this century, in Helyot's Histoire des Ordres, tom. v. vi. vii. to which, however, several interesting circumstances may be added, by consulting other writers. The reform of the monks of Clugni is amply described by the Benedictines, in the Gallia Christiana, tom. vii. p. 544. The same authors speak of the reform of the Regular Canons of St. Augustin, tom. vii. p. 778, 787, 790.—For an account of that of the Cistercians, see Mabillon's Annal. Benedict. tom. vi. p. 121; and the Voyage Literaire de deux Benedictins, tom. i. p. 7; tom. ii. p. 133, 229, 269, 303. The Cistercians were no sooner reformed, than they used their most zealous endeavours for the reformation of the whole society, (i. e. of the Benedictine order,) but in vain. See Meaupou's Vie de l'Abbé de la Trappe, tom. i.

[c] See the Gallia Christiana Nova, an admirable work, composed by the Congregation of St. Maur, tom vii. p. 474.—Helyot, tom. vi. cap. xxxvii. p. 256. The letters patent of Gregory XV., by which the establishment of this famous congregation was approved and confirmed, were criticised with great severity and rigour by Launoy, that formidable scourge of all the monastic orders, in his Examen. Privil. S. Germani, tom. iii. p. i. op. p. 303. The same author, (in his Assert. Inquisit. in priv. S. Medardi, tom. iii. op.) gives an account of the dissentions that arose in this congregation, immediately after its establishment; but this account savours too much of that partiality with which he is chargeable, whenever he treats of monastic affairs.

[d] The Benedictines celebrate, in pompous terms, the exploits of this congregation in general, and more especially its zealous and successful labours in restoring order, discipline, and virtue, in a great number of monasteries, which were falling into ruin through the indolence and corruption of their licentious members; see the "Voyage de deux Religieux Benedictins de la Congregation de S. Maur," tom. i. p. 16; tom. ii. p. 47. This eulogy, though perhaps exaggerated, is not entirely unmerited; and there is no doubt that the Benedictines have contributed much to restore the credit of the monastic orders. There are, nevertheless, several classes of ecclesiastics in the Romish church, who are no well-wishers to this learned congregation, though their dislike be founded on different reasons. In the first class, we may place a certain number of ambitious prelates, whose artful purposes have been disappointed by this ingenious fraternity; for the monks of St. Maur, having turned their principal study toward ancient history and antiquities of every kind, and being perfectly acquainted with ancient records, diplomas, and charters, are thus peculiarly qualified to maintain their possessions, their jurisdictions, and privileges, against the litigious pretensions of the bishops, and have, in fact, maintained them with more success than their order could do in former times, when destitute of learning, or ill furnished with the knowledge of ancient history. The Jesuits form the second class of adversaries, with whom this learned congregation has been obliged to struggle; for, their lustre and reputation being considerably eclipsed by the numerous and admirable productions of these Benedictines, they have used their utmost endeavours to sink, or at least to diminish, the credit of such formidable rivals. See Simon's Lettres Choisies, tom. iv. p. 36, 45. These Benedictines have a third set of enemies, who are instigated by superstition; and it is not improbable that this superstition may be accompanied with a certain mixture of envy. To understand this fully, it must be observed, that the learned monks, of whom we are now speaking, have substituted an assiduous application to the culture of philology and literature in the place of that bodily and manual labour, which the rule of St. Benedict prescribes to his followers. The more robust, healthy, and vigorous monks, indeed, are obliged to employ a certain portion of the day in working with their hands; but those of a weaker constitution and superior genius, are allowed to exchange bodily for mental labour, and, instead of cultivating the lands or gardens of the convent, to spend their days in the pursuit of knowledge, both human and divine. The lazy monks envy this bodily repose; and the superstitious and fanatical ones, who are vehemently prejudiced in favour of the ancient monastic discipline, behold with contempt these learned researches as unbecoming the monastic character, since they tend to divert the mind from divine contemplation. This superstitious and absurd opinion was maintained with peculiar warmth and vehemence, by Armand John Bouthillier de Rance, abbot of La Trappe, in his book des Devoirs Monastiques; upon which the Benedictines employed Mabillon, the most learned of their fraternity, to defend their cause, and to expose the reveries of the abbot in their proper colours. This he did with remarkable success, in his famous book, de Studiis Monasticis, which was published in 1691, passed through many editions, and was translated into different languages. Hence arose that celebrated question, which was long debated with great warmth and animosity in France;—"How far a monk may, consistently with his character, apply himself to the study of literature?" There is an elegant and interesting history of this controversy given by Vincent Thuillier, a most learned monk of the congregation of St. Maur; see the Opera Posthuma of Mabillon and Ruinart, tom. i. p. 365—425.

[e] The curious reader will find an account of the authors and learned productions with which the congregation of St. Maur has enriched the

XXVII. Though these pious attempts to reform the monasteries were not entirely unsuccessful, yet the effects they produced, even in those places where they had succeeded most, came far short of that perfection of austerity that had seized the imaginations of a set of persons, whose number is considerable in the Romish church, though their credit be small, and their severity be generally looked upon as excessive and disgusting. These rigid censors, having always in their eyes the ancient discipline of the monastic orders, and being bent on reducing the modern convents to that austere discipline, looked upon the changes above-mentioned as imperfect and trifling. They considered a monk as a person obliged, by the sanctity of his profession, to spend his whole time in prayer, tears, contemplation, and silence; in the perusal of holy books, and the hardships of bodily labour: they even went so far as to maintain, that all other designs and occupations, however laudable and excellent in themselves, were entirely foreign from the monastic vocation, and, on that account, vain and sinful in persons of that order. This severe plan of monastic discipline was recommended by several persons, whose obscurity put it out of their power to influence many in its behalf; but it was also adopted by the Jansenists, who reduced it to practice in some parts of France,[a] and in none with more success and reputation than in the female convent of Port Royal, where it has subsisted from the year 1618 to our time.[b] These steps of the Jansenists excited a spirit of emulation, and several monasteries exerted themselves in the imitation of this austere model; but they were all surpassed by the famous Bouthillier de Rance, abbot de la Trappe,[c] who, with the most ardent zeal, and indefatigable labour, attended with uncommon success, introduced into his monastery this discipline, in all its austere and shocking perfection. This abbot, so illustrious by his birth, and so remarkable for his extraordinary devotion, was so happy as to vindicate his fraternity from the charge of excessive superstition, which the Jansenists had drawn upon themselves by the austerity of their monastic discipline; and yet his society observed the severe and laborious rule of the ancient Cistercians, whom they even surpassed in abstinence, mortifications, and self-denial. This order still subsists, under the denomination of the Reformed Bernardins of La Trappe, and has several monasteries both in Spain and Italy; but, if credit may be given to the accounts of writers who seem to be well informed, it is degenerating gradually from the austere and painful discipline of its famous founder.[d]

XXVIII. The Romish church, from whose prolific womb all the various forms of superstition issued forth in an amazing abundance, saw several new monastic establishments arise within its borders during this century. The greatest part of them we shall pass over in silence, and confine ourselves to the mention of those which have obtained some degree of fame.

We begin with the Fathers of the Oratory of the Holy Jesus, a famous order, instituted by cardinal Berulle, a man of genius and talents, who displayed his abilities with such success, in the service both of state and church, that he was generally looked upon as equally qualified for shining in these very different spheres. This order, which, both in the nature of its rules, and in the design of its establishment, seems to be in direct opposition to that of the Jesuits, was founded in 1613, has produced a considerable number of persons eminent for their piety, learning, and eloquence, and still maintains its reputation in this respect. Its members however have, on account of certain theological productions, been suspected of introducing new opinions; and this suspicion has not only been raised but is also industriously fomented and propagated by the Jesuits. The priests who enter into this society are not obliged to renounce their property or possessions, but only to refuse all ecclesiastical cures or offices to which any fixed revenues or honours are annexed, as long as they continue members of this fraternity, from which they are, however, at liberty to retire whenever they think proper.[e] While they continue in the order, they are bound to perform, with the greatest fidelity and accuracy, all the priestly functions, and to turn the whole bent of their zeal and industry to one point, namely, the task of preparing and qualifying themselves and others for discharging them daily with greater perfection and more abundant fruits. If, therefore, we consider this order in the original end of its institution, its convents may, not improperly, be called the schools of *sacerdotal divinity*.[f] It is nevertheless to be observed, that, in later times, the Fathers of the Oratory have not confined themselves to this object, but have imperceptibly extended their original plan, and applied themselves to the study of polite litera-

republic of letters, in Ph. le Cerf's Bibliotheque Historique et Critique des Auteurs de la Congregation de St. Maur; and also in Bernard Pez's Bibliotheca Benedictino-Maurina.—These Benedictines still maintain their literary fame by the frequent publications of laborious and learned works both in sacred and profane literature.

[a] See the Mémoires de Port Royal, tom. ii. p. 601. Martin Barcos, the most celebrated Jansenist of this century, introduced this austere rule of discipline into the monastery of St. Cyran, of which he was abbot. See the Gallia Christiana, tom. ii. p. 132, and Moleon's Voyages Liturgiques, p. 135; but, after the death of this famous abbot, the monks of his cloister relapsed into their former disorder, and resumed their former manners. See the Voyage de deux Benedictins, tom. i.

[b] Helyot, tom. v. chap. xliv. p. 455.

[c] This illustrious abbot showed very early an extraordinary genius for the *belles lettres*. At the age of ten, he was master of several of the Greek and Roman poets, and understood Homer perfectly. At the age of twelve or thirteen, he gave an edition of Anacreon, with learned annotations. Some writers allege, that he had imbibed the voluptuous spirit of that poet, and that his subsequent application to the study of theology in the Sorbonne did not entirely extinguish it. They also attribute his conversion to a singular incident. They tell us, that returning from the country, after six weeks' absence from a lady whom he loved passionately, (and not in vain,) he went directly to her chamber by a back-stair, without having the patience to make any previous inquiry about her health and situation. On opening the door, he found the chamber illuminated, and hung with black; and, on approaching the bed, saw the most hideous spectacle that could be presented to his eyes, and the most adapted to mortify passion, inspire horror, and engender the gloom of melancholy devotion, in a mind too lively and too much agitated to improve this shocking change to the purposes of rational piety; he saw his fair mistress in her shroud—dead of the small pox—all her charms fled—and succeeded by the ghastly lines of death, and the frightful marks of that terrible disorder. From that moment, it is said, our abbot retired from the world, repaired to La Trappe, the most gloomy, barren, and desolate spot in the whole kingdom of France, and there spent the forty last years of his life in perpetual acts of the most austere piety.

[d] Marsolier's Vie de l'Abbé de la Trappe.—Meaupou's Vie de M. l'Abbé de la Trappe.—Felibien's Descrip. de l'Ab. de la Trappe.—Helyot, t. vi.

☞ [e] The Fathers, or Priests (as they also are called) of the Oratory, are not, properly speaking, religious, or monks, being bound by no vows, and their institute being purely ecclesiastical or sacerdotal.

[f] See Hubert de Cerisi, Vie du Cardinal Berulle, Fondateur de l'Oratoire de Jesus.—Morini Vita Antiq. prefixed to his Orientalia, p. 3, 110.—R. Simon, Lettres Choisies, tom. ii. p. 60, and his Bibliotheque Critique, (published under the fictitious name of Saint Jorre,) tom. iii. p. 303, 324, 330. For an account of the genius and capacity of Berulle, see Baillet's Vie de Richer, p. 220, 342.—Le Vassor's Histoire de Louis XIII. tom. iii. p. 397.—Helyot, tom. viii. chap. x.—Gallia Christiana Benedictinorum, tom. vii. p. 976.

ture and theology, which they teach with reputation in their colleges.[a]

After these *Fathers*, the next place is due to the Priests of the Missions; an order founded by Vincent de Paul, (who obtained, not long ago, the honours of saintship,) and formed into a regular congregation, in 1632, by pope Urban VIII. The rule prescribed to this society, by its founder, lays its members under the three following obligations: first, to purify themselves, and to aspire daily to higher degrees of sanctity and perfection, by prayer, meditation, the perusal of pious books, and other devout exercises; secondly, to employ eight months in the year in the villages, and, in general, among the country people, in order to instruct them in the principles of religion, form them to the practice of piety and virtue, accommodate their differences, and administer consolation and relief to the sick and indigent; thirdly, to inspect and govern the seminaries in which persons designed for holy orders receive their education, and to instruct the candidates for the ministry, in the sciences that relate to their respective vocations.[b]

The Priests of the Missions were also intrusted with the direction and government of a female order called Virgins of Love, or Daughters of Charity, whose office t was to administer assistance and relief to indigent persons, who were confined to their beds by sickness and infirmity. This order was founded by a noble virgin, whose name was Louisa le Gras, and received, in 1660, the approbation of Clement IX.[c] The Brethren and Sisters of the pious and Christian schools, who are now commonly called Pietists, were formed into a society in 1678, by Nicolas Barre, and obliged by their engagements to devote themselves to the education of poor children of both sexes.[d] It would be endless to mention all the religious societies which rose and fell, were formed by fits of zeal, and dissolved by external incidents, or by their own internal principles of instability and decay.

XXIX. If the Company of Jesus, which may be considered as the soul of the papal hierarchy, and the mainspring that directs its motions, had not been invincible, it must have sunk under the attacks of those formidable enemies, who, during the course of this century assailed it on all sides and from every quarter. When we consider the multitude of the adversaries the Jesuits had to encounter, the heinous crimes with which they were charged, the innumerable affronts they received, and the various calamities in which they were involved, it must appear astonishing that they yet subsist; and still more so, that they enjoy any degree of public esteem, and are not, on the contrary, sunk in oblivion, or covered with infamy. In France, Holland, Poland, and Italy, they experienced, from time to time, the bitter effects of a warm and vehement opposition, and were, both in public and private, accused of the greatest enormities, and charged with maintaining pestilential errors and maxims, that were equally destructive of the temporal and eternal interests of mankind, by their tendency to extinguish the spirit of true religion, and to trouble the order and peace of civil society. The Jansenists, and all who espoused their cause, distinguished themselves more especially in this opposition. They composed an innumerable multitude of books, in order to cover the sons of Loyola with eternal reproach, and to expose them to the hatred and scorn of the universe. Nor were these productions mere defamatory libels dictated by malice alone, or pompous declamations, destitute of argument and evidence. On the contrary, they were attended with the strongest demonstration, being drawn from undeniable facts, and confirmed by unexceptionable testimonies.[e] Yet all this was far from overturning that fabric of profound and insidious policy which the Jesuits had raised, under the protection of the Roman pontiffs, and the connivance of deluded princes and nations. It seemed, on the contrary, as if the opposition of such a multitude of enemies and accusers had strengthened their interest instead of diminishing it, and added to their affluence and prosperity, instead of bringing on their destruction. Amidst the storm that threatened them with a fatal shipwreck, they directed their course with the utmost dexterity, tranquillity and prudence. Thus they safely reached the desired harbour, and rose to the very summit of spiritual authority in the church of Rome. Avoiding, rather than repel-

☞ [a] *The Fathers of the Oratory* will now be obliged, in a more particular manner, to extend their plan, since, by the suppression of the Jesuits in France, the education of youth is committed to them.

[b] Abely's Vie de Vincent de Paul.—Helyot, tom. viii. chap. xi.—Gallia Christiana, tom. vii. p. 998.

[c] Gobillon's Vie de Madame le Gras, Fondatrice des Filles de la Charité, published at *Paris*, in 1676.

[d] Helyot's Histoire des Ordres, tom. viii. chap. xxx. p. 233.

[e] An account of this opposition to, and of these contests with the Jesuits, would furnish matter for many volumes, since there is scarcely any Roman catholic country which has not been the theatre of violent divisions between the sons of Loyola, and the magistrates, monks, or doctors, of the Romish church. In these contests, the Jesuits seemed almost always to be vanquished; and, nevertheless, in the issue, they always came victorious from the field of controversy. A Jansenist writer proposed, some years ago, to collect into one relation the dispersed accounts of these contests, and to give a complete history of this famous order. The first volume of his work accordingly appeared at Utrecht, in 1741, was accompanied with a curious preface, and entitled, Histoire des Religieux de la Compagnie de Jesus. If we may give credit to what this writer tells us of the journeys he undertook, the dangers and difficulties he encountered, and the number of years he spent in investigating the proceedings, and in detecting the frauds and artifices of the Jesuits, we must certainly be persuaded, that no man could be better qualified for composing the history of this insidious order. But this good man, returning imprudently into France, was discovered by his exasperated enemies the Jesuits, and is said to have perished miserably by their hands. Hence not above a third part of his intended work was either published, or finished for the press. ☞ Some things may be added, both by way of correction and illustration, to what Dr. Mosheim has here said concerning the history of the Jesuits and its author. In the first place, its author or compiler is still alive, resides at the Hague, passes by the name of Benard, is supposed to be a Jansenist, and a relative of the famous Father Quesnel, whom the Jesuits persecuted with such violence in France. He is a native of France, and belonged to the oratory. It is also true that he went thither from Holland several years ago; and it was believed, that he had fallen a victim to the resentment of the Jesuits, until his return to the Hague proved that report false. Secondly, this history is carried no farther down than the year 1572, notwithstanding the express promises and engagements, by which our author bound himself, four and twenty years ago,* (in the preface to his first volume,) to publish the whole in a very short time, declaring that it was ready for the press. This suspension is far from being honourable to M. Benard, as he is at full liberty to accomplish his promise. This has made some suspect, that, though he is too much out of the Jesuits' reach to be influenced by their threatenings, he is not too far from them to be moved by the eloquence of their promises, or sufficiently firm and resolute to stand out against the weighty remonstrances they may have employed to prevent the farther publication of his history. It may be observed, thirdly, that the character of a traveller, who has studied the manners and conduct of the Jesuits in the most remarkable scenes of their transactions in Europe, and the other parts of the globe, is here assumed by M. Benard as the most pleasing manner of conveying the accounts which he compiled in his closet. These accounts do not appear to be false, though the character of a traveller, assumed by the compiler, be fictitious. It must be allowed, on the contrary, that M. Benard has drawn his relations from good sources, though his style and manner cannot well be justified from the charge of acrimony and malignity.

* The translator wrote this note in 1765.

ling the assault of their enemies, opposing, for the most part, patience and silence to their redoubled insults, they proceeded uniformly and steadily to their great purpose, and they seemed to have attained it. For those very nations who formerly looked upon a Jesuit as a kind of monster, and as a public pest, commit, at this day, some through necessity, some through choice, and others through both, a great part of their interests and transactions to the direction of this most artful and powerful society.[a]

XXX. All the different branches of literature received, during this century, in the more polished Roman Catholic countries, a new degree of lustre and improvement. France, Spain, Italy, and the Netherlands, produced several men eminent for their genius, erudition, and acquaintance with the learned languages. This happy circumstance must not, however, be attributed to the labour of the schools, or to the methods and procedure of public education; for the old, dry, perplexing, inelegant, scholastic method of instruction prevailed then, and indeed still takes place in both the higher and lower seminaries of learning; and it is the peculiar tendency of this method to damp genius, to depress (instead of exciting and encouraging) the generous efforts of the mind toward the pursuit of truth, and to load the memory with a multitude of insignificant words and useless distinctions. It was beyond the borders of these pedantic seminaries, that genius was encouraged, and directed by great and eminent patrons of science, who opened new paths to the attainment of solid learning, and presented the sciences under a new and engaging aspect to the studious youth. It must be observed here, in justice to the French, that they bore a distinguished part in this literary reformation. Excited by their native force of genius, and animated by the encouragement which learning and learned men received from the munificence of Louis XIV., they cultivated with success almost every branch of literature, and, rejecting the barbarous jargon of the schools, exhibited learning under an elegant and alluring form, and thereby multiplied the number of its votaries and patrons.[b] It is well known how much the example and labours of this polite nation contributed to deliver other countries from the yoke of scholastic bondage.

XXXI. The Aristotelians of this century were a set of intricate dialecticians, who had the name of the Stagirite always in their mouths, without the least portion of his genius, or any tolerable knowledge of his system; and they maintained their empire in the schools, notwithstanding the attempts that had been made to diminish their credit. It was long before the court of Rome, which beheld with terror whatever bore the smallest aspect of novelty, could think of consenting to the introduction of a more rational philosophy, or permit the modern discoveries in that noble science to be explained with freedom in the public seminaries of learning. This appears sufficiently from the fate of Galileo, the famous mathematician of Florence, who was cast into prison by the court of Inquisition, for adopting the sentiments of Copernicus, with regard to the constitution of the solar system. It is true, that Des-Cartes and Gassendi,[c] one by his new philosophy, and the other by his admirable writings, gave a mortal wound to the Peripatetics, and excited a spirit of liberty and emulation that changed the face of science in France. It was under the auspicious influence of these adventurous guides, that several ingenious men of that nation abandoned the perplexed and intricate wilds of the philosophy that was taught by the modern Aristotelians; and, throwing off the shackles of mere authority, dared to consult the dictates of reason and experience, in the study of nature, and in the investigation of truth. Among these converts to true philosophy, several Jesuits, and a still greater number of Jansenists and priests of the Oratory, distinguished themselves; and, accordingly, we find in this list the respectable names of Malebranche, Arnauld, Lami, Nicole, Pascal, who acquired immortal fame by illustrating and improving the doctrine of Des-Cartes, and accommodating it to the purposes of human life.[d] The modesty, circumspection, and self-diffidence of Gassendi, who confessed the scanty measure of his knowledge, and pretended to no other merit than that of pointing out a rational method of arriving at truth, while others boasted that they had already found it out, rendered him disagreeable in France. The ardent curiosity, the fervour, precipitation, and impatience of that lively people, could not bear the slow and cautious method of proceeding that was recommended by the cool wisdom of this prudent inquirer. They wanted to get at the summit of philosophy, without climbing the steps that lead to it.

Toward the conclusion of this century, many eminent men, in Italy and in other countries, followed the example of the French, in throwing off the yoke of the Peripatetics, and venturing into the paths that were newly opened for the investigation of truth. This desertion of the old philosophy was at first attended with that timidity and secrecy which arose from apprehensions of the displeasure and resentment of the court of Rome; but, as soon as it was

[a] It may perhaps be affirmed with truth, that none of the Roman catholic nations attacked the Jesuits with more vehemence and animosity than the French did upon several occasions; and it is certain, that the Jesuits in that kingdom have been, more than once, involved in great difficulties and distress. To be convinced of this, the reader has only to consult Du-Boulay's Hist. Academiæ Parisiensis, tom. vi. page 559, 648, 676, 738, 742, 763, 874, 890, 909, in which he will find an ample and accurate account of the resolutions and transactions of the parliament and university of Paris, and also of the proceedings of the people in general, to the detriment of this artful and dangerous society. But what was the final issue of all these resolutions and transactions, and in what did all this opposition end? I answer, in the exaltation and grandeur of the Jesuits. They had been banished with ignominy out of the kingdom, and were recalled from their exile, and honourably restored to their former credit in 1604, in the reign of Henry IV., notwithstanding the remonstrances of many persons of the highest rank and dignity, who were shocked beyond expression at this unaccountably mean and ignoble step, (see the Memoires de Sully, modern edition, published at Geneva, tom. v. p. 83, 314.) After that period, they moved the main-springs of government both in church and state, and still continue to sit, though invisibly, at the helm of both. ☞ The reader must be reminded, that this note was written by Dr. Mosheim some years before the suppression of the society of Jesuits in France.

[b] For an ample account of this matter, see Voltaire's Siecle de Louis XIV. and more especially the chapter in the second volume relative to the arts and sciences.

[c] See Gassendi Exercitationes Paradoxæ adversus Aristoteleos, tom. iii. op. This subtle and judicious work contributed, perhaps more than any thing else, to hurt the cause, and ruin the credit, of the Peripatetics.

[d] These great men were, indeed, very ill treated by the Peripatetics, on account of their learned and excellent labours. They were accused, by these exasperated scholastics, of irreligion, and were even charged with atheism by father Hardouin, who was really intoxicated with the large draughts he had taken from the muddy fountains of Peripatetic and scholastic science. See his Athei Detecti, in his Op. Posthum.—It is easy to perceive the reasons of all this resentment, since the Cartesian system, which aimed at restoring the authority of reason, and the light of true philosophy, was by no means so proper to defend the pretensions of Rome and the cause of popery, as the dark and intricate jargon of the Peripatetics.

known that the pontiffs beheld, with less indignation and jealousy, the new discoveries in metaphysics, mathematics, and natural philosophy, the deserters broke their chains with greater confidence, and proceeded with greater freedom and boldness in the pursuit of truth.

XXXII. After this general account of the state of learning in the catholic countries, it will not be improper to point out, in a more particular manner, those Romish writers, who contributed most to the propagation and improvement both of sacred and profane erudition during this century. The Jesuits, for a long time, not only possessed an undisputed pre-eminence in this respect, but were, moreover, considered as almost the sole fountains of universal knowledge, and the only religious order that made any great figure in the literary world. And it must be allowed by all, who are not misled by want of candour or of proper information, that this famous society was adorned by many persons of uncommon genius and learning. The names of Petau, Sirmond, Poussin, Labbe, and Abram, will live as long as literature shall be honoured and valued; and even that of Hardouin, notwithstanding the singularity of his disordered fancy, and the extravagance of many of his opinions, will escape oblivion.

It is at the same time to be observed, that the literary glory of the Jesuits suffered a remarkable eclipse in this century, from the growing lustre of the Benedictine order, and more especially of the Congregation of St. Maur. The Jesuits were perpetually boasting of the eminent merit and lustre of their society on the one hand, and exposing, on the other, to public contempt, the ignorance and stupidity of the Benedictines, who, indeed, formerly made a very different figure from what they do at present. Their view in this was to form a plausible pretext for invading the rights of the latter, and engrossing their ample revenues and possessions; but the Benedictines resolved to disconcert this insidious project, to wipe off the reproach of ignorance that had heretofore been cast upon them with too much justice, and to disappoint the rapacious avidity of their enemies, and rob them of their pretexts. For this purpose they not only erected schools in their monasteries, for the instruction of youth in the various branches of learning and science, but also employed such of their select members, as were distinguished by their erudition and genius, in composing a variety of learned productions that were likely to survive the waste of time, adapted to vindicate the honour of the fraternity, and to reduce its enemies to silence. This important task was executed with incredible ability and success by Mabillon, D'Achery, Massuet, Ruinart, Beaugendre, Garnier, De la Rue, Martenne, Montfaucon, and other eminent men of that learned order. It is to these Benedictines that we are indebted for the best editions of the Greek and Latin fathers; for the discovery of many curious records, and ancient documents, that throw a new light upon the history of remote ages, and upon the antiquities of various countries; for the best accounts of ancient transactions, whether ecclesiastical or political, and of the manners and customs of the earliest times; for the improvement of chronology, and the other branches of literature. In all these parts of philology and the belles lettres, the religious order, now under consideration, has shone with a distinguished lustre, and given specimens of knowledge, discernment, and industry, that are worthy of being transmitted to the latest posterity. It would be perhaps difficult to assign a reason for that visible decline of learning among the Jesuits, which commenced precisely at the very period when the Benedictines began to make this eminent figure in the republic of letters. The fact, however, is undeniable; and the Jesuits have long been at a loss to produce any one or more of their members who are qualified to dispute the pre-eminence, or even to claim an equality, with the Benedictines. The latter still continue to shine in the various branches of philology, and, almost every year, enrich the literary world with productions that furnish abundant proofs of their learning and industry; whereas, if we except a single work published by the Jesuits of Antwerp, (the Acts of the Saints,) many years have passed since the sons of Loyola have given any satisfactory proofs of their boasted learning, or added to the mass of literature any work worthy to be compared with the labours of the followers of Benedict.

These learned monks excited the emulation of the Priests of the Oratory, whose efforts to resemble them were far from being destitute of success. Several members of the latter order distinguished themselves by their remarkable proficiency in various branches both of sacred and profane literature. This, to mention no more examples, appears sufficiently from the writings of Morin, Thomassin, and Simon, and from that admirable work of Charles le Cointe, entitled, The Ecclesiastical Annals of France. The Jansenists also deserve a place in the list of those who cultivated letters with industry and success. Many of their productions abound with erudition, and several of them excel both in elegance of style and precision of method; and it may be said, in general, that their writings were eminently serviceable in the instruction of youth, and also proper to contribute to the progress of learning among persons of riper years. The writings of those who composed the community of Port-Royal,[a] the works of Tillemont, Arnauld, Nicole, Pascal, and Lancelot, with many other elegant and useful productions of persons of this class, were undoubtedly an ornament to French literature during this century. The other religious societies, the higher and lower orders of the clergy, had also among them men of learning and genius, who reflected a lustre upon the respective classes to which they belonged. Nor ought this to be a matter of astonishment, since nothing is more natural than that, in an immense multitude of monks and clergy, all possessing abundant leisure for study, and the best opportunities of improvement, there should be some who, unwilling to hide or throw away such a precious talent, would employ with success this leisure, and these opportunities, in the cultivation of the sciences. It is nevertheless certain, that the eminent men who were to be found beyond the limits of the four classes already mentioned,[b] were few in number, comparatively speaking, and scarcely exceeded the list that any one of these classes could furnish.

XXXIII. Hence it comes, that the church of Rome

[a] The denomination of Messieurs de Port-Royal comprehended all the Jansenist writers; but it was applied, in a more confined and particular sense, to those Jansenists who passed their days in pious exercises and literary pursuits in the retreat of Port-Royal, a mansion situated near Paris. It is well known, that several writers of superior genius, extensive learning, and uncommon eloquence, resided in this sanctuary of letters.

[b] The Jesuits, Benedictines, Priests of the Oratory, and Jansenists.

can produce a long list of writers who have arisen in its bosom, and acquired a shining and permanent reputation by their learned productions. At the head of the eminent authors, found among the monastic orders and the regular clergy, must be placed the cardinals Baronius and Bellarmine, who have obtained an immortal name in their church, one by his laborious Annals, and the other by his books of controversy. The other writers who belong to this class, are, Serrarius, Fevardentius, Possevin, Gretser, Combefis, Natalis Alexander, Becan, Sirmond, Petau, Poussin, Cellot, Caussin, Morin, Renaud, Fra-Paolo, Pallavicini, Labbe, Maimbourg, Thomassin, Sfondrati, Aguirre, Henry Norris, D'Achery, Mabillon, Hardouin, Simon, Ruinart, Montfaucon, Galloni, Scacchi, Cornelius à Lapide, Bonfrere, Menard, Seguenot, Bernard, Lamy, Bolland, Henschen, Papebroch, and others.

The principal among the secular clergy, who are neither bound by vows, nor attached to any peculiar community and rules of discipline, were, Perron, Estius, Launoy, Albaspinæus, Peter de Marca, Richelieu, Holstenius, Baluze, Bona, Huet, Bossuet, Fenelon, Godeau, Tillemont, Thiers, Du-Pin, Leo Allatius, Zaccagni, Cotelier, Filesac, Visconti, &c.[a] This list might be considerably augmented by adding to it those writers among the laity who distinguished themselves by their theological or literary productions.

XXXIV. If we take an accurate view of the religious system of the Romish church during this century, both with respect to articles of faith and rules of practice, we shall find that, instead of being improved by being brought nearer to the perfect model of doctrine and morals, exhibited to us in the Holy Scriptures, it had contracted new degrees of corruption and degeneracy, partly by the negligence of the pontiffs, and partly by the dangerous maxims and influence of the Jesuits. This is not only the observation of those who have renounced the Romish communion, and in the despotic style of that church are called heretics; it is the complaint of the wisest and worthiest part of that communion, of all its members who have a zeal for the advancement of true Christian knowledge and genuine piety.

As to the doctrinal part of the Romish religion, it is said, and not without foundation, to have suffered extremely in the hands of the Jesuits, who, under the connivance, and sometimes even by the immediate assistance of the pontiffs, have perverted and corrupted such of the fundamental doctrines of Christianity as were left entire by the council of Trent. There are proofs sufficient to support this charge; inasmuch as the subtle and insidious fathers have manifestly endeavoured to diminish the authority and importance of the Scriptures, have extolled the power of human nature, changed the sentiments of many with respect to the necessity and efficacy of divine grace, represented the mediation and sufferings of Christ as less powerful and meritorious than they are said to be in the sacred writings, turned the Roman pontiff into a terrestrial Deity, and put him almost upon an equal footing with the Divine Saviour; and, finally, have rendered, as far as they can, the truth of the Christian religion dubious, by their fallacious reasonings, and their artful and pernicious sophistry. The testimonies adduced to support these accusations by men of weight and merit, particularly among the Jansenists, are of very great authority; and it is extremely difficult to refuse our assent to them, when they are impartially examined: but, on the other hand, it may be easily proved, that the Jesuits, instead of inventing these pernicious doctrines, did no more, in reality, than propagate them as they found them in that ancient system of religion which preceded the Reformation, and was directly calculated to raise the authority of the pope, and the power and prerogatives of the church, to the highest pitch of despotic grandeur. To inculcate this form of doctrine was the direct vocation of the Jesuits, who were to derive all their credit, opulence, and influence, from their being considered as the main support of the papacy, and the peculiar favourites of the pontiffs. If the ultimate end and purpose of these pontiffs were to render the church more pure and holy, and to bring it as near as possible to the resemblance of its Divine Founder, and if this were the commission they gave to their favourite emissaries the doctors, then the Jesuits would be at liberty to preach a very different doctrine from what they now inculcate. But that liberty cannot be granted to them as long as their principal orders from the papal throne are, to use all their diligence and industry, to the end that the pontiffs may hold what they have acquired, and recover what they have lost, and that the bishops and other ministers of the church may daily see their opulence increase, and the limits of their authority extended and enlarged. The chief crime then of the Jesuits is really this, that they have explained, with more openness and perspicuity, those points which the leading managers in the council of Trent had either entirely omitted, or slightly mentioned, that they might not shock the friends of true religion, who composed a part of that famous assembly. And here we see the true reason why the pontiffs, notwithstanding the ardent solicitations and remonstrances that have been employed to arm their just severity against the Jesuits, have always maintained that artful order, and have been so deaf to the accusations of their adversaries, that no entreaties have been able to persuade them to condemn their religious principles and tenets, however erroneous in their nature, and pernicious in their effects. On the contrary, the court of Rome has always opposed, either in a public or clandestine manner, all the vigorous measures that have been used to procure the condemnation and suppression of the doctrine of the Jesuits; and it has constantly treated all such attempts as the projects of rash and imprudent men, who, through involuntary ignorance or obstinate prejudice, were blind to the true interest of the church.

XXXV. In the sphere of morals, the Jesuits made still more dreadful and atrocious inroads than in that of religion. In affirming that they have perverted and corrupted almost every branch and precept of morality, we should not express sufficiently the pernicious tendency of their maxims. Were we to go still farther, and maintain, that they have sapped and destroyed its very foundations, we should maintain no more than what innumerable writers of the Romish church abundantly testify, and what many of the most illustrious communities of that church publicly lament. Those who bring this dreadful charge against the sons of Loyola, have taken abundant precautions to vindicate themselves from the reproach of

[a] For a particular account of the respective merit of the writers here mentioned, see Du-Pin's His. des Ecrevains Eccles. t. xvii. xviii. xix.

calumny. They have published several maxims, inconsistent with all regard for virtue and even decency, which they have drawn from the moral writings of that order, and more especially from the numerous productions of its casuists. They observe, more particularly, that the whole society adopts and inculcates the following maxims:

"That persons truly wicked, and void of the love of God, may expect to obtain eternal life in heaven, provided hat they be impressed with a fear of the divine anger, nd avoid all heinous and enormous crimes through the dread of future punishment.

"That those persons may transgress with safety, who have a probable reason for transgressing, i. e. any plausible argument or authority in favour of the sin they are inclined to commit.[a]

"That actions intrinsically evil, and directly contrary to the divine laws, may be innocently performed, by those who have so much power over their own minds, as to join, even ideally, a good end to this wicked action, or (to speak in the style of the Jesuits) who are capable of rightly directing their intention.[b]

"That philosophical sin is of a very light and trivial nature, and does not deserve the pains of hell:—By philosophical sin the Jesuits mean an action contrary to the dictates of nature and right reason, done by a person who is ignorant of the written law of God, or doubtful[c] of its true meaning.

"That the transgressions committed by a person blinded by the seduction of lust, agitated by the impulse of tumultuous passions, and destitute of all sense and impression of religion, however detestable and heinous they may be in themselves, are not imputable to the transgressor before the tribunal of God; and that such transgres sions may often be as involuntary as the actions of a madman:

"That the person who takes an oath, or enters into a contract, may, to elude the force of the one, and the obligation of the other, add, to the form of words by which they are expressed, certain mental additions and tacit reservations."

These, and other enormities of a like nature,[d] are said to make an essential part of the system of morality inculcated by the Jesuits. And they were complained of, in the strongest remonstrances, not only by the Dominicans and Jansenists, but also by the most eminent theologians of Paris, Poictiers, Louvain, and other academical cities, who expressed their abhorrence of them in such a public and solemn manner, that the pontiff neither thought

☞ [a] This is one of the most corrupt and most dangerous maxims of the Jesuits. On one hand, they have among them doctors of different characters and different principles, that thus they may render their society recommendable in the eyes of all sorts of persons, the licentious as well as the austere. On the other hand, they maintain, that an opinion or practice, recommended by any one doctor, becomes thereby probable, as it is not to be supposed, that a learned divine would adopt an opinion, or recommend a practice, in favour of which no considerable reason could be alleged.—But here lies the poison: this probable opinion or practice *may* be followed, say the Jesuits, when the contrary is still more probable, and even when it is *sure*, because, though the man may err, he errs under the authority of an eminent doctor. Thus Escobar affirms, that a judge may decide in favour of that side of a question which is the least probable, and even against his own opinion, if he be supported by any tolerable authority. See the viiith of the Lettres Provinciales.

☞ [b] For example, an ecclesiastic who buys a benefice, in order to direct his intention rightly, must, by a powerful act of abstraction, turn away his thoughts from the crime of simony, which he is committing, to some lawful purpose, such as that of acquiring an ample subsistence, or that of doing good by instructing the ignorant. Thus again, a man who runs his neighbour through the body in a duel, on account of a trivial affront, to render his action lawful, has only to turn his thoughts from the principal of vengeance, to the more decent principle of honour, and the murder he commits will, by the magic power of Jesuitical morality, be converted into an innocent action. There is no crime or enormity to which this abominable maxim may not be extended. "A famous Jesuit has declared, that a son may wish for the death of his father, and even rejoice at it when it arrives, provided that his wish does not arise from any personal hatred, but only from a desire of the patrimony which this death will procure him." See Gaspard Hurtado, de sub. peccat. definit. 9, quoted by Diana, p. 5. tr. 14. R. 99, and another has had the effrontery to maintain, that a monk or ecclesiastic may lawfully assassinate a calumniator, who threatens to impute scandalous crimes to their community, when there is no other way of preventing the execution of his purpose. See the works of Father L'Amy, tom. v. disp. 36, n. 118.

☞ [c] It would perhaps be more accurate to define the philosophical sin of the Jesuits to be "an action contrary to right reason, which is done by a person who is either absolutely ignorant of God, or does not think of him during the time this action is committed."

[d] The books that have been written to expose and refute the corrupt and enormous maxims of the Jesuits, would make an ample library, were they collected. But nothing of this kind is equal to the learned, ingenious, and humorous work of the famous Pascal, entitled, Les Provinciales, ou Lettres ecrites par Louis de Montalte à un Provincial de ses amis, et aux Jesuites, sur la Morale et la Politique de ces Peres. This exquisite production is accompanied, in some editions of it, with the learned and judicious observations of Nicole, who, under the fictitious name of Guillaume Wenderock, fully demonstrated the truth of those facts which Pascal had advanced without quoting his authorities, and placed, in a full and striking light, several interesting circumstances which that great man had treated with, perhaps, too much brevity. These letters, which did the Jesuits more real mischief than either the indignation of sovereign princes, or any other calamity that had heretofore fallen upon their order, were translated into Latin by Rachelius. On the other hand, the sons of Loyola, sensibly affected and alarmed by this formidable attack upon their reputation, left no means unemployed to defend themselves against such a respectable adversary. They sent forth their ablest champions to defend their cause, or, at least, to cover them from shame: among which champions the subtle and eloquent Father Daniel, the celebrated author of the History of France, shone forth with a superior lustre; and, as if they thought it unsafe to trust to the powers of argument, and the force of evidence alone, they applied themselves for help to the secular arm, and had credit enough to obtain a sentence, condemning the Provinciales to be burned publicly at Paris. See Daniel's Opuscules, vol. i. p. 363. This author, however, acknowledges that the greatest part of the answers which the Jesuits opposed to the performance of Pascal were weak and unsatisfactory. Certain it is, that (whether it was owing to the strength of argument, or to the elegant wit and humour that reigned in them,) the Provincial Letters lost not the smallest portion of their credit and reputation by all the answers that were made to them, but continued to pass through a great number of editions, which could scarcely be printed off with rapidity sufficient to satisfy the desires of the public.

Another severe attack was made upon the Jesuits, in a book inferior to Pascal's work in point of wit and genteel pleasantry, but superior to it in point of evidence, since it abounds with passages and testimonies, which are drawn from the most applauded writings of the Jesuits, and demonstrate fully the corruption and enormity of the moral rules and maxims inculcated by that famous order. This book, which was published at Mons in 1702, bears the following title: La Morale des Jesuites, extraite fidèlement de leurs Livres imprimez avec la permission et l'approbation des Superieurs de leur Compagnie, par un Docteur de Sorbonne. The author was Perrault, (son of Charles Perrault, who began the famous controversy in France concerning the respective merits of the ancients and moderns,) and his book met with the same fate with the Provinciales of Pascal: for it was burned at Paris in 1670, at the request of the Jesuits. See the Opuscules du Pere Daniel, t. i. p. 356. Nor indeed is it at all surprising, that the Jesuits exerted all their zeal against this compilation, which exhibited, in one shocking point of view, all that had been complained of and censured in their maxims and institutions, and unfolded the whole mystery of their iniquity.

It has also been laid to the charge of the Jesuits, that they reduced their pernicious maxims to practice, especially in the remoter parts of the world. Arnauld, and some of his Jansenist brethren, ably endeavoured to support this charge in that laborious and celebrated work, entitled La Morale Pratique des Jesuites. In this important work, a multitude of authentic relations, documents, facts, and testimonies, are employed to demonstrate the criminal conduct and practices of the Jesuits. For an ample account of the Jesuitical doctrine concerning philosophical sin, and the dissensions and controversies it occasioned, see Jacobi Hyacinthi Serry.* Addenda ad Histor. Congregationum de Auxiliis, p. 82; as also his Auctarium, p. 289.

☞ * This is a fictitious name; the true name of the author of the Addenda was Augustin Le Blanc.

it safe nor honourable to keep silence on that head. Accordingly some of these maxims were condemned, in 1659, by pope Alexander VII. in a public edict; and, in 1690, the article relating to philosophical sin met with the same fate, under the pontificate of Alexander VIII.[a]. It was natural to think, that, if the order of Jesuits did not expire under the terrible blows it received from such a formidable list of adversaries, yet their system of morals must at least have been suppressed, and their pestilential maxims banished from the schools. This is the least that could have been expected from the complaints and remonstrances of the clerical and monastic orders, and the damnatory bulls of the pontiffs. And yet, if we may credit the testimonies of many learned and pious men in the communion of Rome, even this effect was not produced; and the remonstrances of the monks, the complaints of the clergy, and the bulls of the popes, rather served to restrain, in a certain measure, the enormous licentiousness that had reigned among the writers of this corrupt order, than to purify the seminaries of instruction from the contagion of their dissolute maxims.—After what has been observed in relation to the moral system of the Jesuits, it will not be difficult to assign a reason for the remarkable propensity that is discovered by kings, princes, the nobility and gentry of both sexes, and an innumerable multitude of persons of all ranks and conditions, to commit their consciences to the direction, and their souls to the care, of the brethren of this society. It is, no doubt, highly convenient for persons, who do not pretend to a rigid observance of the duties of religion and morality, to have spiritual guides, who diminish the guilt of transgression, disguise the deformity of vice, let loose the reins to all the passions, and even nourish them by their dissolute precepts, and render the way to heaven as easy, agreeable, and smooth as is possible.[b]

What has here been said concerning the erroneous maxims and corrupt practices of the Jesuits, must, however, be understood with modifications and restrictions. It must not be imagined, that these maxims are adopted, or these practices justified, by all the sons of Loyola, without exception, or that they are publicly taught and inculcated in all their schools and seminaries: for this, in reality, is not the case. As this order has produced men of learning and genius, so neither has it been destitute of men of probity and candour; nor would it be a difficult task to compile from the writings of the Jesuits a much more just and proper representation of the duties of religion and the obligations of morality, than that hideous and unseemly exhibition of both, which Pascal and his followers have drawn from the Jesuitical casuists, summists, and moralists. Those who censure the Jesuits in general, must, if their censures be well founded, have the following circumstances in view; first, that the rulers of that society not only suffer many of their members to propagate publicly impious opinions and corrupt maxims, but even go so far as to set the seal of their approbation to the books in which these opinions and maxims are contained;[c] secondly, that the system of religion and morality, taught in the greatest part of their seminaries, is so loose, vague, and ill-digested, that it not only may be easily perverted to bad purposes and erroneous conclusions, but even seems peculiarly susceptible of such abuse; and lastly, that the select few, who are initiated into the grand mysteries of the society, and set apart to transact its affairs, to carry on its projects, to exert their political talents in the closet of the minister, or in the cabinet of the prince, commonly make use of the dangerous and pernicious maxims that are complained of to augment the authority and opulence of their order. The candour and impartiality that become an historian, oblige us to acknowledge, at the same time, that, in demonstrating the turpitude and enormity of certain maxims and opinions of the Jesuits, their adversaries have gone too far, and permitted their eloquence and zeal to run into exaggeration. This we might show, with the fullest evidence, by examples deduced from the doctrines of probability and mental reservation, and the imputations that have been made to the Jesuits on these heads; but this would lead us too far from the thread of our history. We shall only observe, that what happens frequently in every kind of controversy, happened here in a singular manner; I mean, that the Jesuits were charged with tenets, which had been drawn *consequentially* from their doctrine, by their accusers, without their consent; that their phrases and terms were not always interpreted according to the precise meaning which they annexed to them; and that the tendency of their system was represented in too partial and unequitable a light.

XXXVI. The Scriptures did not acquire any new degrees of public respect and authority under the pontiffs of this century. It can be proved, on the contrary, by the most authentic records, that the votaries of Rome, and more especially the Jesuits, employed all their dexterity and art, either to prevent the word of God from falling into the hands of the people, or at least to have it explained in a manner consistent with the interest, grandeur, and pretensions of their church. In France and the Netherlands there arose, indeed, several commentators and critics, who were very far from being destitute of knowledge and erudition; but it may nevertheless be said of them, that, instead of illustrating and explaining the divine oracles, they rendered them more obscure, by blending their own crude inventions with the dictates of celestial wisdom. This is chargeable even upon the Jansenists, who, though superior to the other Roman catholic expositors in most respects, yet fell into that absurd method of disfiguring the pure word of God, by far-fetched allusions, mystic interpretations, and frigid allegories, compiled from the reveries of the ancient fathers.[d] Here, nevertheless, an exception is to be made in favour of Pasquier Quesnel, a priest of the oratory, whose edition

[a] There is a concise and accurate account of the contests and divisions, to which the morality of the Jesuits gave rise in France and in other countries, in a work, entitled, Catechisme Historique et Dogmatique sur les Contestations qui divisent maintenant l'Eglise, published in 1730. See tom. ii. p. 26.—It is very remarkable, that the two bulls of Alexander VII. and VIII. against the Jesuits are not to be found in the Bullarium Pontificum; but the Jansenists and Dominicans, who are careful in perpetuating whatever may tend to the dishonour of the Jesuits, have preserved them industriously from oblivion.

[b] The translator has here inserted in the text the note [q] of the original.

☞ [c] This is, no doubt, true. The Jesuits have doctors of all sorts and sizes; and this, indeed, is necessary, in order to the establishment of that universal empire at which they aim. See Lettres Provinciales, let. v. p. 62 of the tenth Cologne edition.

[d] The reader will find a striking example of this in the well-known Bible of Isaac le Maitre, commonly called Sacy, which contains all the crude and extravagant fancies and allegories, with which the ancient doctors obscured the beautiful simplicity of the Scriptures, and rendered their clearest expressions intricate and mysterious.

of the New Testament, accompanied with pious meditations and remarks, made such a prodigious noise in the theological world,[a] and even in our time has continued to furnish matter of warm and violent contest, and to split the Roman catholic doctors into parties and factions.[b]

XXXVII. The majority of the public schools retained that dry, intricate, and captious method of teaching theology, which had prevailed in the ages of barbarism and darkness, and which could only excite disgust in all such as were endowed with a liberal turn of mind. There was no possibility of ordering matters so, that didactic or biblical theology, which is supposed to arrange and illustrate the truths of religion by the dictates of Scripture, should be placed upon the same footing, and holden in the same honour with scholastic divinity, which had its source in the metaphysical visions of the Peripatetic philosophy. Even the edicts of the pontiffs were insufficient to accomplish this object. In the greatest part of the universities, the scholastic doctors domineered, and were constantly molesting and insulting the biblical divines, who, generally speaking, were little skilled in the captious arts of sophistry and dialectical chicane. It is nevertheless to be observed, that many of the French doctors, and more especially the Jansenists, explained the principal doctrines and duties of Christianity in a style and manner that were at least recommendable on account of their elegance and perspicuity; and indeed it may be affirmed, that almost all the theological or moral treatises of this age, that were composed with any tolerable degree of simplicity and good sense, had the doctors of Port-Royal, or the French priests of the oratory, for their authors. We have already taken notice of the changes that were introduced, during this century, into the method of carrying on theological controversy. The German, Belgic, and French divines, being at length convinced, by disagreeable experience, that their captious, incoherent, and uncharitable manner of disputing, exasperated those who differed from them in their religious sentiments, and confirmed them in their respective systems, instead of converting them;—and perceiving, moreover, that the arguments in which they had formerly placed their principal confidence, proved feeble and insufficient to make the least impression,—found it necessary to look out for new and more specious methods of attack and defence.

XXXVIII. The Romish church has, notwithstanding its boasted uniformity of doctrine, been always divided by a multitude of controversies. It would be endless to enumerate the disputes that have arisen between the seminaries of learning, and the contests that have divided the monastic orders. The greatest part of these, as being of little moment, we shall pass over in silence; for they have been treated with indifference and neglect by the popes, who never took notice of them but when they grew violent and noisy, and then suppressed them with an imperious nod, that imposed silence upon the contending parties. Besides, these less momentous controversies, which it will never be possible entirely to extinguish, are not of such a nature as to affect the church in its fundamental principles, to endanger its constitution, or to hurt its interests. It will, therefore, be sufficient to give a brief account of those debates which, by their superior importance and their various connexions and dependencies, may be said to have affected the church in general, and to have threatened it with alarming changes and revolutions.

And here the first place is naturally due to the famous debates, carried on between the Jesuits and Dominicans concerning the nature and necessity of divine grace; the decision of which important point had, toward the conclusion of the preceding century, been committed by Clement VIII. to a select assembly of learned divines. These arbiters, after having employed several years in deliberating upon this nice and critical subject, and in examining the arguments of the contending parties, intimated, plainly enough, to the pontiff, that the sentiments of the Dominicans, concerning grace, predestination, human liberty, and original sin, were more conformable to the doctrine of Scripture and the decisions of the ancient fathers than the opinions of Molina, which were patronised by the Jesuits. They observed, more especially, that the former leaned toward the tenets of Augustine, while the latter bore a striking resemblance to the Pelagian heresy. In consequence of this declaration, Clement seemed resolved to pass condemnation on the Jesuits, and to determine the controversy in favour of the Dominicans. Affairs were in this state in 1601, when the Jesuits, alarmed at the dangers that threatened them, beset the old pontiff night and day, and so importuned him with entreaties, menaces, arguments, and complaints, that, in 1602, he consented to re-examine this intricate controversy, and undertook himself the critical task of principal arbitrator. For this purpose, he chose a council[c] (composed of fifteen cardinals, nine professors of divinity, and five bishops,) which, in the course of three years,[d] assembled seventy-eight times or, to speak in the style of Rome, held so many *congregations*. At these meetings, the pontiff heard, at one time, the Jesuits and Dominicans disputing in favour of their respective systems; and, at another, ordered the assembled doctors to weigh their reasons, and examine the proofs that were adduced on both sides of this difficult question. The result of this examination is not known with certainty; as the death of Clement, which happened on the fourth day of March, 1605, prevented his pronouncing a decisive sentence. The Dominicans assure us, that the pope, had he lived, would have condemned Molina. The Jesuits, on the contrary, maintain, that he would have acquitted him publicly from all charge of heresy and error. They alone who have seen the records of this council and the journals of its proceedings, are qualified to determine which of the two we are to believe; but these records are kept with the utmost secrecy at Rome.

XXXIX. The proceedings of the congregation that had been assembled by Clement were suspended for some time, by the death of that pontiff; but they were resumed, in the same year, by the order of Paul V. his successor. Their deliberations, which were continued from September

☞ [a] That is, in the Roman Catholic part of the theological world. Never perhaps did any thing show, in a more striking manner, the blind zeal of faction than the hard treatment this book met with. See Cent. xviii. sect. x. note .

[b] The first part of this work, which contains observations on the four Gospels, was published in 1671; and, as it was received with general applause, this encouraged the author not only to revise and augment it, but also to enlarge his plan, and compose observations on the other books of the N. Test. See the Catech. Hist. sur les Contest. de l'Eglise, t. ii. p. 150.—Ch. Eberh. Weismanni Hist. Eccles. sæc. XVII. p. 588.

☞ [c] This council was called the congregation *de Auxiliis*.

[d] From the 20th of March, 1602, to the 22d of January, 1605.

to the following March, did not turn so much upon the merits of the cause, which were already sufficiently examined, as upon the prudent and proper method of finishing the contest. The great question now was, whether the well-being of the church would admit the decision of this controversy by a papal bull; and, if such a decision should seem advisable, it still remained to be considered, in what terms the bull should be drawn up. All these long and solemn deliberations resembled the delivery of the mountain in the fable, and ended in this resolution, that the whole controversy, instead of being *decided*, should be *suppressed*, and that each of the contending parties should have the liberty of following their respective opinions. The Dominicans assert, that the two pontiffs, together with the congregation of divines employed by them in the review of this important controversy, were fully persuaded of the justice of *their* cause, and of the truth of *their* system; they moreover observe, that Paul had expressly ordered a solemn condemnation of the doctrine of the Jesuits to be drawn up, but was prevented from finishing and publishing it, by the unhappy war that was kindled about that time between him and the Venetians. The Jesuits, on the other hand, represent these accounts of the Dominicans as entirely fictitious, and affirm that neither the pontiff, nor the more judicious and respectable members of the congregation, found any thing in the sentiments of Molina that was worthy of censure, or stood in much need of correction. In a point which is rendered thus uncertain by contradictory testimonies and assertions, it is difficult to determine what we are to believe; it however appears exceedingly probable, that, whatever the private opinion of Paul may have been, he was prevented from pronouncing a public determination of this famous controversy, by his apprehensions of offending either the king of France, who protected the Jesuits, or the king of Spain, who warmly maintained the cause of the Dominicans. It is farther probable, and almost certain, that, had the pontiff been independent of all foreign influence, and at full liberty to decide this knotty point, he would have pronounced one of those *ambiguous* sentences, for which the oracle of Rome is so famous, and would have so conducted matters as to shock neither of the contending parties.[a]

XL. The flame of controversy, which seemed thus extinguished, or at least covered, broke out again with new violence, in 1640, and formed a kind of schism in the church of Rome, which involved it in great perplexity, and proved highly detrimental to it in various respects. The occasion of these new troubles was the publication of a book, entitled Augustinus, composed by Cornelius Jansenius, bishop of Ypres, and published after the death of the author.[b] In this book, which even the Jesuits acknowledge to be the production of a man of learning and piety, the doctrine of Augustine, concerning man's natural corruption, and the nature and efficacy of that divine grace, which alone can efface this unhappy stain, is unfolded at large, and illustrated, for the most part, in Augustine's own words: for the end, which Jansenius proposed to himself in this work, was not to give his own private sentiments concerning these important points, but to show in what manner they had been understood and explained by that celebrated father of the church, now mentioned, whose name and authority were highly revered in all parts of the Roman catholic world.[c] No incident could be more unfavourable to the cause of the Jesuits, and the progress of their religious system, than the publi-

[a] Beside the authors we have above recommended as proper to be consulted in relation to these contests, see Le Clerc, Memoires pour servir à l'Histoire des Controverses dans l'Eglise Romaine sur la Predestination et sur la Grace, in his Bibliotheque Universelle et Historique, tom. xiv. p. 235. The conduct, both of the Jesuits and Dominicans, after their controversy was hushed, affords much reason to presume that they had been both secretly exhorted by the pontiff to mitigate their respective systems, and so to modify their doctrines or expressions, as to avoid the reproach of heresy that had been cast upon them; for the Jesuits had been accused of Pelagianism, and the Dominicans of a propensity to the tenets of the protestant churches. This appears, in a more particular manner, from a letter written by Claudius Aquaviva, general of the Jesuits, in 1613, and addressed to all the members of his order. In this letter the prudent general modifies with great dexterity and caution the sentiments of Molina, and enjoins it upon the brethren of the society to teach every where the doctrine which represents the Supreme Being as electing, freely, to eternal life, without any regard had to their merits, those whom he has been pleased to render partakers of that inestimable blessing; but, at the same time, he exhorts them to inculcate this doctrine in such a manner, as not to give up the tenets relating to divine grace, which they had maintained in their controversy with the Dominicans. Never, surely, was such a contradictory exhortation or order heard of; the good general thought, nevertheless, that he could reconcile abundantly these contradictions, by that branch of the divine knowledge which is called, by the schoolmen, *scientia media*. See the Catechisme Historique sur les Dissensions de l'Eglise, tom. i. p. 207.

On the other hand, the Dominicans, although their sentiments remain the same as they were before the commencement of this controversy, have learned to cast a kind of ambiguity and obscurity over their theological system, by using certain terms and expressions, which are manifestly borrowed from the schools of the Jesuits; and this they do to prevent the latter from reproaching them with a propensity to the doctrine of Calvin. They are, moreover, much less remarkable than formerly, for their zealous opposition to the Jesuits, which may be owing perhaps to prudent reflections on the dangers they may have been involved in by this opposition, and the fruitless pains and labour it has cost them. The Jansenists reproach them severely with this change of conduct, and consider it as a manifest and notorious apostacy from divine truth. See the Lettres Provinciales of Pascal, lettre ii. We are not, however, to conclude, from this change of style and external conduct among the Dominicans, that they are reconciled to the Jesuits, and that there remain no traces of their ancient opposition to that perfidious order. By no means; for, besides that many of them are shocked at the excessive timidity or prudence of a great part of their brethren, the whole body retain some hidden sparks of the indignation with which they formerly beheld the Jesuits; and, when a convenient occasion of discovering this indignation is offered, they do not let it pass unimproved. The Jansenists are here embarked in the same cause with the Dominicans since the sentiments of St. Thomas, concerning divine grace differ very little from those of St. Augustine. Cardinal Henry Noris, the most eminently learned among the followers of the latter, expresses his concern, that he is not at liberty to publish what passed in favour of Augustine, and to the disadvantage of Molina and the Jesuits, in the famous congregation *de Auxiliis*, so often assembled by the popes Clement VIII. and Paul V. See his Vindiciæ Augustinianæ, cap. vi. p. 1175, tom. i. op.—"Quando," says he, "recentiori Romano decreto id vetitum est, cum dispendio causæ, quam defendo, necessariam defensionem omitto."

[b] For an account of this famous man, see Bayle's *Dictionaire*.—Leydecker, de Vita et Morte Jansenii, lib. iii. which makes the first part of his History of Jansenism.—*Dictionaire des Livres Jansenistes*, tom. i.—This celebrated work of Jansenius, which gave such a wound to the Romish church, as neither the power nor wisdom of its pontiffs will ever be able to heal, is divided into three parts. The first is historical, and contains a relation of the Pelagian controversy, which arose in the fifth century. In the second we find an accurate account and illustration of the doctrine of Augustine, relating to the Constitution and Powers of Human Nature, in its original, fallen, and renewed state. The third contains the doctrine of the same great man relating to the Aids of sanctifying Grace procured by Christ, and to the eternal Predestination of Men and Angels. The style of Jansenius is clear, but not sufficiently correct.

[c] Thus Jansenius expresses himself in his Augustinus, tom. ii. lib proœmial. cap. xxix. p. 65.—Non ego hic de aliqua nova sententia reperienda disputo . . . sed de antiqua Augustini. Quæritur, non quid de naturæ humanæ statibus et viribus, vel de Dei gratia et prædestinatione sentiendum est, sed quid Augustinus olim, ecclesiæ nomine et applausu, tradiderit, prædicaverit, scriptoque multipliciter consignaverit."

cation of this book; for, as the doctrine of Augustine scarcely differed from that of the Dominicans;[a] as it was held sacred, and almost respected as divine, in the church of Rome, on account of the extraordinary merit and authority of that illustrious bishop, and, at the same time, was almost diametrically opposite to the sentiments generally received among the Jesuits, the latter could scarcely consider the book of Jansenius in any other light than as a tacit, but formidable refutation of their opinions concerning human liberty and divine grace; and accordingly, they not only drew their pens against this famous book, but also used their most zealous endeavours to obtain a public condemnation of it from Rome. Their endeavours were not unsuccessful. The Roman inquisitors began the opposition by prohibiting the perusal of it, in 1741; and, in the following year, Urban VIII. condemned it by a solemn bull, as infected with various errors that had been long banished from the catholic church.

XLI. There were nevertheless places, even within the bounds of the Romish church, where neither the decisions of the inquisitors, nor the bull of the pontiff, were in the least respected. The doctors of Louvain in particular, and the followers of Augustine in general, who were very numerous in the Netherlands, opposed, with the utmost vigour, the proceedings of the Jesuits and the condemnation of Jansenius; and hence arose a warm contest, which proved a source of much trouble to the Belgic provinces. But it was not confined within such narrow limits; it reached the neighbouring countries, and broke out with peculiar vehemence in France, where the abbot of St. Cyran,[b] a man of an elegant genius, and equally distinguished by the extent of his learning, the lustre of his piety, and the sanctity of his manners, had procured to Augustine many zealous followers, and to the Jesuits as many bitter and implacable adversaries.[c] This respectable abbot was the intimate friend and relative of Jansenius, and one of the most strenuous defenders of his doctrine. On the other hand, the far greater part of the French theologists appeared on the side of the Jesuits, whose religious tenets seemed more honourable to human nature, or, at least, more agreeable to its propensities, more suitable to the genius of the Romish religion, and more adapted to promote and advance the interests of the Romish church, than the doctrine of Augustine. The party of Jansenius had also its patrons; and they were such as reflected honour on the cause. In this respectable list we may reckon several bishops eminent for their piety, and some of the first and most elegant geniuses of the French nation, such as Arnauld, Nicole, Pascal, and Quesnel, and the other famous and learned men, who are known under the denomination of the Authors of Port-Royal. This party was also considerably augmented by a multitude of persons, who looked upon the usual practice of piety in the Romish church (which consists in the frequent use of the eucharist, the confession of sins, and the performance of certain external acts of religion) as much inferior to what the Gospel requires, and who considered Christian piety as the vital and internal principle of a soul, in which true faith and divine love have gained a happy ascendency. Thus one of the contending parties excelled in the number and power of its votaries, the other in the learning, genius, and piety of its adherents; and, things being thus balanced, it is not difficult to comprehend, how a controversy, which began about a century ago, should be still carried on with vehement contention and ardour.[d]

XLII. Those who have taken an attentive view of this long, and indeed endless controversy, cannot but think it a matter both of curiosity and amusement to observe the contrivances, stratagems, arguments, and arts employed by both Jesuits and Jansenists; by the former in their methods of attack, and by the latter in their plans of defence. The Jesuits came forth into the field of controversy, armed with sophistical arguments, odious comparisons, papal bulls, royal edicts, and the protection of a great part of the nobility and bishops; and, as if all this had appeared to them insufficient, they had recourse to still more formidable auxiliaries, even the secular arm, and a competent number of dragoons. The Jansenists, far from being dismayed at the view of this warlike host, stood their ground with steadiness and intrepidity. They evaded the seemingly mortal blows that were levelled at them in the royal and papal mandates, by the help of nice interpretations and subtle distinctions, and by the very same sophistical refinements which they blamed in the Jesuits. To the threats and frowns of the nobles and bishops, who protected their adversaries, they opposed the favour and applause of the people; to sophisms they opposed sophisms, and invectives to invectives; and to human power they opposed the Divine Omnipotence, and boasted of the miracles by which Heaven had declared itself in their favour. When they perceived that the strongest arguments, and the most respectable authorities, were insufficient to conquer the obstinacy of their adversaries, they endeavoured by their religious exploits, and their application to the advancement of piety and learning, to obtain the favour of the pontiffs, and strengthen their interest with the people. Hence they declared war against the enemies of the Romish church; formed new stratagems to ensnare and ruin the protestants; took extraordinary pains in instructing the youth in all the liberal arts and sciences; drew up a variety of useful, accurate, and elegant abridgments, containing the elements of philosophy and the learned languages; published a multitude of treatises on practical religion and morality, whose per-

[a] The Dominicans followed the sentiments of Thomas Aquinas, concerning the nature and efficacy of Divine Grace.

[b] The name of this abbot was Jean du Verger de Haurane.

[c] This illustrious abbot is considered by the Jansenists as equal in merit and authority to Jansenius himself, whom he is supposed to have assisted in composing his Augustinus. The French, more especially, (I mean such of them as adopt the doctrine of Augustine,) revere him as an oracle, and even extol him beyond Jansenius. For an account of the life and transactions of this pious abbot, see Lancelot's Memoires touchant la Vie de M. de S. Cyran.—Recueil de plusieurs Pieces pour servir à l'Histoire de Port-Royal.—Arnaud D'Andilly, Memoires au sujet de l'Abbé de S. Cyran, published in the first volume of his Vies des Religieuses de Port-Royal.—Bayle's Dictionary, at the article Jansenius. Dictionaire des Livres Jansenistes, tom. i. For an account of the earlier studies of the abbot in question, see Gabriel Liron's Singularités Historiques et Literaires, tom. iv. p. 507.

[d] The history of this contest is to be found in many authors, who have either given a relation of the whole, or treated apart some of its most interesting branches. The writers that ought to be principally consulted on this subject are the following: Gerberon, Histoire Generale du Jansenisme, published at Amsterdam in 1700; and Du-Mas, Histoire des Cinq Propositions de Jansenius. The former maintains the cause of the Jansenists, while the latter favours that of the Jesuits.—Add, to these, Melch. Leydecker's Historia Jansenismi, and Voltaire's Siecle de Louis XIV. Several books, written on both sides, are enumerated in the Bibliotheque Janseniste, ou Catalogue Alphabetique des Principaux Livres Jansenistes, the author of which is said to be Domin. Colonia, a learned Jesuit.

suasive eloquence charmed all ranks and orders of men; introduced and cultivated an easy, correct, and agreeable manner of writing; and gave accurate and learned interpretations of several ancient authors. To all these various kinds of merit, the greatest part of which were real and solid, they added others that were at least visionary and chimerical; for they endeavoured to persuade, and did in effect persuade many, that the Supreme Being interposed particularly in support of their cause, and, by prodigies and miracles of a stupendous kind, confirmed the truth of the doctrine of Augustine, in a manner adapted to remove all doubt, and triumph over all opposition.[a] All this rendered the Jansenists extremely popular, and held the victory of the Jesuits for some time dubious; and it is more than probable, that the former would have triumphed, had not the cause of the latter been the cause of the papacy, and had not the stability and grandeur of the Romish church depended in a great measure upon the success of their religious maxims.

XLIII. It appears from several circumstances, that Urban VIII., and after him Innocent X., were really bent on appeasing these dangerous tumults, in the same manner as the popes in former times had prudently suppressed the controversies excited by Baius and the Dominicans. But the vivacity, inconstancy, and restless spirit of the French doctors, threw all into confusion, and disconcerted the measures of the pontiffs. The opposers of the doctrine of Augustine selected five propositions out of the work of Jansenius already mentioned, which appeared to them the most erroneous in their nature, and the most pernicious in their tendency; and, being set on by the instigation, and seconded by the influence of the Jesuits, employed their most zealous endeavours and their most importunate entreaties at the court of Rome, to have these propositions condemned. On the other hand, a great part of the Gallican clergy used their utmost efforts to prevent this condemnation; and, for that purpose they sent deputies to Rome, to entreat Innocent to suspend his final decision until the true sense of these propositions should be deliberately examined, since the ambiguity of style, in which they were expressed, rendered them susceptible of a false interpretation. But these entreaties were ineffectual: the interest and importunities of the Jesuits prevailed; and the pontiff, without examining the merits of the cause with a suitable degree of impartiality and attention, condemned, by a public bull, on the 31st of May, 1653, the propositions of Jansenius. These propositions contained the following doctrines: 1. "That there are divine precepts which good men, notwithstanding their desire to observe them, are, nevertheless, absolutely unable to obey; nor has God given them that measure of grace, which is essentially necessary to render them capable of such obedience: 2. That no person, in this corrupt state of nature, can resist the influence of divine grace, when it operates upon the mind: 3. That, in order to render human actions meritorious, it is not requisite that they be exempt from necessity, but only that they be free from constraint:[b] 4. That the Semi-Pelagians err grievously in maintaining, that the human will is endowed with the power of either receiving or resisting the aids and influences of preventing grace: 5. That whosoever affirms, that Jesus Christ made expiation, by his sufferings and death, for the sins of all mankind, is a Semi-Pelagian." —Of these propositions the pontiff declared the first four only heretical; but he pronounced the fifth rash, impious, and injurious to the Supreme Being.[c]

XLIV. This sentence of the supreme ecclesiastical judge was indeed painful to the Jansenists, and in consequence highly agreeable to their adversaries. It did not however either drive the former to despair, or satisfy the latter to the extent of their desires; for while the *doctrine* was condemned, the *man* escaped. Jansenius was not named in the bull, nor did the pontiff even declare that the five propositions were maintained, in the book entitled Augustinus, in the sense in which he had condemned them. Hence the disciples of Augustine and Jansenius

[a] It is well known that the Jansenists, or Augustinians, have long pretended to confirm their doctrine by miracles; and they even acknowledge, that these miracles have sometimes saved them, when their affairs have been reduced to a desperate situation. See the Memoires de Port-Royal, tom. i. p. 256, tom. ii. p. 107.—The first time we hear mention made of these miracles, is in 1656, and the following years, when a thorn of the derisive crown that was put upon our Saviour's head by the Roman soldiers, is reported to have performed several marvellous cures in the convent of Port-Royal. See the Recueil de plusieurs Pieces pour servir â l'Histoire de Port-Royal, p. 228, 448; and Fontaine's collections upon the same subject, tom. ii.—Other prodigies followed in 1661 and 1664; and the fame of these miracles rose to a great height during the last century, and proved singularly advantageous to the cause of the Jansenists; but they are now fallen, even in France, into oblivion and discredit. The Jansenists, therefore, of the present age, being pressed by their adversaries, were obliged to have recourse to new prodigies, as the old ones had entirely lost their credit; and they seemed, indeed, to have had miracles at command, by the considerable number they pretended to perform. Thus, (if we are credulous enough to believe their reports,) in 1725, a woman, whose name was La Fosse, was *suddenly* cured of a bloody flux, by imploring the aid of the host, when it was, one day, carried by a *Jansenist* priest. About two years after this, we are told, that the tomb of Gerard Rouse, a canon of Avignon, was honoured with miracles of a stupendous kind; and, finally, we are informed, that the same honour was conferred, in 1731, on the bones of the abbé de Paris, which were interred at St. Medard, where innumerable miracles are said to have been wrought. This last story has given rise to the warmest contests, between the superstitious or crafty Jansenists and their adversaries in all communions. Beside all this, Quesnel, Levier, Desangins, and Tournus, the great ornaments of Jansenism, are said to have furnished extraordinary succours, on several occasions, to sick and infirm persons, who testified a lively confidence in their prayers and *merits*. See a famous Jansenist book composed in answer to the *Bull Unigenitus*, and entitled, Jesus Christ sous l'Anatheme et sous l'Excommunication, art. xvii. xviii.—There is no doubt that a great part of the Jansenists defend these miracles from principle, and in consequence of a persuasion of their truth and reality; for that party abounds with persons, whose piety is blended with a most superstitious credulity, who look upon their religious system as celestial truth, and their cause as the immediate cause of Heaven, and who are consequently disposed to think that it cannot be neglected by the Deity, or left without extraordinary marks of his approbation and supporting presence. It is however amazing, and almost incredible, on the other hand, that the more judicious defenders of this cause, those eminent Jansenists, whose sagacity, learning, and good sense, discover themselves so abundantly in other matters, do not consider that the powers of nature, the efficacy of proper remedies, or the effects of imagination, produce many important changes and effects, which, from imposture, or a blind attachment to some particular cause, many are led to attribute to the miraculous interposition of the Deity. We can easily account for the delusions of weak enthusiasts, or the tricks of egregious impostors; but when we see men of piety and judgment appearing in defence of such miracles as those now under consideration, we must conclude, that they look upon fraud as lawful in the support of a good cause, and make no scruple of deceiving the people, when they propose, by this delusion, to confirm and propagate what they take to be the truth.

[b] Augustine, Leibnitz, and a considerable number of modern philosophers, who maintain the doctrine of necessity, consider this necessity, in moral actions, as consistent with true liberty, because it is consistent with spontaneity and choice. According to them, constraint alone and external force destroy merit and imputation.

[c] This bull is still extant in the Bullarium Romanum, tom. vi. p. 456. It has also been published, together with several other pieces relating to this controversy, by Du-Plessis D'Argentre, in his Collectio Judiciorum de novis Erroribus, tom. iii. p. ii.

defended themselves by a distinction invented by the ingenious and subtle Arnaud, in consequence of which they considered separately in this controversy the matter of doctrine and the matter of fact; that is to say, they acknowledged themselves bound to believe, that the five propositions were justly condemned by the pontiff;[a] but they maintained, that the pope had not declared, and consequently that they were bound not to believe, that these propositions were to be found in Jansenius' book, in the sense in which they had been condemned.[b] They did not however enjoy long the benefit of this artful distinction. The restless and invincible hatred of their enemies pursued them in every quarter where they looked for protection or repose, and at length engaged Alexander VII., the successor of Innocent, to declare, by a solemn bull, issued in 1656, that the five condemned propositions were the tenets of Jansenius, and were contained in his book. The pontiff did not stop here; but to this flagrant instance of imprudence added another still more shocking; for, in 1665, he sent into France the form of a declaration, that was to be subscribed by all those who aspired to any preferment in the church, and in which it was affirmed, that the five propositions were to be found in the book of Jansenius, in the same sense in which they had been condemned by the church.[c] This declaration, whose temerity and contentious tendency appeared in the most odious colours, not only to the Jansenists, but also to the wiser part of the French nation, produced deplorable divisions and tumults. It was immediately opposed with vigour by the Jansenists, who maintained, that in matters of fact the pope was fallible, especially when his decisions were merely personal, and not confirmed by a general council; and, in consequence, that it was neither obligatory nor necessary to subscribe this papal declaration, which had only a matter of fact for its object. The Jesuits, on the contrary, audaciously asserted, even openly, in the city of Paris, and in the face of the Gallican church, that faith and confidence in the papal decisions relating to matter of fact, had no less the characters of a well-grounded and divine faith, that when these decisions related merely to matters of doctrine and opinion. It is to be remarked, on the other hand, that all the Jansenists were by no means so resolute and intrepid as those above-mentioned. Some of them declared, that they would neither subscribe nor reject the Form in question, but would show their veneration for the authority of the pope, by observing a profound silence on that subject. Others professed themselves ready to subscribe it, not indeed without exception and reserve, but on condition of being allowed to explain, either verbally or in writing, the sense in which they understood it, or the distinctions and limitations with which they were willing to adopt it. Others employed a variety of methods and stratagems to elude the force of this tyrannical declaration.[d] But nothing of this kind was sufficient to satisfy the violent demands of the Jesuits; nothing less than the entire ruin of the Jansenists could appease their fury. Such, therefore, among the latter, as made the least opposition to the declaration in question, were thrown into prison, or sent into exile, or involved in some other species of persecution; and it is well known, that this severity was a consequence of the suggestions of the Jesuits, and of their influence in cabinet-councils.

XLV. The lenity or prudence of Clement IX. suspended, for a while, the calamities of those who had sacrificed their liberty and their fortunes to their zeal for the doctrine of Augustine, and gave them both time to breathe, and reason to hope for better days. This change, which happened in 1669, was occasioned by the fortitude and resolution of the bishops of Angers, Beauvais, Pamiers, and Alet, who obstinately and gloriously refused to subscribe, without the proper explications and distinctions, the oath or declaration that had produced such troubles and divisions in the church. They did not indeed stand alone in the breach; for, when the court of Rome began to menace and level its thunder at their heads, nineteen bishops more arose with a noble intrepidity, and adopted their cause, in solemn remonstrances, addressed both to the king of France and the pontiff. These resolute protesters were joined by Ann Genevieve de Bourbon, duchess of Longueville, a heroine of the first rank both in birth and magnanimity, who, having renounced the pleasures and vanities of the world, which had long employed her most serious thoughts, espoused, with a devout ardour, the doctrines and cause of the Jansenists, and most earnestly implored the pope's clemency in their behalf. Moved by these entreaties, and also by other arguments and considerations of like moment, Clement became so indulgent as to accept a conditional subscription to the famous declaration, and to permit doctors of scrupulous consciences to sign it according to the mental interpretation they thought proper to give it. This instance of condescension and lenity was no sooner made public, than the Jansenists began to come forth from their lurking-places, to return from their voluntary exile, and to enjoy their former tranquillity and freedom, being exempt from all uneasy apprehensions of any farther persecution.

This remarkable event is commonly called the Peace of Clement IX.; its duration, nevertheless, was but transitory.[e] It was violated in 1676, at the instigation of the Jesuits, by Louis XIV., who declared, in a public edict, that it had only been granted for a time, out of condescending indulgence to the tender and scrupulous consciences of a certain number of persons; and it was totally

[a] This was what our author calls the *quæstio de jure*.

[b] This is the *quæstio de facto*.

[c] This bull, and several other pieces, are also to be found in D'Argentre's Collectio Judiciorum, tom. iii.—See the form of Alexander's declaration, with the Mandate of Louis XIV. *ibid.*

[d] See Du-Mas, Histoire des Cinq Propositions, p. 158.—Gerberon, Histoire Generale du Jansenisme, p. ii. p. 516.

[e] The transactions relating to this event, which were carried on under the pontificate of Clement IX., are circumstantially related by cardinal Rospigliosi, in his Commentaries, which Du-Plessis D'Argentre has subjoined to his Elementa Theologica, published at Paris, in 1716. See also the last-mentioned author's Collectio Judiciorum, tom. iii. p. ii. p. 336, in which the letters of Clement are inserted. Two Jansenists have written the History of the Clementine Peace.—Varet, vicar to the archbishop of Sens, in an anonymous work, entitled, Relation de ce qui s'est pass dans l'Affaire de la Paix de l'Eglise sous le Pape Clement IX.; and Quesnel, in an anonymous production also, entitled, La Paix de Clement IX. ou Demonstration des deux Faussetés capitales avancées dans l'Histoire des Cinq Propositions contre la Foi des Disciples de St. Augustin. That Varet was the author of the former work is asserted in the Catechisme Historique sur les Contestations de l'Eglise, tom. i. p. 352; and that the latter came from the pen of Quesnel, we learn from the writer of the Bibliotheque Janseniste, p. 314. There was another accurate and interesting account of this transaction published in 1706, under the following title: Relation de ce qui s'est passé dans l'Affaire de la Paix de l'Eglise sous le Pape Clement IX. avec les Lettres, Actes, Memoires, et autres Pieces qui y ont rapport. The important services that the duchess of Longueville rendered to the

abolished after the death of the dutchess of Longueville, which happened in 1679, and deprived the Jansenists of their principal support. From that time their calamities were renewed, and they were pursued with the same malignity and rage that they had before experienced. Some of them avoided the rising storm by a voluntary exile; others sustained it with invincible fortitude and constancy of mind; others turned aside its fury, and escaped its violence, as well as they could, by dexterity and prudence. Antoine Arnaud, who was the head and leader of the party, fled into the Netherlands in 1679;[a] and in this retreat he not only escaped the fury of his enemies, but had it in his power to hurt them considerably, and actually made the Jesuits feel the weight of his talents and the extent of his influence. For the admirable eloquence and sagacity of this great man gave him such an ascendency in the Netherlands, that the greatest part of the churches there embraced his opinions, and adopted his cause; the Romish congregations in Holland also were, by his influence, and the ministry of his intimate friends and adherents, John Neercassel and Peter Coddeus, bishops of Castorie and Sebasto,[b] entirely gained over to the Jansenist party. The latter churches still persevere with the utmost steadiness in the principles of Jansenism; and, secured under the protection of the Dutch government, defy the threats, and hold in derision the resentment, of the Romish pontiffs.[c]

XLVI. It is not only on account of their embracing the doctrine of Augustine concerning divine grace (a doctrine which bears a striking resemblance to that of the Calvinists,) that the Jansenists have incurred the displeasure and resentment of the Jesuits. They are charged with many other circumstances, which appear intolerable to the warm votaries of the church of Rome. And, indeed, it is certain, that the various controversies, which have been mentioned above, were excited in that church principally by the Jansenists, and have been propagated and handed down by them, even to our times, in a prodigious multitude of their books published both in France and in the Netherlands.[d] But that which offends most the Jesuits, and the other creatures of the pontiff, is the austere severity that reigns in the system of moral discipline and practical religion adopted by the Jansenists. For the members of this sect cry out against the corruptions of the church of Rome, and complain that neither its doctrines nor morals retain any traces of their former purity. They reproach the clergy with an universal depravation of sentiments and manners, and an entire forgetfulness of the dignity of their character, and the duties of their vocation. They censure the licentiousness of the monastic orders, and insist upon the necessity of reforming their discipline according to the rules of sanctity, abstinence, and self-denial, that were originally prescribed by their respective founders. They maintain, also, that the people ought to be carefully instructed in all the doctrines and precepts of Christianity, and that, for this purpose, the Scriptures and public liturgies should be offered to their perusal in their mother-tongue; and, finally, they look upon it as a matter of the highest moment to persuade all Christians that true piety does not consist in the observance of pompous rites, or in the performance of external acts of devotion, but in inward holiness and divine love.

These sentiments of the Jansenists, on a general view, seem just and rational, and suitable to the spirit and genius of Christianity; but, when we examine the particular branches into which they extend these general principles, the consequences they deduce from them, and the manner in which they apply them, in their rules of discipline and practice, we shall find, that the piety of this famous party is deeply tinged both with superstition and fanaticism; that it more especially favours the harsh and enthusiastical opinion of the Mystics; and, in consequence, that the Jansenists are not undeservedly branded by their adversaries with the appellation of Rigorists.[e] This deno-

Jansenists in this affair are related with elegance and spirit by Villefort, in his Vie d'Anne Genevieve de Bourbon, Duchesse de Longueville, tom. ii. livr. vi. p. 89, of the edition of Amsterdam (1739,) which is more ample and complete than the edition of Paris.

[a] For an account of this great man, see Bayle's Dictionary, and the Histoire abregée de la Vie et des Ouvrages de M. Arnaud, published at Cologne. The change introduced into the Romish churches in Holland is mentioned by Lafiteau, Vie de Clement XI. tom. i. p. 123. For an account of Coddeus, Neercassel, and Varet, and the other patrons of Jansenism among the Dutch, see the Dictionaire des Livres Jansenistes, tom. i. ii. iv.

[b] Bishops *in partibus infidelium.*

[c] It must, however, be observed, that, notwithstanding the ascendency which the Jansenists have in Holland, the Jesuits, for some time past, have by artifice and disguise gained a considerable footing among the Romish churches that are tolerated by the republic.

[d] See Hist. Eccles. Rom. sæc. XVI. sect. xxxi.

[e] They who desire to form a just notion of the dismal piety of the Jansenists, (which carries the unseemly features of the gloomy devotion that was formerly practised by fanatical hermits in the deserts of Syria, Libya, and Egypt, but is entirely foreign from the dictates of reason and the amiable spirit of Christianity,) have only to peruse the epistles and other writings of the abbot of St. Cyran, who is the great oracle of the party. This abbot was a well-meaning man; and his piety, such as it was, carried in it the marks of sincerity and fervour; he was also superior, perhaps, as a pastor, to the greatest part of the Roman catholic doctors; and his learning, more especially his knowledge of religious antiquity, was very considerable; but to propose this man as a complete and perfect model of *genuine* piety, and as a most accurate and accomplished teacher of *Christian* virtue, is an absurdity peculiar to the Jansenists, and can be adopted by no person who knows what genuine piety and Christian virtue are. That we may not seem to detract rashly, and without reason, from the merit of this eminent man, it will not be improper to confirm what we have said by some instances. This good abbot, having undertaken to vanquish the *heretics*, (*i. e.* the protestants,) in a prolix and extensive work, was obliged to read, or at least to look into the various writings published by that *impious tribe*; and this he did in company with his nephew Martin de Barcos, who resembled him entirely in his sentiments and manners. But before he would venture to open a book composed by a protestant, he constantly marked it with the sign of the cross, to expel the evil spirit. What weakness and superstition did this ridiculous proceeding discover! for the good man was persuaded that Satan had fixed his residence in the books of the protestants; but it is not so easy to determine where he imagined the wicked spirit lay, whether in the paper, in the letters, between the leaves, or in the doctrines of these *infernal* productions. Let us see the account that is given of this matter by Lancelot, in his Memoires touchant la Vie de M. l'Abbé de S. Cyran, tom. i. p. 226. His words are as follow: "Il lisoit ces livres avec tant de piété, qu'en les prenant il les exorcisoit toujours en faisant la signe de la croix dessus, ne doutant point que le demon n'y residoit actuellement." His attachment to Augustine was so excessive, that he looked upon as sacred and divine even those opinions of that great man, which the wiser part of the Romish doctors had rejected as erroneous and highly dangerous. Such, (among others,) was the extravagant and pernicious tenet, that the saints are the only lawful proprietors of the world, and that the wicked have no right, by the divine law, to those things which they possess justly, in consequence of the decisions of human law. To this purpose is the following assertion of our abbot, as we find it in Fontaine's Memoires pour servir à l' Histoire de Port-Royal, tom. i. p. 201. "Jesus Christ n'est encore entré dans la possession de son royaume temporel, et des biens du monde qui lui appartiennent, que par cette *petite portion* qu'en tient l'eglise par les benefices de ses clercs, qui ne sont que les fermiers et les depositaires de Jesus Christ." If, therefore, we are to give credit to this visionary man, the golden age is approaching, when Jesus Christ, having pulled down the mighty from their seats, and dethroned the kings and princes of the earth, shall reduce the whole world under his sole dominion, and give it over to the government of priests and monks, who are the princes of his church.—After we have seen such sentiments as these maintained by their oracle and

mination they merited in a peculiar manner, by their doctrine concerning repentance and penance, whose tendency, considered both in a civil and religious point of view, is singularly pernicious; for they make repentance consist chiefly in those voluntary sufferings, which the transgressor inflicts upon himself, in proportion to the nature of his crimes and the degree of his guilt. As their notions of the extent of man's original corruption are greatly exaggerated, they prescribe remedies to it that are of the same nature. They look upon Christians as bound to expiate this original guilt by acts of mortification performed in solitude and silence, by torturing and macerating their bodies, by painful labour, excessive abstinence, continual prayer and contemplation; and they hold every person obliged to increase these voluntary pains and sufferings, in proportion to the degree of corruption derived by each from nature, or contracted by a vicious and licentious course of life. They even carry these austerities to so high a pitch, that they do not scruple to call those *holy* self-tormentors, who have gradually put an end to their days by excessive abstinence or labour, the 'sacred victims of repentance, that have been *consumed* by the fire of divine love.' Not satisfied with this fanatical language, they go still farther, and superstitiously maintain, that the conduct of these self-murderers is peculiarly meritorious in the eye of Heaven; and that their sufferings, macerations, and labours, appease the anger of the Deity, and not only contribute to their own felicity, but draw down abundant blessings upon their friends and upon the church. We might confirm this account by various examples, and more especially by that of the famous abbé de Paris, the great wonder-worker of the Jansenists, who put himself to a most painful death, in order to satisfy the justice of an incensed God:[a] such was the picture he had formed of the best of beings in his disordered fancy.

XLVII. A striking example of this austere, forbidding, and extravagant species of devotion, was exhibited in that celebrated female convent called Port-Royal in the Fields, which was situated in a retired, deep, and gloomy vale, not far from Paris. Henry IV. committed the inspection and government of this austere society, about the commencement of this century, to Jaqueline, daughter of Antoine Arnaud,[b] who, after her conversion, assumed the name of Marie Angelique de la Sainte-Madelaine. This lady had at first led a very dissolute life,[c] which was the general case of the cloistered fair in France about this period; but a remarkable change happened in her sentiments and manners, in 1609, when she resolved no more to live like a nun, but to consecrate her future days to deep devotion and penitential exercises. This holy resolution was strengthened by her acquaintance with the famous Francois de Sales, and the abbot of St. Cyran. The last of these pious connexions she formed in 1623, and regulated both her own conduct and the manners of her convent by the doctrine and example of these devout men. Hence it happened, that, during the whole course of this century, the convent of Port-Royal excited the indignation of the Jesuits, the admiration of the Jansenists, and the attention of Europe. The holy virgins observed, with the utmost rigour and exactness, that ancient rule of the Cistercians, which had been almost every where abrogated on account of its excessive and intolerable austerity: they even went beyond its most cruel demands.[d] Such was the fame of this devout sisterhood,

chief, it is natural to be surprised when we hear the Jansenists boasting of their zeal in defending sovereign states, and, in general, the civil ights of mankind, against the stratagems and usurpations of the ontiffs.

The notions of the abbot of St. Cyran concerning prayer, which breathe the fanatical spirit of mysticism, will farther confirm what we have said of his propensity to enthusiasm. It was, for example, a favourite maxim with him, that the Christian who prays, ought never to recollect the good things he stands in need of in order to ask them of God, since true prayer does not consist in distinct notions and clear ideas of what we are doing in that solemn act, but in a certain blind impulse of divine love. Such is the account given of the abbot's sentiments on this head by Lancelot, tom. ii. p. 44.—"Il ne croyoit pas, (says that author,) que l'on pût faire quelque effort pour s'appliquer a quelque point, ou a quelque pensée particuliere—parce que la veritable priere est plutôt un attrait de son amour, qui emporte notre cœur vers lui, et nous enleve comme hors de nous-mêmes, qu'une occupation de notre esprit, qui se remplisse de l'idée de quelque objeti quoi que divin." According to this hypothesis, the man prays best who neither *thinks* nor *asks*, in that act of devotion. This is, indeed, a very extraordinary account of the matter, and contains an idea of prayer which seems to have been quite unknown to Christ, and his apostles; for the former has commanded us to address our prayers to God in a set form of words; and the latter frequently tell us the subjects of their petitions and supplications.

But, of all the errors of this Arch-Jansenist, not one was so pernicious as the fanatical notion he entertained of his being the *residence* of the Deity, the *instrument* of the Godhead, by which the divine nature itself essentially operated. It was in consequence of this dangerous principle, that he recommended it as a duty incumbent on all pious men to follow, without consulting their judgment or any other guide, the first motions and impulses of their minds, as the dictates of Heaven. And, indeed, the Jansenists, in general, are intimately persuaded, that God operates immediately upon the minds of those who have composed, or rather suppressed, all the motions of the understanding and of the will, and that to such he declares, from above, his intentions and commands; since whatever thoughts, inclinations, or designs, arise within them, in this calm state of tranquillity and silence, are to be considered as the direct suggestions and oracles of the divine wisdom. See, for a farther account of this pestilential doctrine, the Memoires de Port-Royal, tom iii. p. 246.

[a] See Morin's Com. de Pœnitentiâ, præf. p. 3, in which there is a tacit censure of the penance of the Jansenists.—See, on the other hand, the Memoires de Port-Royal.—The Jansenists, among all the meritorious actions of the abbot of St. Cyran, find none more worthy of admiration and applause than his restoring from oblivion the true system of penitential discipline; and they consider him as the second author or parent of the doctrine of penance. This very doctrine, however, was one of the principal reasons of his being committed to prison by the order of cardinal Richelieu.

[b] An eminent lawyer, and father to the famous Arnaud, doctor of the Sorbonne.

☞ [c] The dissolute life imputed to this abbess by Dr. Mosheim is an egregious mistake, which seems to have proceeded from his misunderstanding a passage in Bayle's Dictionary, vol. i. p. 338, note [f], the fourth French edition.

[d] There is a prodigious multitude of books still extant, in which the rise, progress, laws, and sanctity, of this famous convent, are described and extolled by eminent Jansenists, who, at the same time, deplore its fate in the most doleful strains. Of this multitude we shall mention those only which may easily be procured, and which contain the most modern and circumstantial accounts of that celebrated establishment.—The Benedictines of St. Maur have given an exact, though dry history of this convent in their Gallia Christiana, tom. vii. A more elegant and agreeable account of it, charged, however, with imperfection and partiality, was composed by the famous poet Racine, under the title of Abrégé de l Histoire de Port-Royal, and was published, after having passed through many editions, in the year 1750, at Amsterdam, among the works of his son Louis Racine, tom. ii. The external state and form of this convent are professedly described by Moleon, in his Voyages Liturgiques, p. 234.—Add to these, Nic. Fontaine's Memoires pour servir à l'Histoire de Port-Royal, published in 1738.—The Memoires (by Du-Fosse) pour servir à l'Histoire de Port-Royal; and the Recueil de plusiers Pieces pour servir à l'Histoire de Port-Royal.—The editor of this last compilation promises, in his preface, farther collections of pieces relative to the same subject, and seems to insinuate, that a complete history of Port-Royal, drawn from these and other valuable and authentic records, will sooner or later see the light. See, beside the authors above-mentioned, Lancelot's Memoires touchant la Vie de l'Abbé de St. Cyran. All these authors confine their relations to the external form and various revolutions of this nunnery. Its internal state, its rules of discipline, the manners of its virgins, and the incidents and transactions that happened between them and the holy neighbourhood of Jansenists, are described and related by another set of writers. See the Memoires pour servir à l'Histoire de Port-Royal, et à

that multitudes of pious persons were ambitious to dwell in the neighbourhood of Port-Royal, and that a great part of the Jansenist Penitents, or self-tormentors, of both sexes, built huts without its precincts, where they imitated the manners of those austere and gloomy fanatics, who, in the fourth and fifth centuries, retired into the wild and uncultivated places of Syria and Egypt, and were commonly called the Fathers of the Desert. The end which these penitents had in view was, by silence, hunger, thirst, prayer, bodily labour, watchings, sorrow, and other voluntary acts of self-denial, to efface the guilt, and remove the pollution which the soul had derived from natural corruptions or evil habits.[a] They did not, however, all observe the same discipline, or follow the same kind of application and labour. The more learned consumed their strength in composing laborious productions filled with sacred and profane erudition, and some of these have, no doubt, deserved well of the republic of letters: others were employed in teaching youth the rudiments of language and the principles of science; but the far greatest part exhausted both the health of their bodies and the vigour of their minds in servile industry and rural labour, and thus pined away by a slow kind of death. What is singularly surprising is, that many of these voluntary victims of an inhuman piety were persons illustrious both by their birth and stations, who, after having distinguished themselves in civil or military employments, debased themselves so far in this penitential retreat, as to assume the character, offices, and labours, of the lowest servants.

This celebrated retreat of the devout and austere Jansenists was subject to many vicissitudes during the whole course of this century: at one time it flourished in unrivalled glory; at another, it seemed eclipsed, and on the brink of ruin. At length, however, the period of its extinction approached. The nuns obstinately refused to subscribe the declaration of pope Alexander VII., that has been so often mentioned; on the other hand, their convent and rule of discipline were considered as detrimental to the interests of the kingdom, and a dishonour to some of the first families in France; hence Louis XIV., in 1709, instigated by the violent counsels of the Jesuits, ordered the convent to be suppressed, the whole building to be levelled with the ground, and the nuns to be removed to Paris. And, lest there should still remain some secret fuel to nourish the flame of superstition in that place, he ordered the very carcases of the nuns and devout Jansenists to be dug up and buried elsewhere.

XLVIII. The other controversies that disturbed the tranquillity of the church of Rome, were but light blasts when compared with this violent hurricane. The old debate, however, between the Franciscans and Dominicans, concerning the immaculate conception of the Virgin Mary, which was maintained by the former, and denied by the latter, gave much trouble and perplexity to the pontiffs, and more especially to Paul V., Gregory XV., and Alexander VII. The kingdom of Spain was so agitated and divided into factions by this controversy, in the former part of this century, that solemn embassies were sent to Rome, both by Philip III., and his successor, with a view to engage the Roman pontiff to determine the question, or, at any rate, to put an end to the contest by a public edict. But, notwithstanding the weighty solicitations of these monarchs, the oracle of Rome pronounced nothing but ambiguous words; and its high priests prudently avoided coming to a plain and positive decision of the affair. If they were awed, on one hand, by the warm remonstrances of the Spanish court, which favoured the sentiment of the Franciscans, they were restrained, on the other, by the credit and influence of the Dominicans: so that, after the most earnest entreaties and importunities, all that could be obtained from the pontiff, by the court of Spain, was a declaration, intimating that the opinion of the Franciscans had a high degree of probability on its side, and forbidding the Dominicans to oppose it in a public manner; but this declaration was accompanied with another,[b] by which the Franciscans were prohibited, in their turn, from treating as erroneous the doctrine of the Dominicans. This accommodation of the dispute would have been highly laudable in a prince or civil magistrate, who, unacquainted with theological questions of such an abstruse nature, preferred the tranquillity of his people to the discussion of such an intricate and unimportant point; but whether it was honourable to a supreme pontiff, who boasts of a divine right to decide all religious controversies, and pretends to a degree of inspiration that places him beyond the possibility of erring, we leave to the consideration of those who have his glory at heart.

---

la Vie de Marie Angelique D'Arnaud, published at Utrecht in 1742; also the Vies interessantes et edifiantes des Religieuses de Port-Royal, et de plusieurs Personnes qui leur etoient attachées; and, for an account of the suppression and abolition of this convent, see the Memoires sur la Destruction de l'Abbaye de Port-Royal des Champs. If we not do mistake, all these histories and relations have been much less serviceable to the reputation of this famous convent than the Jansenist party are willing to think. When we view Arnaud, Tillemont, Nicole, Le Maitre, and the other authors of Port-Royal, in their learned productions, they then appear truly great; but, when we lay aside their works, and, taking up these histories of Port-Royal, see these great men in private life, in the constant practice of that austere discipline of which the Jansenists boast so foolishly, they shrink almost to nothing, appear in the contemptible light of fanatics, and seem totally unworthy of the fame they have acquired. When we read the Discourses that Isaac le Maitre, commonly called Sacy, pronounced at the bar, together with his other ingenious productions, we cannot refuse him the applause that is due to such an elegant and accomplished writer; but when we meet with this polite author at Port-Royal, mixed with labourers and reapers, and with the spade or the sickle in his hand, he certainly makes a ludicrous or comical figure, and can scarcely be looked upon as perfectly right in his head.

[a] Among the most eminent of these penitents was Isaac le Maitre, a celebrated advocate at Paris, whose eloquence had procured him a shining reputation, and who, in 1637, retired to Port-Royal to make expiation for his sins. The retreat of this eminent man raised new enemies to the abbot of St. Cyran. See the Memoires pour l'Histoire de Port-Royal, tom. i. p. 223. The example of Le Maitre was followed by some persons of the highest distinction, and by a great number of persons of all ranks. See the Vies des Religieuses de Port-Royal, t. i. p. 141.

[b] See Fred. Ulr. Calixti Historia Immaculatæ Conceptionis B. Virginis Mariæ, published in 1696.—Hornbeckii Comm. ad Bullam Urbani VIII. de diebus Festis, p. 250.—Launoii Præscriptiones de Conceptu Virginis Mariæ, tom. i. p. i. oper.—Long after this period, Clement XI. went a step farther, and appointed, in 1708, a festival to be celebrated, in honour of the immaculate conception, throughout the Romish church. See the Memoires de Trevoux for the year 1709, art. xxxviii. p. 514. But the Dominicans obstinately deny that the obligation of this law extends to them, and persist in maintaining their ancient doctrine, though with more modesty and circumspection than they formerly discovered in this debate; and when we consider that their opinion in this respect has never been expressly condemned by any pope, and that they are not in the least molested, or even censured, for refusing to celebrate the festival above-mentioned, it appears evidently, from all this, that the terms of the papal edict are to be understood with certain restrictions, and interpreted in a mild and indulgent manner; and that the spirit of this edict is not contrary to the tenor of the former declarations of the pontiffs on this head. See Lamindus Pritanius (a fictitious name assumed by the author Muratori) de Ingeniorum Moderatione in Religionis Negotio, p. 254.

XLIX. The controversies with the Mystics were now renewed; and that sect, which in former times enjoyed such a high degree of reputation and authority, was treated with the greatest severity, and involved in the deepest distress, toward the conclusion of this century. This unhappy change in its affairs was principally occasioned by the fanaticism and imprudence of Michael de Molinos, a Spanish priest, who resided at Rome, and the fame of whose ardent piety and devotion procured him a considerable number of disciples of both sexes. A book published at Rome in 1681, by this ecclesiastic, under the title of the Spiritual Guide, alarmed the doctors of the church.[a] This book contained, beside the usual precepts and institutions of mystic theology, several notions relating to a spiritual and contemplative life, that seemed to revive the pernicious and infernal errors of the Beghards, and open a door to all sorts of licentiousness and profligacy. The principles of Molinos, which have been very differently interpreted by his friends and enemies, amount to this: "that the whole of religion consists in the perfect tranquillity of a mind removed from all external and finite things, and centred in God, and in such a pure love of the Supreme Being, as is independent of all prospect of interest or reward;" or, to express the doctrine of this Mystic, in other words, "The soul, in the pursuit of the supreme good, must retire from the reports and gratifications of sense, and, in general, from all corporeal objects, and, imposing silence upon all the motions of the understanding and will, must be absorbed in the Deity." Hence the denomination of Quietist was given to the followers of Molinos; though that of Mystic, which was their vulgar title, was more applicable, and expressed with greater propriety their fanatical system; for the doctrine of Molinos had no other circumstance of novelty attending it, than the singular terms he employed in unfolding his notions, and the ingenuity he discovered in digesting what the ancient Mystics had thrown out in the most confused and incoherent jargon, into something that looked like a system. The Jesuits, and other zealous votaries of Rome, soon perceived that his system was a tacit censure of the Romish church, as having departed from the spirit of true religion, by placing the essence of piety in external works, and in the performance of a certain round of ceremonies. But the warmest opposition that he met with was from the French ambassador[b] at Rome, who raised a most violent persecution against him. This made many imagine, that it was not his theological system alone that had inflamed the resentment of that minister, but that some considerations of a political nature had been blended with this famous controversy, and that the Spanish Mystic had opposed the designs and negotiations of the French monarch at the court of Rome. However that may have been, Molinos, unable to resist the storm, and abandoned by those from whom he chiefly expected succour, yielded to it in 1685, when, notwithstanding the number, rank, and credit of his friends at Rome, and the particular marks of favour he had received from the pontiff,[c] he was thrown into prison. Two years after this, he was obliged to renounce, in a public manner, the errors of which he was accused; and this solemn recantation was followed by a sentence of perpetual imprisonment, from which he was, in an advanced age, delivered by death, in 1696.[d] The candid and impartial will be obliged to acknowledge, that the opinions and expressions of this enthusiast were perfidiously misrepresented and perverted by the Jesuits and others, whose interest it was that he should be put out of the way, and excluded from every thing but contemplation and repose; and it is most certain, that his doctrine was charged with consequences which he neither approved nor even apprehended. But, on the other hand, it must also be confessed, that his system was chargeable with the greatest part of the reproaches that are justly thrown upon the Mystics, and favoured much the illusions and follies of those fanatics, who would make the crude visions of their disordered fancies pass for divine revelations.[e]

L. It would have been truly surprising had a system of piety, that was so adapted to seduce the indolent mind, to captivate the warm imagination, and melt the tender heart, been destitute of votaries and followers. This was by no means the case. In Italy, Spain, France, and the Netherlands, Molinos had a considerable number of disciples; and, beside the reasons we have now hinted, another circumstance must have contributed much to multiply his votaries; for, in all parts of the Romish dominion, there were numbers of persons, who had sense and knowledge enough to perceive, that the whole of religion could not consist in external rites and bodily mortifications, but too little to direct themselves in religious matters, or to substitute what was right in the place of what they knew to be wrong; and hence it was natural for them to follow the first plausible guide that was offered to them. But the church of Rome, apprehensive of the consequences of this mystic theology, left no method unemployed that could contribute to stop its progress; and, by the force of promises and threats, of severity and mildness properly applied, stifled in the birth the commotions and changes it seemed adapted to excite. The death of Molinos contributed also to dispel the anxiety of the Romish doctors, since his disciples and followers seemed too inconsiderable to deserve any notice. Among these are generally reckoned cardinal Petrucci, Francis de la Combe, a Barnabite friar, (the spiritual director of Madame Guyon,) Francis Malavalle, Bernier de Louvigni, and others of less note. These enthusiasts, as is common among the Mystics, differ from Molinos in several points, and are also divided among themselves. This diversity is, however, rather nominal than real; and, if we consider the true

[a] This work, which was published in 1675, was honoured with the approbation and encomiums of many eminent and respectable personages. It was translated into Latin, Italian, French, and Dutch, and passed through many editions. There is another work of Molinos composed in the same spirit, concerning the daily celebration of the communion, which was also condemned. See the "Recueil de diverses Pieces concernant le Quietisme et les Quietistes, ou Molinos, ses Sentimens et ses Disciples," published at Amsterdam, in 1688, in which the reader will find a French translation of the Spiritual Guide, together with a collection of letters on various subjects, written by Molinos.

[b] Cardinal d'Estrées.

[c] Innocent XI.

[d] He was born in the diocese of Saragossa, in 1627; see the Biblioth. Janseniste, p. 469.—For an account of this controversy, see the Narrative of the Proceedings of the Controversy concerning Quietism, subjoined to the German translation of Burnet's Travels; as also Arnoldi Histor. Eccles. et Hæretic. tom. iii. c. xvii.—Jaegeri Histor. Eccles. et Polit. Sæculi XVII. decen. ix.—Plessis D'Argentre, Collectio Judiciorum de novis Erroribus, t. iii. p. 357, where may be seen the papal edicts relating to this controversy.

[e] All that can be alleged in defence of Molinos has been collected by Weisman, in his Histor. Ecclesiast. sæc. XVII.

signification of the terms by which they express their respective notions, we shall find that they all set out from the same principles, and tend to the same conclusions.[a]

LI One of the principal patrons and propagators of Quietism in France was Marie Bouvieres de la Mothe Guyon, a woman of fashion, remarkable for the goodness of her heart and the regularity of her manners, but of an inconstant and unsettled temper, and subject to be drawn away by the seduction of a warm and unbridled fancy. This female apostle of mysticism derived all her ideas of religion from the feelings of her own heart,[b] and described its nature to others as she felt it herself; a manner of proceeding which is extremely uncertain and delusive. And, accordingly, her religious sentiments made a great noise in 1687, and gave offence to many. Hence, after they had been attentively and accurately examined by several men of eminent piety and learning, they were pronounced erroneous and unsound, and, in 1697, were professedly confuted by the celebrated Bossuet. This gave rise to a controversy of still greater moment, between the prelate last mentioned, and Francis Salignac de Fenelon, archbishop of Cambray, whose sublime virtue and superior genius were beheld with veneration in all the countries of Europe. Of these two disputants, who, in point of eloquence, were avowedly without either superiors or equals in France, the latter seemed disposed to favour the religious system of Madame Guyon; for, when Bossuet desired his approbation of the book he had composed in answer to the sentiments of that female mystic, Fenelon not only refused it, but openly declared that this pious woman had been treated with great partiality and injustice, and that the censures of her adversary were unmerited and groundless. Nor did the warm imagination of this amiable prelate permit him to stop here, where the dictates of prudence ought to have set bounds to his zeal; for, in the same year, he published a book,[c] in which he adopted several of the tenets of Madame Guyon, and more especially that favourite doctrine of the Mystics, which teaches that the love of the Supreme Being must be pure and disinterested; that is, exempt from all views of interest and all hope of reward.[d] This doctrine Fenelon explained with pathetic eloquence, and confirmed it by the authority of many of the most eminent and pious among the Romish doctors. Bossuet, whose leading passion was ambition, and who beheld with anxiety the rising fame and eminent talents of Fenelon as an obstacle to his glory, was highly exasperated by this opposition, and left no method unemployed which artifice and jealousy could suggest to mortify a rival whose illustrious merit had rendered him so formidable. For this purpose, he threw himself at the feet of Louis XIV., implored the pope's aid, and, by his importunities and stratagems, obtained the condemnation of Fenelon's book. This censure was pronounced, in 1699, by Innocent XII., who, in a public brief, declared that book unsound in general, and branded with peculiar marks of disapprobation twenty-three propositions, specified by that Congregation which had been appointed to examine it. The book, however, was condemned alone, without any mention of the author; and the conduct of Fenelon on this occasion was very remarkable. He declared publickly his entire acquiescence in the sentence by which his book had been condemned, and not only read that sentence to his people in the pulpit at Cambray, but exhorted them to respect and obey the papal decree.[e] This step was differently interpreted by different persons, according to their notions of this great man, or their respective ways of thinking. Some considered it as an instance of true magnanimity, as the mark of a meek and gentle spirit, that preferred the peace of the church to every private view of interest or glory. Others, less charitable, looked upon this submissive conduct as ignoble and pusillanimous, as denoting manifestly a want of integrity, inasmuch as it implied, that the prelate condemned with his lips what in his heart he believed to be true. One thing indeed seems generally agreed on; and that is, that Fenelon persisted, to the end of his days, in the sentiments which, in obedience to the order of the pope, he retracted and condemned in a public manner.

LII. Beside these controversies, which derived their importance chiefly from the influence and reputation of the disputants, and thus became productive of great tumults and divisions in the church, there were others excited by several innovators, whose new and singular opinions were followed by troubles, though of a less momentous and permanent nature. Such was the strange doctrine of Isaac la Peyrere, who, in two small treatises, published in 1655, maintained that it is the origin of the Jewish nation, and not of the human race, that we find recorded in the books of Moses, and that our globe was inhabited by many nations before Adam, whom he considered as merely the father of the Jews. Though Peyrere was a protestant when he published this opinion, yet the doctors of the Romish church thought themselves bound to punish an error that seemed to strike at the foundation of all revealed religion; and, therefore, in 1656, had him seized at Brussels, and thrown into prison, where, to escape the flames, he publickly renounced his

[a] The writings of these fanatics are enumerated and sharply criticised by Colonia, in the Bibliotheque Quietiste (which he has subjoined to his Biblioth. Janseniste,) p. 455, 488.—See also God. Arnoldi Hist. et Descriptio Theologiæ Mysticæ, p. 364, and Poiret's Biblio. Mysticorum.

[b] The writings of this lady abound with childish allegories and mystic ejaculations. She wrote an account of her own life and spiritual adventures; but her principal production was La Bible de Mad. Guyon, avec des Explications et Reflexions qui regardent la Vie interieure. This Bible, with Annotations relating to the hidden or internal Life, was published in 1715, in twenty volumes in 8vo. and the notes abundantly discover the fertile imagination and shallow judgment of this female mystic.—See a farther account of her in the Letters of Mad. de Maintenon, tom. i. ii.

[c] This book was entitled, Explication des Maximes des Saints sur la Vie interieure. It has been translated into Latin.

[d] This doctrine has thus far a foundation in reason and philosophy, that the moral perfections of the Deity are, in themselves, *intrinsically amiable*; and that their excellence is as much adapted to excite our esteem and love, as the experience of their beneficent effects in promoting our well-being, is to inflame our gratitude. The error, therefore of the mystics lay in their drawing extravagant conclusions from a right principle, and in their requiring in their followers a perpetual abstraction and separation of ideas which are intimately connected, and, as it were, blended together, such as felicity and perfection; for, though these two are inseparable in fact, yet the mystics, from a fanlostic pretension to disinterestedness, would separate them right or wrong, and turned their whole attention to the latter. In their views also of the Supreme Being, they overlooked the important relations he bears to us as *benefactor* and *rewarder*; relations which certainly give rise to noble sentiments and important duties; and confined their views to his supreme beauty, excellence, and perfection.

[e] An ample and impartial account of this controversy has been given by Toussaint du Plessis, a Benedictine, in his Histoire de l'Eglise de Meaux, livre v. tom. i. p. 485—523.—Ramsay, in his life of Fenelon, is less impartial, but is nevertheless worthy of being consulted on this subject. See Voltaire's Siecle de Louis XIV. tom. ii. p. 301.—The public acts and edicts relating to this controversy have been collected by M. du Plessis Argentre, in his Collectio Judiciorum, tom. iii.

erroneous system, and, to make a full expiation for it, embraced the popish religion.[a]

Thomas White, known at different times, and in different countries, by the names of Albius, Anglus, Candidus, Bianchi,[b] which he assumed successively, made a considerable figure, about the middle of this century, in England, Portugal, France, and the Netherlands, by the number and subtlety of his philosophical productions; but he also incurred the displeasure of many of the doctors of his communion, on account of the novelty and singularity of his opinions. He was undoubtedly a man of genius and penetration; but, being a passionate admirer of the Peripatetic philosophy, he ventured to employ it in the explication of some of the peculiar doctrines of the Romish church. This bold attempt led him imperceptibly out of the beaten road of popery, opened to him new views of things, and made him adopt notions that had never been heard of in the church of Rome; and hence his books were prohibited and condemned in several places, and particularly at Rome by the Congregation of the Index. This innovator is said to have died in England, his native country, and to have left a sect behind him that embraced his doctrine, but which, in process of time, fell into oblivion.[c]

His peculiarities, however, were nothing, in comparison with the romantic notions of Joseph Francis Borri, a Milanese knight, eminent for his knowledge of chemistry and physic; but who, at the same time, appears to have been rather a madman than a heretic. The fancies broached by this man, concerning the Virgin Mary, the Holy Ghost, the erection of a new celestial kingdom, of which he himself was to be the founder, and the downfall of the Roman pontiff, are so extravagant, childish, and absurd, that no sober person can view them in any other light than as the crude reveries of a disordered brain. Besides, the conduct of this fanatic, in many instances, discovered the greatest vanity and levity, attended with that spirit of imposture which is usually visible in quacks and mountebanks; and, indeed, in the whole of his behaviour, he seemed destitute of sense, integrity, and prudence. The inquisitors had spread their snares for Borri; but he fortunately escaped them, and wandered up and down through a great part of Europe, giving himself out for another Æsculapius, and pretending to be initiated into the most profound mysteries of chemical science. But, in 1672, he imprudently fell into the power of the pontiff, who pronounced against him a sentence of perpetual imprisonment.[d]

The last innovator we shall here mention is Celestine Sfondrati, who, having formed the design of terminating the disputes concerning predestination, by new explications of that doctrine, wrote a book upon that knotty subject, which threw into combustion, in 1696, a considerable part of the Romish church, since it was, in some things, agreeable to none of the contending parties, and neither satisfied entirely the Jesuits nor their adversaries.[e] Five French bishops, of great credit at the court of Rome, accused the author, notwithstanding the high rank of cardinal to which he had been raised on account of his extensive learning, of various errors, and more especially of having departed from the sentiments and doctrine of Augustine. This accusation was brought before Innocent XII. in 1696; but the contest which it seemed calculated to excite was nipped in the bud. The pontiff appeased, or rather put off, the French prelates, with a fair promise that he would appoint a congregation to examine the cardinal's doctrine, and then pronounce sentence accordingly; but he forgot his promise, imitated the prudent conduct of his predecessors on like occasions, and did not venture to decide this intricate controversy.

LIII. There was scarcely any change introduced into the Romish ritual during this century, if we except an edict of Urban VIII., issued in 1643,[f] for diminishing the number of holidays: we shall therefore conclude this account with a list of the saints added to the calendar by the Roman pontiffs during the period now before us.

In the year 1601, Clement VIII. raised to that spiritual dignity Raymond of Pennafort, the famous compiler of the Decretals; in 1608, Frances Pontiani, a Benedictine nun; and, in 1610, the eminent and illustrious Charles Borromeo, bishop of Milan, so justly celebrated for his exemplary piety, and almost unparalleled liberality and beneficence.

Gregory XV. conferred, in 1622, the honour of saintship on Theresa, a native of Avila in Spain, and a nun of the Carmelite order.

Urban VIII. in 1623, conferred the same spiritual honours on Philip Neri, the founder of the order entitled Fathers of the Oratory, in Italy; on Ignatius Loyola, the parent of the Jesuits; and on his chief disciple Francis Xavier, the Apostle of the Indians.

Alexander VII. canonized, in 1658, Thomas de Villa nueva, a Spanish monk, of the order of St. Augustin, and, in 1665, Francis de Sales, bishop of Geneva.

Clement X. added to this honourable list, in 1670, Pedro de Alcantara, a Franciscan monk, and Maria Magdalena Pactii, a Florentine nun of the Carmelite order; and, in 1671, Rose, an American virgin, of the third order of Dominick, and Louis Bertrand, a Dominican monk.

Under the pontificate of Innocent XII. saintship was conferred upon Caietan of Vicenza, a regular clerk of the order of Theatins, for whom that honour had been designed twenty years before by Clement X. who died at the time when the canonization was to have been performed.

---

[a] Bayle's Dictionary.—Arnold's Histor. Eccles. et Hæret. tom. iii.—Menagiana, published by M. de la Monnoye, tom. ii.

☞ [b] All these denominations bear reference to his true name, which was White. This man was a peculiar favourite of Sir Kenelm Digby, and mentions him with singular veneration in his philosophical writings. See more of this White in Wood's Athenæ Oxon. second edit. vol. ii. p. 665, and in the Biograph. Brit. article Glanville, vol. iv. p. 2206.

[c] See Bayle's Dictionary, at the article *Anglus*.—Baillet, Vie de M. Des Cartes, tom. ii.

[d] There is a very interesting article in Bayle's Dictionary relating to Borri, in which all the extravagances of that wrong-headed man are curiously related. See also Arnold's History, p. iii. c. xviii. p. 193.

[e] This book, which was published at Rome in 1696, is entitled, Nodus Prædestinationis dissolutus. The letters of the French bishops, with the answer of the pontiff, are to be found in Du-Plessis D'Argentre's Collectio Judiciorum, tom. iii. and in Natalis Alexander's Theologia Dogmatica et Moralis, p. 877. The letters of the bishops are remarkable in this respect, that they contain sharp animadversions upon the Jesuits and their discipline. The prelates express, in the strongest terms, their abhorrence of the doctrine of philosophical sin, which rendered the Jesuits so deservedly infamous, and their detestation of the methods of propagating Christianity employed by the missionaries of that order in China; and, to express their aversion to the doctrine of Sfondrati, they say, that his opinions are still more erroneous and pernicious than even those of the Molinists. The doctrine of this cardinal has been accurately represented and compared with that of Augustin by the learned Basnage, in his Histoire de l'Eglise, livre xii. c. iii. sect. xi.

[f] This bull may be seen in the Nouvelle Bibliotheque, tom. xv. p. 88.

John of Leon, also, a hermit of St. Augustin; Pascal Baylonio, a Franciscan monk of the kingdom of Arragon; and John de Dieu, a Portuguese, and one of the order of the Brethren of Hospitality, all of whom had been marked for a place in the calendar by Alexander VIII., were solemnly canonized, in 1691, by Innocent XII.[a]

CHAPTER II.

The History of the Greek and Oriental Churches.

I. THE history of the Greek and Eastern Christians, faithfully and accurately composed, would, no doubt, furnish us with a variety of entertaining and useful records; but the events that happen, and the transactions that are carried on in those distant regions, are very rarely transmitted to us genuine and uncorrupted. The spirit of religious party, and the pious frauds which it often engenders, want of proper information, and undistinguishing credulity, have introduced a fabulous mixture into the accounts we have of the state of the Christian religion in the East; and this consideration has engaged us to treat in a more concise manner than would otherwise have been expedient, this particular branch of ecclesiastical history.

The Greek church, whose wretched situation was mentioned in the history of the preceding century, continued, during the present one, in the same deplorable state of ignorance and decay, destitute of the means of acquiring or promoting solid and useful knowledge. This account is, however, to be considered as taken from a general view of that church; for several of its members may be alleged as exceptions from the prevailing character of ignorance, superstition, and corruption. Among the multitude of Greeks who travel into Sicily, Italy, England, Holland, and Germany, or carry on trade in their own country, or fill honourable and important posts in the courts of the Turkish emperors, there are undoubtedly some who are exempt from this reproach of ignorance and stupidity, of superstition and profligacy, and who make a figure by their opulence and credit.[b] But nothing can be more rooted and invincible than the aversion the Greeks in general discover to the Latin or Romish church; an aversion which neither promises nor threats, artifice nor violence, have been able to conquer, or even to temper or diminish, and which has continued inflexible and unrelenting amidst the most zealous efforts of the Roman pontiffs, and the various means employed by their numerous missionaries, to gain over this people to their communion and jurisdiction.[c] It is true, indeed, that the Latin Christians have founded churches in some of the islands of the Archipelago; but these congregations are poor and inconsiderable; nor will either the Greeks or their masters, the Turks, permit the Romish missionaries to extend farther their spiritual jurisdiction.

II. Under the pontificate of Urban VIII. great hopes were entertained of softening the antipathy of the Greeks against the Latin church,[d] and of engaging them and the other Christians of the East, to embrace the communion of Rome, and acknowledge the supremacy and jurisdiction of its pontiff. This was the chief object that excited the ambitious zeal and employed the assiduous labour and activity of Urban, who called to his assistance such ecclesiastics as were most eminent for their acquaintance with Greek and Oriental learning, and with the tempers, manners, and characters of the Christians in those distant regions, that they might suggest the shortest and most effectual method of bringing them and their churches under the Roman yoke. The wisest of these counsellors advised the pontiff to lay it down for a preliminary in this difficult negotiation, that the Greek and Eastern Christians were to be indulged in almost every point that had hitherto been refused them by the Romish missionaries, and that no alteration was to be introduced either into their ritual or doctrine; that their ceremonies were to be tolerated, since they did not concern the essence of religion; and that their doctrine was to be explained and understood in such a manner as might give it a near and striking resemblance to the doctrine and institutions of the church of Rome. In defence of this method of proceeding, it was judiciously observed, that the Greeks would be much more tractable and obsequious, were they told by the missionaries, that it was not meant to convert them; that they had always been Roman catholics in reality, though not in profession; and that the popes had no intention of persuading them to abandon the doctrine

[a] The diplomas of the pontiffs, relative to all these canonizations, may be seen in Fontanini's Codex Constitutionum, quas summi Pontifices ediderunt in solemni Canonizatione sanctorum, p. 260, published at Rome, in 1729. As they contain the particular reasons which occasioned the elevation of these persons to a place in the calendar, and the peculiar kind of merit on which each promotion was founded, they offer abundant matter for reflection and censure to a judicious reader. Nor would it be labour ill employed to inquire, without prejudice or partiality, into the justice, piety, and truth of what the popes allege in these diplomas, as the reasons for conferring saintship on the persons therein mentioned.

[b] I have been led to these remarks by the complaints of Alexander Helladius, and of others who see things in the light in which he has placed them. There is still extant a book published in Latin by this author, in 1714, entitled, The present State of the Greek Church, in which he throws out the bitterest reproaches upon several authors of eminent merit and learning, who have given accounts of that church, and maintains that his brethren of the Greek communion are much more pious, learned, wise, and opulent, than they are commonly supposed to be. Instead of envying the Greeks the merit and felicity which this panegyrist supposes them to possess, we sincerely wish them much greater degrees of both. But we observe at the same time, that from the very accounts given by Helladius it would be easy to prove, that the state of the Greeks is not a whit better than it is generally supposed to be; though it may be granted, that the same ignorance, superstition, and immorality, do not abound alike in all places, or among all persons. See what we have remarked on this subject in the accounts we have given of the Eastern church during the sixteenth century.

[c] The Jesuit Tarillon has given an ample relation of the numerous missions in Greece and the other provinces of the Ottoman empire, and of the present state of these missions, in his letter to Pontchartrain, sur l'Etat present des Missions des Péres Jesuites dans la Grece, published in the Nouveaux Memoires des Missions de la Compagnie de Jesus, tom. i. p. 1125. For an account of the state of the Romish religion in the islands of the Archipelago, see the letter of the Jesuit Xavier Portier, in the Lettres edifiantes et curieuses, écrites des Missions étrangeres, t. x. p. 328. These accounts are, it is true, somewhat embellished, in order to advance the glory of the Jesuits; but the exaggerations of these missionaries may be easily corrected by the accounts of other writers, who, in our times, have treated this branch of ecclesiastical history. See, above all others, R. Simon's (under the fictitious name of Saint-Jore) Bibliotheque Critique, tom. i. c. xxiii. p. 340, and especially p. 346, where the author confirms a remarkable fact, which we have mentioned above upon the authority of Cerri, namely, that, amidst the general dislike which the Greeks have to the Romish church, no persons carry this dislike to such a high degree of antipathy and aversion, as those very Greeks who have been educated at Rome, or in the other schools and seminaries belonging to its spiritual jurisdiction. "Ils sont (says Father Simon) les premiers à crier contre et à medire du pape et des Latins. Ces pelerins Orientaux qui viennent chez nous, fourbent et abusent de notre credulité, pour acheter un benefice, et tourmenter les missionaries Latins, &c." We have still more recent and ample testimonies of the invincible hatred of the Greeks toward the Latins, in the preface to Cowell's Account of the present Greek Church.

[d] See the Life of Morinus, prefixed to his Antiquitates Eccles. Orient. p. 37.

of their ancestors, but only desired that they would understand it in its true and genuine sense. This plan gave rise to a variety of laborious productions, in which there was more learning than probity, and more dexterity than candour and good faith. Such were the treatises published by Leo Allatius, Morinus, Clement Galanus, Lucas Holstenius, Abraham Ecchellensis,[a] and others who pretended to demonstrate, that there was little or no difference between the religion of the Greeks, Armenians and Nestorians, and that of the church of Rome, a few ceremonies excepted, together with some unusual phrases and terms that are peculiar to the Christians of the East.

The design of bringing, by artful compliances, the Greek and Eastern churches under the jurisdiction of Rome, was opposed by many, but by none with more resolution and zeal than by Cyril Lucar, patriarch of Constantinople, a man of extensive learning and knowledge of the world, who had visited a great part of Europe, and was well acquainted with the doctrine and discipline, both of the protestant and papal churches. This prelate declared openly, and indeed with more courage than prudence, that he had a strong propensity to the religious sentiments of the English and Dutch churches, and had conceived the design of reforming the doctrine and ritual of the Greeks, and bringing them nearer to the purity and simplicity of the Gospel. This was sufficient to render the venerable patriarch odious to the friends of Rome; and accordingly the Jesuits, seconded by the credit and influence of the French ambassador, and assisted by the treacherous stratagems of some perfidious Greeks, continued to perplex and persecute the good man in various ways, and at length accomplished his ruin; for, by the help of false witnesses, they obtained an accusation of treason against him; in consequence of which he was put to death, in 1638, by the mandate of the Turkish emperor.[b] He was succeeded by Cyril, bishop of Berea, a man of a dark, malignant, and violent spirit, and the infamous instrument the Jesuits had chiefly employed in bringing him to an untimely end. As this new patriarch declared himself openly in favour of the Latins, the reconciliation of the Greeks with the church of Rome seemed more probable than ever, and almost certain;[c] but the dismal fate of this unworthy prelate suddenly dispelled the pleasing hopes and the anxious fears with which Rome and its adversaries beheld the approach of this important event. The same violent death that had concluded the days of Cyril Lucar pursued his successor, in whose place Parthenius, a zealous opposer of the doctrine and ambitious pretensions of Rome, was raised to the patriarchal dignity. After this period the Roman pontiffs desisted from their attempts upon the Greek church, no opportunity being offered either of deposing its patriarchs, or gaining them over to the Romish communion.

III. Notwithstanding these unsuccessful attempts of the pontiffs to reduce the Greek church under their dominion, many allege, and more especially the reformed clergy complain, that the doctrine of that church has been manifestly corrupted by the emissaries of Rome. It is supposed, that, in later times, the munificence of the French ambassadors at the Porte, and the persuasive sophistry of the Jesuits, have made such irresistible impressions on the avarice and ignorance of the Greek bishops, whose poverty is great, that they have departed, in several points, from the religious system of their ancestors, and have adopted, among other errors of the Romish church, the monstrous and unnatural doctrine of transubstantiation. This change is said to have been more especially brought about in the famous council, which was assembled, in 1672, at Jerusalem, by Dositheus, the patriarch of that city.[d] Without entering into an examination of the truth and equity of this charge brought against the Greek bishops, we shall only observe, that it was the controversy between the catholics and protestants in France that first gave rise to it. The latter, and more especially John Claude, so justly celebrated for his extensive learning and masterly eloquence, maintained, that many of the doctrines of the Romish church, and more particularly that of transubstantiation, were of a modern date, and had never been heard of before the ninth century. The catholics on the contrary, with Arnaud at their head, affirmed, that the doctrine of Rome concerning the eucharist, and the real conversion of the bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ in that holy ordinance, had

[a] The book of Leo Allatius, *de Concordiâ Ecclesiæ Orientalis et Occidentalis*, is well known, and deservedly looked upon, by the most learned protestants, as the work of a disingenuous and insidious writer. The Græcia Orthodoxa of the same author, which was published at Rome in 1652, and contains a compilation from all the books of the Grecian doctors who were well affected to the Latin church, is still extant.—We have nothing of Lucas Holstenius (who was superior to Allatius in learning and sagacity) upon this subject, except two posthumous dissertations, *de Ministro et Formâ Sacramenti Confirmationis apud Græcos*, which were published at Rome in 1666.—The treatises of Morinus, de Pœnitentiâ et Ordinationibus, are known to all the learned, and seem expressly composed to make the world believe, that there is a striking conformity of sentiment between the Greek and Latin churches on these two important points, when, laying aside the difference that scholastic terms and peculiar modes of expression may appear to occasion, we attend to the meaning that is annexed to these terms by the members of the two communions. Galanus, in a long and laborious work, has endeavoured to prove, that the Armenians differ very little from the Latins in their religious opinions; and Abraham Ecchellensis has attempted to convince us in several treatises, (and more especially in his Animadversiones ad Hebed. Jesu Catalogum librorum Chaldaicorum) that all Christians throughout Africa and Asia have the same system of doctrine that is received among the Latins.

[b] The Confession of Faith, drawn up by Cyril Lucar, was published in Holland, in 1645; and is also inserted by Aymon in his Monumens authentiques de la Religion des Grecs, p. 237. By this confession, it appears evidently, that this prelate had a stronger inclination toward the doctrine of the reformed churches, than to that which was commonly received among the Greeks. Nor was he, by any means, ill-affected toward the Lutherans, since he addressed several letters to the Swedish clergy about this time, and solicited their friendship, as appears from the learned Archenholtz' Memoires de la Reine Christine.—Aymon has published, in the work already mentioned, twenty-seven letters of this patriarch to the clergy of Geneva, and to the doctors of the reformed church, in which his religious sentiments are still more plainly discovered. His life, transactions, and deplorable fate, have been recorded by Thomas Smith, a learned divine of the English church, in his Narratio de Vitâ, Studiis, Gestis et Martyrio Cyrilli Lucaris, which is the third article of his Miscellanea; as also by Hottinger, and by other authors mentioned by Fabricius in his Bibliotheca Græca.

[c] See Eliæ Vegelii Defensio Exerc. de Ecclesiâ Græcâ, p. 300, where we find the letters of pope Urban VIII. to Cyril of Berea, in which he loads with applause this new patriarch, for having been so instrumental in banishing from among the Greeks the pernicious errors of Cyril Lucar, and warmly exhorts him to depose all the Greek patriarchs and bishops who are not favourable to the Latin church. These exhortations are seconded by flattering promises, and, particularly, by an assurance of protection and succour from the king of Spain. Cyril of Berea died in the communion of the Romish church. See Hen. Hilarii Not. ad Phil. Cyprii Chron. Ecclesiæ Græcæ, p. 470.

[d] See, for an account of this council, Aymon's Memoires Authentiques de la Religion des Grecs, tom. i. p. 263; and Gisberti Cuperi Epistolæ, p. 404, 407.—See, more especially, the judicious and learned observations of Basnage on the transactions of this council, in his Histoire de la Religion des Eglises Reformées, period iv. p. i. c. xxxii. p. 452, and Cowell's Account of the Present State of the Greek Church, book i. ch. v.

been received by Christians in all ages of the church.[a] To strengthen their cause by authorities, which they imagined would have no small influence upon their adversaries, they ventured to assert that this doctrine was adopted by all the Eastern Christians, and particularly by the Greek churches.[b] This bold assertion required striking and authentic testimonies to give it any degree of credit. Accordingly the ambassador of France, residing at Constantinople, received orders from his court to concur with the Jesuits, and to leave no methods unemployed in procuring certificates from the Greek clergy to confirm this assertion. On the other hand, the English and Dutch ambassadors, persuaded that no such doctrine was really professed in the Greek church, procured also the testimonies of several ecclesiastics, in order to take from the catholic disputants this pretext; which, after all, was of no great consequence, as it did not affect the merits of the cause. The result, however, of this scrutiny was favourable to the Romish doctors, whose agents in foreign parts procured a more numerous list of testimonies than their adversaries could produce. The protestants invalidated these testimonies, by proving fully, that many of them were obtained by bribery from the indigent Greeks, whose deplorable poverty made them sacrifice truth to lucre; and that a great number of them were drawn by artifice from ignorant priests, whom the Jesuits deceived, by disguising the doctrines of Rome in such a manner as to give them a Grecian air, and make them resemble the religious system of the Eastern churches.[c] If we grant this to be true, we may nevertheless justly question, whether the admission of certain doctrines in the Greek church, that resemble the errors of popery, ought to be dated from the period now before us; and whoever examines this controversy with a spirit of impartiality, accompanied with a competent knowledge of the history of the religious doctrine of the Greek churches, will perhaps find that a certain vague and obscure notion, similar to the Romish doctrine of transubstantiation, was received during many ages by several of these churches; though, in these later times, they may have learned, from the Romish missionaries, the popish manner of expressing this very absurd and unaccountable tenet.[d]

IV. Of those independent Greek churches, which are governed by their own laws, and are not subject to the jurisdiction of the patriarch of Constantinople, there is not one that can furnish any matter for an ecclesiastical historian, except the church established in Russia; the rest are sunk in the most deplorable ignorance and barbarity that can be imagined. About the year 1666, a certain sect, which assumed the name of *Isbraniki*, i. e. the multitude of the Elect, but were called by their adversaries *Roscolskika*, or the seditious Faction, arose in Russia, and excited considerable tumults and commotions in that kingdom.[e] The reasons alleged by this sect in defence of its separation from the Russian church, are not yet known with certainty; nor have we any satisfactory or accurate account of its doctrines and institutions;[f] we only know in general, that its members affect an extraordinary air of piety and devotion, and complain of the corruptions introduced into the ancient religion of the Russians, partly by the negligence, and partly by the ambition, of the episcopal order.[g] On the other hand, great pains were taken to conquer the obstinacy of this factious sect; arguments, promises, threatenings, dragoonings, the authority of synods and councils, seconded by racks and gibbets; in a word, all the methods that artifice or barbarity could suggest, were practised to bring back these seditious heretics into the bosom of the church. But the effect of these violent measures by no means answered the expectations of the Russian government; they exasperated, instead of reclaiming, these schismatics, who retired into the woods and deserts, and, as it often happens, were rendered more fierce and desperate by the calamities and sufferings in which they were involved. From the time that Peter the Great ascended the throne of Russia, and made such remarkable changes both in its civil and ecclesiastical government, this faction has been treated with greater humanity and mildness; but it is alleged, that these mild proceedings have by no means healed the schism, and that, on the contrary, the Roskolniki have gained strength, and have become still more obstinate since the period now mentioned.

V. It will not be improper here to give some account of this reformation of the church of Russia, which resulted from the active zeal and wisdom of Peter; for, though this interesting event belongs to the history of the follow-

☞ [a] It was to prove this most groundless assertion, that the famous Nicole published his artful book, de la Perpetuité de la Foi, in 1664, which was answered, with a victorious force of evidence, by the learned Claude.

[b] The names and productions of the principal writers that appeared in this controversy may be found in the Bibliotheca Græca of Fabricius, vol. x. p. 444, and in the learned Pfaff's Dissertatio contra Ludov. Rogerii Opus Eucharisticum.

[c] Here, above all other histories, the reader will do well to consult Cowell's Account of the present State of the Greek Church, as this author was actually at Constantinople when the scene of fraud and bribery was carried on, and was an eye-witness of the insidious arts and perfidious practices employed by the Jesuits to obtain, from the Greek priests and monks, testimonies in favour of the doctrine of the Latin or Romish church.

[d] The learned La Croze, who cannot be suspected of any propensity to favour the cause of Rome in general, or that of the Jesuits in particular, was of opinion that the Greeks had been long in possession of the foolish doctrine of transubstantiation. See Gisberti Cuperi Epistolæ.

[e] These, perhaps, are the same persons of whom the learned Gmelin speaks, under the denomination of Sterowerzi, in the account of his Voyage into Siberia, tom. iv. p. 404.

☞ [f] This sect is called, by other authors, the sect of the Roskolniki. According to the account of Voltaire, who pretends to have drawn the materials of his History of the Russian Empire under Peter I. from authentic records furnished by the court of Petersburg, this sect made its first appearance in the twelfth century. The members of it alleged, in defence of their separation, the corruptions, both in doctrine and discipline, which had been introduced into the Russian church. They profess a rigorous zeal for the *letter* of Scripture, which they do not understand; and the transposition of a single word in a new edition of the Russian Bible, though it tended only to correct an uncouth phrase in the translation commonly received, threw them into the greatest combustion and tumult. They will not allow a priest to administer baptism after having tasted spirituous liquor; and in this, perhaps, they do not amiss, since it is well known, that the Russian priests seldom touch the flask without drinking deeply. They hold that there is no subordination of rank, no superior or inferior, among the faithful; that a Christian may kill himself for the love of Christ; that it is a great sin to say *Hallelujah* thrice, and that a priest must never give a blessing but with three fingers. They are regular, even to austerity, in their manners; but, as they have always refused to admit Christians of other denominations into their religious assemblies, they have been suspected of committing, at those meetings, various abominations, which ought not to be believed without the strongest demonstrative proof. They are accused, for example, of killing a child in these assemblies, and of drinking its blood, and of lascivious commerce in its most irregular forms.

[g] See Bergius, de Statu Ecclesiæ et Religionis Moscoviticæ, sect. xi. cap. vii. sect. ii. cap. xvi.—Append. 270.—Heineccius' Account of the Greek Church, written in German; and Haven's Iter Russicum.—Some writers conjecture, that the Roskolniki are a branch descended from the ancient Bogomilians, of whom we have already given some account cent. xii. p. ii. chap. v. sect. ii.

ing century, yet the scheme, by which it was brought about, was formed toward the conclusion of the seventeenth. This great prince made no change in the articles of faith received among the Russians, and which contain the doctrine of the Greek church. But he took the utmost pains to have this doctrine explained in a manner conformable to the dictates of right reason and the spirit of the Gospel; and he used the most effectual methods to destroy, on one hand, the influence of the hideous superstition that sat brooding over the whole nation, and, on the other, to dispel the ignorance of the clergy, which was incredible, and that of the people, which would have exceeded it, had that been possible. These were great and arduous undertakings; and the reformation to which they pointed, was such as seemed to require whole ages to accomplish and bring to any tolerable degree of perfection. To accelerate the execution of this glorious plan, Peter became a zealous protector and patron of arts and sciences. He encouraged, by various instances of munificence, men of learning and genius to settle in his dominions. He reformed the schools that were sunk in ignorance and barbarism, and erected new seminaries of learning. He endeavoured to excite in his subjects a desire of emerging from their ignorance and brutality, and a taste for knowledge and the useful arts. And, to crown all these noble attempts, he extinguished the infernal spirit of persecution; abolished the penal laws against those who differed merely in religious opinion from the established church; and granted to Christians of all denominations liberty of conscience, and the privilege of performing divine worship in the manner prescribed by their respective liturgies and institutions. This liberty, however, was modified in such a prudent manner, as to restrain and defeat any attempts that might be made by the Latins to promote the interests of popery in Russia, or to extend the jurisdiction of the Roman pontiff beyond the tolerated chapels of that communion; for, though Roman Catholics were allowed to have places for the celebration of divine worship, the Jesuits were not permitted to exercise the functions of missionaries or public teachers in Russia; and a particular charge was given to the council, to which belonged the cognizance of ecclesiastical affairs, to use the utmost care and vigilance to prevent the propagation of Romish tenets among the people.

Beside all this, a remarkable change was now introduced into the manner of governing the church. The splendid dignity of patriarch, which approached too near the lustre and prerogatives of majesty, not to be offensive to the emperor, and burthensome to the people, was suppressed, or rather assumed by this spirited prince, who declared himself the supreme pontiff and head of the Russian church.[a] The functions of this high and important office were committed to a council assembled at Petersburg, which was called the Holy Synod, and in which one of the archbishops, the most distinguished by his integrity and prudence, acted as president. This honourable office was filled by the famous Stephen Javorski, who composed a laborious work, in the Russian language, against heresy.[b] The other orders of the clergy continued in their respective ranks and offices; but both their revenues and their authority were considerably diminished. It was resolved at first, in this general reformation, to abolish all monasteries and convents, as prejudicial to the community, and unfriendly to population; but this resolution was not executed; on the contrary, the emperor himself erected a magnificent monastery in honour of Alexander Newsky, whom the Russians place in the list of their heroes.[c]

VI. A small body of the Monophysites in Asia abandoned, for some time, the doctrine and institutions of their ancestors, and embraced the communion of Rome. This step was entirely occasioned by the suggestions and intrigues of a person named Andrew Achigian, who had been educated at Rome, where he imbibed the principles of popery, and, having obtained the title and dignity of patriarch from the Roman pontiff, assumed the denomination of Ignatius XXIV.[d] After the death of this pretended patriarch, another usurper, whose name was Peter, aspired to the same dignity, and, taking the title of Ignatius XXV., placed himself in the patriarchal chair; but the lawful patriarch of the sect had credit enough with the Turks to procure the deposition and banishment of this pretender; and thus the small congregation which acknowledged his jurisdiction was entirely dispersed.[e] The African Monophysites, and more especially the Copts notwithstanding that poverty and ignorance which exposed them to the seductions of sophistry and gain, stood firm in their principles, and made an obstinate resistance to the promises, presents, and attempts, employed by the papal missionaries to bring them under the Roman yoke. With respect to the Abyssinians, we have mentioned already, in its proper place, a revolution by which they delivered themselves from that tyrannical yoke, and resumed the liberty they had so imprudently renounced. It is proper, however, to take notice here of the zeal discovered by the Lutherans, in their attempts to dispel the ignorance and superstition of this people, and to bring them to the knowledge of a purer religion and a more rational worship. It was with this pious design that the learned Heyling, of Lubeck, undertook a voyage into Ethiopia in 1634, where he resided many years, and acquired such a distinguished place in the favour and esteem of the emperor, that he was honoured with the important office of prime minister of that mighty empire.

☞ [a] This account is not perhaps entirely accurate. Dr. Mosheim seems to insinuate that Peter assumed not only the authority, but also the office and title of patriarch or supreme pontiff and head of the church. This, however, was not the case; he retained the power without the title, as may be seen by the oath that every member of the synod he had established was obliged to take when he was appointed to that office. It was in consequence of his authority, as emperor, that he claimed an absolute authority in the church, and not from any spiritual character or denomination. The oath now mentioned ran thus: "I swear and promise to be a faithful and obedient subject and servant to my true and natural sovereign, and to the august successors whom it shall please him to appoint, in consequence of the indisputable power he has to regulate the succession to the crown.—I acknowledge him as the supreme judge of this spiritual college," &c. See Voltaire's Histoire de l'Empire de Russie sous Pierre le Grand, tom. i. p. 174.

[b] Le Quien, Oriens Christianus, tom. i. p. 1295.

[c] Those who are acquainted with either the Danish or German language, will find several interesting anecdotes relating to these changes in Haven's Iter Russicum.

[d] From the fifteenth century downwards, all the patriarchs of the Monophysites have taken the name of Ignatius, for no other reason than to show that they are the lineal successors of Ignatius, (who was bishop of Antioch in the first century,) and of consequence the lawful patriarchs of Antioch. A like reason induces the religious chief of the Maronites, who also claims the same dignity, to assume the name of Peter; for St. Peter is said to have governed the church of Antioch before Ignatius.

[e] Jo. Simon. Assemani Biblioth. Oriental. Clementino-Vatican. tom. ii. p. 482, and his Dissert. de Monophysitis, sect. iii.

In this eminent station he gave many instances of his zeal both for the interests of religion and the public good; after which he set out for Europe, but never arrived there; nor is it known in what manner, or by what accident, he ended his days.[a]

Several years after this, Ernest, duke of Saxe-Gotha, surnamed the Pious, on account of his sanctity and virtue, formed the resolution of making a new attempt to diffuse the knowledge of the Gospel, in its purity and simplicity, among the ignorant and superstitious Abyssinians. This design was formed by the counsels and suggestions of the famous Ludolph, and was to have been executed by the ministry of the abbot Gregory, an Abyssinian, who had resided for some time in Europe.[b] The unhappy fate of this missionary, who perished in a shipwreck in 1657, did not totally discourage the prince from pursuing his purpose; for, in 1663, he entrusted the same pious and important commission to John Michael Wansleb, a native of Erfort, to whom he gave the wisest orders, and whom he charged particularly to leave no means unemployed that might contribute to give the Abyssinian nation a favourable opinion of the Germans, as it was upon this basis alone that the success of the present enterprise could be built. Wansleb, however, whose virtue was by no means equal to his abilities, instead of continuing his journey to Abyssinia, remained several years in Egypt. On his return thence into Europe, he began to entertain uneasy apprehensions of the account that would naturally be demanded both of his conduct, and of the manner in which he had employed the sums of money he had received for his Abyssinian expedition. These apprehensions rendered him desperate, because they were attended with a consciousness of guilt. Hence, instead of returning into Germany, he went to Rome, where, in 1667, he embraced, at least in outward profession, the doctrine of that church, and entered into the Dominican order.[c] Thus the pious design of the best of princes failed in the execution. To his formation of that scheme, however, we are indebted for the great light that has been thrown by the learned and laborious Ludolph on the history, doctrine, literature, and manners of the Abyssinians, which before this period were very superficially known in Europe.

VII. The state of the Christians in Armenia underwent a considerable change soon after the commencement of this century, in consequence of the incursions of Abbas the Great, king of Persia, into that province. This prince ravaged that part of Armenia which lay contiguous to his dominions, and ordered the inhabitants to retire into Persia. These devastations were intended to prevent the Turks from approaching his frontier; for the Eastern monarchs, instead of erecting fortified towns on the borders of their respective kingdoms, as is done by the European princes, laid waste their borders upon the approach of the invaders, that, by thus cutting off the means of their subsistence, their progress might be either entirely stopped, or considerably retarded. In this general emigration, the more opulent and the better sort of the Armenians removed to Ispahan, the capital of Persia, where the generous monarch granted them a beautiful suburb for their residence, with the free exercise of their religion under the jurisdiction of a bishop or patriarch. Under the sway of this magnanimous prince, who cherished his people with a paternal tenderness, these happy exiles enjoyed the sweets of liberty and abundance; but after his death the scene changed, and they were involved in calamities of various kinds.[d] The storm of persecution that arose upon them shook their constancy; many of them apostatised to the Mohammedan religion, so that it was justly to be feared that this branch of the Armenian church would gradually be lost. On the other hand, the state of religion in that church derived considerable advantages from the settlement of a great number of Armenians in different parts of Europe for the purposes of commerce. These merchants, who had fixed their residence, during this century, at London, Amsterdam, Marseilles, and Venice,[e] were not unmindful of the interests of religion in their native country; and their situation furnished them with opportunities of exerting their zeal in this good cause, and particularly of supplying their Asiatic brethren with Armenian translations of the Scriptures, and of other theological books, from the European presses, especially from those of England and Holland. These pious and instructive productions, being dispersed among the Armenians, who lived under the Persian and Turkish governments, contributed, no doubt, to preserve that illiterate and superstitious people from falling into the most consummate and deplorable ignorance.

VIII. The divisions that reigned among the Nestorians in the preceding century still subsisted, as all the methods employed to heal them had hitherto proved ineffectual. Some of the Nestorian bishops discovered a propensity to accommodate matters with the church of Rome. Elias II., bishop of Mosul, sent two private embassies to the pope, in 1607 and 1610, to solicit his friendship; and, in the letter he addressed upon that occasion to Paul V., he declared his desire of effecting a reconciliation between the Nestorians and the Latin church.[f] Elias III., though at first extremely averse to the doctrine and institution of that church, changed his sentiments in this respect; and, in 1657, addressed a letter to the congregation *de propagandâ Fide*, in which he intimated his readiness to join with the church of Rome, on condition that the pope would allow the Nestorians a place of public worship in that city, and would abstain from all attempts to alter the discipline of the sect.[g] The Romish doctors could not but perceive that a reconciliation, founded on such conditions as these, would be attended with no advantage to their church, and promised nothing that could flatter the ambition of their pontiff; and accordingly we do not find

[a] A very curious life of Heyling was published in German by Dr. Michaelis at Halle, in 1724.—See also Moller's Cimb. Litera. t. i. p. 253.

[b] See Ludolphi Proëmium ad Comm. in Hist. Æthiop. p. 31.—Junckeri Vita Lobi Ludolphi, p. 63.

[c] For an account of this inconstant and worthless, but learned man, see Lobo's Voyage d'Abyss. tom. i. p. 198, 227, 233, 248.—Cyprian's Catalog. MSS. Biblioth. Gothanæ, p. 64.—Eus. Renaudot's Præf. ad Histor. Patriarch. Alexand. and his Historia Ecclesiæ Alexandrinæ: see also Scriptor. Ordin. Prædicatorum, edited by Echard and Quetif. t. ii. p. 693.

[d] See Chardin's Voyages en Perse, tom. ii. p. 106; and the Nouvelles Relations au Levant, by Gabriel de Chinon, p. 206.

[e] For an account of the Armenians who settled at Marseilles, and of the books which they ordered to be printed in that city for the use of their brethren in foreign parts, see Richard Simon's Lettres Choisies, tom. ii. p. 137.—The same author (tom. iv. p. 160,) and the learned Joachim Schroder, in a dissertation prefixed to his Thesaurus Linguæ Armenicæ, give an account of the Armenian Bible that was printed in Holland. The latter also takes notice of the other Armenian books that were published at Venice, Lyons, and Amsterdam.

[f] Jos. Sim. Assemani Biblioth. Orient. Clement. Vatican. tom. i. ii. iii.

[g] Idem Opus, tom. iii.

that the proposal above-mentioned was accepted. It does not appear that the Nestorians were received, at this time, into the communion of the Romish church, or that the bishops of Mosul were, after this period, at all solicitous about the friendship or good-will of the pope. The Nestorian bishops of Ormus, who successively assume the name of Simeon, proposed also, more than once,[a] plans of reconciliation with the church of Rome; and, with that view, sent to the pontiff a confession of their faith, which gave a clear idea of their religious tenets and institutions. But these proposals were little attended to by the court of Rome, either in consequence of its disapprobation of the doctrine of these Nestorians,[b] or of that contempt which their poverty and want of influence excited in the pontiffs, whose ambition and avidity aimed at acquisitions of greater consequence; for it is well known, that, since the year 1617, the bishops of Ormus have been in a low and declining state, both in point of opulence and credit, and are no longer in a condition to excite the envy of their brethren at Mosul.[c] The Romish missionaries gained over, nevertheless, to their communion, a small number of Nestorians, whom they formed into a congregation or church, about the middle of this century. The bishops or patriarchs of this little flock reside in the city of Amida, or Diarbek, and all assume the denomination of Joseph.[d] The Nestorians, resident on the coast of Malabar, called also the Christians of St. Thomas, suffered innumerable vexations, and the most grievous persecution, from the Romish priests, and more especially from the Jesuits, while those settlements were in the hands of the Portuguese; but neither artifice nor violence could engage them to embrace the communion of Rome.[e] When Cochin was taken by the Dutch, in 1663, and the Portuguese were driven out of these quarters, the persecuted Nestorians resumed their primitive liberty, and were reinstated in the privilege of serving God without molestation, according to their consciences. These blessings they still continued to enjoy; nor are such of them as entered into the communion of Rome disturbed by the Dutch, who are accustomed to treat with toleration and indulgence all sects that live peaceably with those who differ from them in religious opinions and ceremonies.[f]

[a] In the years 1619 and 1658.
[b] Assemani Biblioth. tom. i. ii. iii.
[c] Pet. Strozza, Præf. ad Librum de Chaldæorum Dogmatibus.
[d] See Le Quien, Oriens Christianus, tom. ii. p. 1078.
[e] La Croze, Histoire du Christianisme des Indes, liv. v. p. 334.
[f] Schouten, Voyage aux Indes Orient. tom. i. p. 319, 446.

SECTION II.

PART II.

THE HISTORY OF THE MODERN CHURCHES.

CHAPTER I.

The History of the Lutheran Church.

1. We have already seen[a] the calamities and vexations that were entailed on the Lutheran church, by the persecuting spirit of the Roman pontiffs, and the intemperate zeal of the house of Austria, which, on many occasions, showed too great a propensity to second their ambitious and despotic measures; we shall, therefore, at present confine our view to the losses it sustained from other quarters. The cause of Lutheranism suffered considerably by the desertion of Maurice, landgrave of Hesse, a prince of uncommon genius and learning, who not only embraced the doctrine and discipline of the *reformed* church,[b] but also, in 1604, removed the Lutheran professors from their places in the university of Marpurg, and the doctors of that communion from the churches they had in his dominions. After taking this vigorous step, on account of the obstinacy with which the Lutheran clergy opposed his design, he took particular care to have his subjects instructed in the doctrine of the Helvetic church, and introduced into the Hessian churches the form of public worship that was observed at Geneva. This plan was not executed without some difficulty; but it acquired a complete degree of stability and consistence in 1619, when deputies were sent by this prince to the synod of Dordrecht, with express orders to consent, in the name of the Hessian churches, to all the acts that should be passed in that assembly. The doctors of the reformed church, who lived at this period, strenuously defended the measures followed by Maurice, and maintained, that in all these transactions he observed the strictest principles of equity, and discovered an uncommon spirit of moderation. Perhaps the doctors of modern days may view this matter in a different light. They will acknowledge, perhaps without hesitation, that if this illustrious prince had been more influenced by the sentiments of the wisest of the reformed doctors, concerning the conduct we ought to observe toward those who differ from us in religious matters, and less by his own will and humour, he would have ordered many things otherwise than he actually did.[c]

II. The example of the landgrave of Hesse was followed, in 1614, by John Sigismund, elector of Brandenburg, who also renounced Lutheranism, and embraced the communion of the reformed churches, though with certain restrictions, and without employing any acts of mere authority to engage his subjects in the same measure; for it is observable, that this prince did not adopt all the peculiar doctrines of Calvinism. He introduced, indeed, into his dominions the Genevan form of public worship, and embraced the sentiments of the reformed churches concerning the person of Christ, and the manner in which he is present in the eucharist, as they appeared to him much more conformable to reason and Scripture than the doctrine of the Lutherans relating to these points. But, on the other hand, he refused to admit the Calvinistical doctrines of divine grace and absolute decrees; and, on this account, he neither sent deputies to the synod of Dordrecht, nor adopted the decisions of that famous assembly on these intricate subjects. This way of thinking was so exactly followed by the successors of Sigismund, that they never would allow the opinion of Calvin, concerning the divine decrees, to be considered as the public and received doctrine of the reformed churches in their dominions. It must be particularly mentioned, to the honour of this wise prince, that he granted to his subjects an entire liberty in religious matters, and left it to their unrestrained and free choice, whether they would remain in the profession of Lutheranism, or follow the example of their sovereign; nor did he exclude from civil honours and employments, or from the usual marks of his protection and favour, those who continued in the faith of their ancestors. This lenity and moderation, which seemed so adapted to prevent jealousy and envy, and to satisfy both parties, did not however produce this natural and salutary effect; nor were they sufficient to restrain within the bounds of decency and charity several warm and inconsiderate votaries of Lutheranism. These over-zealous persons, who breathed the violent spirit of an age in which matters of consequence were usually carried on with vehemence and rigour, deemed it intolerable and highly provoking, that the Lutherans and Calvinists should enjoy the same honours and prerogatives; that all injurious terms and odious comparisons should be banished from religious debates; that the controverted points in theology should either be entirely omitted in the public discourses of the clergy, or explained with a spirit of modesty and Christian charity; that certain rites which displeased the Calvinists should be totally abolished; and that they who differed in opinion should be obliged to live in peace, concord, and the mutual exchange of good offices. If it was unreasonable in them to be offended at injunctions of this nature, it was still more so to discover their indignation in a manner, that excited not only sharp and uncharitable debates, but also civil commotions and violent tumults, that disturbed considerably the tranquillity of the state, and nourished a spirit of sedition and revolt, which the labour of years was in vain employed to extinguish. In this troubled state of

---

[a] In the History of the Romish Church.—See above.

☞ [b] The reader must always remember, that the writers of the continent generally use the denomination of *reformed* in a limited sense, to distinguish the church of England and the Calvinistical churches from those of the Lutheran persuasion.

[c] The reader will find a more ample account of this matter in the controversial writings of the divines of Cassel and Darmstadt, of which Salig speaks largely in his Hist. Aug. Confess. tom. i. lib. iv. cap. ii. p. 756. Those who understand the German language, may also consult Garth's Historischer Bericht von dem Religions-Wesen in Furstenthum Hessen—Cyprian's Unterricht von Kirchlicher Vereinigung der Protestanten, and the Acts published in the Unschuld. Nachrich. An. 1749

things, the divines of Saxony, and more especially those of Wittenberg, undertook to defend the Lutheran cause; but if it be acknowledged, on one hand, that their views were good, and their intentions upright, it must be owned, on the other, that their style was keen even to a degree of licentiousness, and their zeal warm beyond all measure. And, indeed, as it generally happens, their want of moderation injured, instead of promoting, the cause in which they had embarked; for it was in consequence of their violent proceedings, that the Form of Concord was suppressed in the territories of Brandenburg, and the subjects of that electorate were prohibited, by a solemn edict, from studying divinity in the university of Wittenberg.[a]

III. It was deplorable to see two churches, which had discovered an equal degree of pious zeal and fortitude in throwing off the despotic yoke of Rome, divided among themselves, and living in discords that were highly detrimental to the interests of religion and the welfare of society. Hence several eminent divines and leading men, both among the Lutherans and Calvinists, anxiously sought some method of uniting the two churches, though divided in their opinions, in the bonds of Christian charity and ecclesiastical communion. A competent knowledge of human nature and human passions served to persuade these wise and pacific mediators, that a perfect uniformity of religious opinion was not practicable, and that it would be entirely extravagant to imagine that either of these communities could ever be brought to embrace universally, and without limitation, the doctrines of the other. They made it, therefore, their principal business to persuade those, whose spirits were inflamed with the heat of controversy, that the points in debate between the churches were not essential to true religion;—that the fundamental doctrines of Christianity were received and professed in both communions;—and that the difference of opinion between the contending parties, turned either upon points of an abstruse and incomprehensible nature, or upon matters of indifference, which did not tend to render mankind wiser or better, and in which the interests of genuine piety were in no respects concerned. Those who viewed things in this point of light, were obliged to acknowledge, that the diversity of opinion was by no means a sufficient reason for the separation of the churches, and that in consequence they were called, by the dictates of that Gospel which they both professed, to live not only in the mutual exercise of Christian charity, but also to enter into the fraternal bonds of church communion. The greatest part of the reformed doctors seemed disposed to acknowledge, that the errors of the Lutherans were not of a momentous nature, or of a pernicious tendency, and that the fundamental doctrines of Christianity had not undergone any remarkable alteration in that communion; and thus on their side an important step was made toward peace and union between the churches. But the majority of the Lutheran doctors declared, that they could not form a like judgment with respect to the doctrine of the reformed churches; they maintained tenaciously the importance of the points which divided the two communions, and affirmed, that a considerable part of the controversy turned upon the fundamental principles of all religion and virtue. It is not at all surprising, that the opposite party branded this steadiness and constancy with the epithets of morose obstinacy, supercilious arrogance, and the like odious denominations. The Lutherans were not behind-hand with their adversaries in acrimony of style; they recriminated with vehemence, and charged their accusers with instances of misconduct, different in kind, but equally condemnable. They reproached them with having dealt disingenuously, by disguising, under ambiguous expressions, the real doctrine of the reformed churches; they observed farther, that their adversaries, notwithstanding their consummate prudence and circumspection, gave plain proofs, on many occasions, that their propensity to a reconciliation between the churches arose from views of private interest, rather than from a zeal for the public good.

IV. Among the public transactions relative to the project of an union between the reformed and Lutheran churches, we must not omit mentioning the attempt made in 1615 by James I., king of Great Britain, to accomplish this salutary purpose. The person employed for this end by the British monarch, was Peter du Moulin, the most eminent among the Protestant doctors in France;[b] but this design was neither carried on with spirit, nor attended with success.[c] Another attempt of the same pacific nature was made in 1631, in the synod of Charenton, in which an act was passed by the reformed doctors of that respectable assembly, declaring the Lutheran system of religion conformable with the spirit of true piety, and free from pernicious and fundamental errors. By this act, an opportunity was offered to the Lutherans of joining with the reformed church upon honourable terms, and of entering into the bonds both of civil and religious communion with their Calvinistical brethren.[d] But this candid and charitable proceeding was attended with very little fruit, since few of the Lutherans were disposed to embrace the occasion that was here so freely offered to them, of terminating the dissensions that separated the two churches. In the same year, a conference took place at Leipsic between the Saxon doctors, Koe, Lyser, and Hopfner, on one side, and some of the most eminent divines of Hesse-Cassel and Brandenburg, on the other; to the end that, by exposing with

[a] The edicts of Sigismund and his successors, relating to this change in the state of religion in Brandenburg, have been several times republished in one collection. Beside these, there are many books, treatises, and pamphlets, which give an account of this remarkable transaction, and of which the reader will find a complete list in the German work, entitled, Unschuldigen Nachrichten, An. 1745, p. 34; An. 1746, p. 326, compared with Jo. Carol. Kocheri. Biblioth. Theolog. Symbol. p. 312.—The reader who desires to attain a perfect acquaintance with this controversy, and to be able to weigh the merits of the cause, by having a true state of the case before him, will do well to consult Arnold's Histor. Eccles. et Hæret. p. ii. lib. xvii. c. vii. p. 965.—Cyprian's Unterricht von der Vereinigung der Protestant. p. 75, and Append. Monum. p. 225. Unschuldigen Nachrichten, An. 1727, p. 1069, et An. 1732, p. 715. They who affirm that the elector's ultimate end, in changing the face of religion in his dominions, was not the prospect of augmenting and extending his authority, found their opinion rather on conjecture than on demonstration; nor do they confirm this assertion by testimonies that are sufficient to produce full conviction. It must, however, be acknowledged, on the other hand, that their conjectures have neither an absurd nor an improbable aspect.

[b] See Le Vassor, Hist. de Louis XIII. tom. ii. part ii.

[c] King James, who would have abandoned the most important and noble design, at any time, to discuss a point of grammar or theology, or to gain a point of interest for himself or his minions, neglected this union of the Lutheran and reformed churches, which he had begun to promote with such an appearance of piety and zeal.

[d] Benoit, Histoira de l'Edit de Nantes, tom. ii. p. 544.—Aymon, Actes des Synodes Nationaux des Eglises Reformées de France, tom. ii. p. 500.—Ittigii Dissert. de Synodi Carentoniensis Indulgentiâ erga Lutheranos, Lips. 1705. 4to.

fidelity and precision their respective doctrines, it might be more easily seen, what were the real obstacles to the union projected between the churches. This conference was conducted with decency and moderation, and the deliberations were neither disturbed by intemperate zeal nor by a proud spirit of contention and dispute; but that openness of heart, that mutual trust and confidence, which are so essential to the success of all kinds of pacification, were not manifested on this occasion; for, though the doctors of the reformed party exposed, with great precision and fairness, the tenets of their church, and even made several concessions, which the Lutherans themselves could scarcely expect; yet the latter, suspicious and fearful, and always apprehensive of schemes, formed by artifice under the mask of candour, to betray and ensnare them, did not dare to acknowledge, that they were satisfied with these explications and offers; and thus the conference broke up without having contributed in any respect to promote the salutary work of peace.[a] To form a true idea of these pacific deliberations, of the reasons that gave rise to them, and of the principles by which they were conducted, it will be necessary to study the civil history of this interesting period with attention and care.

V. Uladislaus IV., king of Poland, formed a still more extensive plan of religious union than those which have been mentioned; he proposed a reconciliation, not only between the Reformed and Lutheran churches, but also between these communions and that of Rome. For this purpose, he ordered a conference to be holden at Thorn, in 1645, the issue of which, as might naturally have been expected, was far from being favourable to the projected union; for the persons employed by the three churches to heal their divisions, or at least to calm their animosities, returned from this conference with a greater measure of party zeal, and a smaller portion of Christian charity, than they had brought to it.

The conference which took place at Cassel in 1661, by the order of William VI., landgrave of Hesse, between Musæus and Henichius, professors at Rintelen, on the side of the Lutherans, and Curtius and Heine, of the university of Marpurg, on that of the reformed, was attended with better success; and, if it did not bring about a perfect uniformity of opinion, it produced what was more desirable, a spirit of Christian charity and forbearance. For these candid doctors, after having diligently examined the nature, and weighed the importance, of the controversies that divided the two churches, embraced each other with reciprocal marks of affection and esteem, and mutually declared that their respective doctrines were less different than was generally imagined, and that this difference was not of sufficient moment to prevent their fraternal union and concord. But it unfortunately happened, that these moderate theologians could not infuse the same spirit of peace and charity that animated *them*, into their Lutheran brethren, nor persuade them to view the diversities of opinion that divided the Protestant churches, in the same indulgent point of view in which they had considered them in the conference at Cassel. On the contrary, this their moderation drew upon them the hatred of almost all the Lutherans; and they were loaded with bitter reproaches in a multitude of pamphlets,[b] that were composed expressly to refute their sentiments, and to censure their conduct. The pains that were taken after this period by the princes of the house of Brandenberg, and more especially by Frederic William and his son Frederic, in order to compose the dissensions and animosity that divided the Protestants, and particularly to promote a fraternal union between the reformed and Lutheran churches in the Prussian territories, and in the rest of their dominions, are well known; and it is also equally notorious, that innumerable difficulties opposed the execution of this salutary design.

VI. Beside these public conferences, holden by the authority of princes, in order to promote union and concord among Protestants, a multitude of individuals, animated by a spirit of true Christian charity, embarked in this pious cause on their own private authority, and offered their mediation and good offices to reconcile the two churches. It is true, indeed, that these peace-makers were, generally speaking, of the reformed church, and that those among the Lutherans, who appeared in this amiable character, were but few, in comparison with the great number of Calvinists that favoured this benevolent but arduous design. The most eminent Calvinistical advocate of peace was John Dureus, a native of Scotland, justly celebrated on account of his universal benevolence, solid piety, and extensive learning, but, at the same time, more remarkable for genius and memory, than for nicety of discernment and accuracy of judgment, as might be evinced by several proofs and testimonies, were this the proper place for discussions of that nature. Be that as it will, never, perhaps, were greater zeal and perseverance manifested than by Dureus, who, during a period of forty-three years,[c] suffered vexations and underwent labours which required the firmest resolution and the most inexhaustible patience; wrote, exhorted, admonished, entreated, and disputed; in a word, tried every method that human wisdom could suggest, to put an end to the dissensions and animosities that reigned among the Protestant churches. It was not merely by the persuasive eloquence of his pen, or by forming plans in the silence of the closet, that this worthy divine performed the task which his benevolence and zeal engaged him to undertake; his activity and industry were equal to his zeal; he travelled through all the countries in Europe, where the Protestant religion had obtained any footing; he formed connexions with the doctors of both parties; he addressed himself to kings, princes, magistrates, and ministers; and by representing, in lively and striking colours, the utility and importance of the plan he had formed, hoped to engage them more or less in this good cause, or

[a] Timanni Gesselii Historia Sacra et Ecclesiastica, p. ii. in addendis, p. 597—613, in which the acts of this conference are published.—Jo. Wolfg. Jaegeri Historia Sæculi XVII. decenn. iv. p. 497. ☞ This testimony of Dr. Mosheim, who was himself a Lutheran, is singularly honourable to the reformed doctors.

[b] The writers who have given accounts of the conferences of Thorn and Cassel, are enumerated by Sagittarius, in his Introd. ad Hist. Ecclesiast. tom ii. p. 1604. See also Jaegeri Historia Sæculi XVII. decenn. v. p. 689, and decenn. vii. p. 160, where the acts of the two conferences are extant.—Add to these Jo. Alphons. Turretini Nubes Testium pro moderato in Rebus theologicis Judicio, p. 178.—There is an ample account of the conference of Cassel in the life of Musæus, given by Moller, in his Cimbria Literata, tom. ii. p. 566. The reader will find, in the same work, an accurate index of the accounts of this conference, published on both sides.

[c] From the year 1631 to 1674.

at least to derive some succour from their influence and protection. But here his views were considerably disappointed; for, though his undertaking was generally applauded, and though he met with a favourable and civil reception from the greatest part of those to whom he addressed himself, he found very few who were seriously disposed to alleviate his labours, by lending him their assistance, and seconding his attempts by their influence and counsels. Some, suspecting that his fervent and extraordinary zeal arose from mysterious and sinister motives, and apprehending that he had secretly formed a design of drawing the Lutherans into a snare, even attacked him in their writings with animosity and bitterness, and loaded him with the sharpest invectives and reproaches: so that this well-meaning man, neglected at length by those of his own communion, opposed and rejected by the followers of Luther, involved in various perplexities and distress, exhausted by unsuccessful labour, and oppressed and dejected by injurious treatment, perceived, by a painful experience, that he had undertaken a task which was beyond the power of a private person, and spent the remainder of his days in repose and obscurity at Cassel.[a]

It may not be improper to observe here, that Dureus, who, notwithstanding the general uprightness of his intentions, was sometimes deficient in ingenuous frankness, had annexed to his plan of reconciliation certain doctrines which, were they susceptible of proof, would serve as a foundation for the union, not only of the Lutherans and Calvinists, but also of all the different sects that bear the Christian name; for, among other things, he maintained, that the Apostles' Creed was a complete body of divinity; that the Ten Commandments formed a perfect system of morals, and the Lord's Prayer a comprehensive series of petitions for all the blessings contained in the divine promises. Now if this notion, that these sacred compositions contain all that is essential to faith, obedience, and devotion, had been universally entertained, or evidently demonstrated, it would not have been a chimerical project to aim at a reconciliation of all Christian churches upon this basis, and to render these compositions the foundation of their coalition and the bond of their union. But it would have been highly chimerical to expect, that the Christian sects would universally adopt this notion, or be pleased to see the doctrines of Christianity reduced to such general principles. It is farther to be observed, with respect to Dureus, that he showed a peculiar propensity toward the sentiments of the Mystics and Quakers, on account of their tendency to favour his conciliatory and pacific project. Like them, he placed the essence of religion in the ascent of the soul to God, in calling forth the hidden word, in fanning the divine spark that resides in the recesses of the human mind; and, in consequence of this system, he was intimately persuaded, that differences merely in theological opinions did not at all concern the essence of true piety.

VII. Among the Lutherans, those who appeared the most zealous in this pacific cause, were John Matthias,[b] bishop of Strengnes in Sweden, and George Calixtus, professor of divinity at Helmstadt, whom Dureus had animated with a portion of his charitable and indulgent spirit. The former was a man of capacity and merit; the latter was eminently distinguished among the divines of this century, by his learning, genius, probity, and candour; but both failed in the arduous undertaking in which they had engaged, and suffered considerably in their attempts to promote the cause of unity and concord. The *Olive-branches*[c] of Matthias, who entitled thus his pacific productions, were, by a royal edict, publicly condemned and suppressed in Sweden; and their author, in order to appease the fury of his enemies, was obliged to resign his bishopric, and pass the rest of his days in retirement.[d] The zeal of Calixtus, in calming the tumultuous and violent spirit of the contending parties, drew upon him the bitterest reproaches, and the warmest animosity and resentment from those who were more bent on maintaining their peculiar opinions, than in promoting that charity which is the end of the commandment; and, while he was labouring to remove all sects and divisions, he appeared to many of his brethren in the light of a new sectary, who was founding the most pernicious of all sects, even that of the Syncretists, who were supposed to promote peace and concord at the expense of truth. We shall, before we finish this chapter, endeavour to give a more particular and circumstantial account of the sentiments and trials of this great man, to whose charge many other things were laid, beside the *crime* of endeavouring to unite the disciples of the same master in the amiable bonds of charity, concord, and mutual forbearance, and whose opinions and designs excited warm contests in the Lutheran church.

VIII. The external state of the Lutheran church at this period was attended with various circumstances of prosperity, among which we may reckon its standing firm against the assaults of Rome, whose artifice and violence were in vain employed to effect its destruction. It is well known, that a very considerable number of Lutherans resided in those provinces where the public exercise of their religion was prohibited. It has more especially been shown by the late memorable emigration of the Saltzburgers,[e] that a still greater number of them lay concealed in that land of despotism and bigotry,

[a] See Coleri Historia Joh. Duræi, to which many important additions might be made from public records, and also from documents that have not yet seen the light. Some records and documents of the kind here referred to, have been published by Hasæus, in his Bibliotheca Bremens. Theologico-Philologica, tom. i. p. 911, and tom. iv. p. 683. A still greater number are given by Gesselius, in the addenda to his Historia Ecclesiastica, tom. ii. p. 614. The transactions of Duræus at Marpurg, are mentioned by Schenck, in his Vitæ Professorum Theologiæ Marpurg. p. 207.—His attempts in Holstein may be learned from the letters of Lackman and Lossius, which are joined together in the same volume. His exploits in Prussia and Poland are recorded by Jablonsky, in his Historia Consensus Sendomiriensis, p. 127; and his labours in Switzerland, Denmark, and the Palatinate, are mentioned respectively in the Museum Helveticum, tom. iii. iv. v. by Elswich, in his Fasciculus Epistol. Theolog. p. 147, and by Seelen, in the Deliciæ Epistol. p. 353. See also Jaegeri Historia Sæculi XVII. decenn. vii. p. 171; the Englische Reformations Historie, by Bohm, and more especially an account of Duræus, published under my direction at Helmstadt, in 1744, by Benzelius, and entitled, Dissertatio de Johan. Duræo, maxime de Actis ejus Suecanis.

[b] Matthias had been chaplain to Gustavus Adolphus, and was afterwards appointed, by that prince, preceptor to his daughter Christina, so famous in history, on account of the whimsical peculiarities of her character, her taste for learning, and her desertion of the Swedish throne and the protestant religion.

[c] Rami Olivæ Septentrionalis.

[d] See Schefferi Suecia Literata, p. 123, and Joh. Molleri ad eam Hypomnemata, p. 317.—Archenholtz, Memoires de la Reine Christine, tom. i. p. 320, 505; tom. ii. p. 63.

[e] For an account of the persecuted Lutherans in the archbishopric of Saltzburg, see Burnet's Travels. See more especially a famous Latin discourse, entitled, Commentariolus Theologicus de non tolerandis in Religione Dissentientibus, pub at Tubingen, in 1732, by W. L. Letsching.

where the smallest dissent from popery, with whatever secrecy and circumspection it may be disguised, is considered as an enormous and capital crime; and that they preserved their religious sentiments and doctrines pure and uncorrupted amidst the contagion of Romish superstition, which they always beheld with aversion and horror. In those countries which are inhabited by persons of different communions, and whose sovereigns are members of the Romish church, we have numberless instances of the cruelty and injustice practised by the papists against those who dissent from them; and these cruelties are exercised under a pretext suggested by the most malevolent bigotry, which represents these dissenters as seditious subjects, and consequently as worthy of the most rigorous treatment. And yet it is certain that, amidst all these vexations, the Lutheran church stood its ground; nor could either the craft or fury of its enemies, in any country, deprive it entirely of its rights and privileges. It may also be observed, that the doctrine of Luther was carried into Asia, Africa, and America, by several persons who fixed their habitations in those distant regions, and was also introduced into some parts of Europe, where it had hitherto been unknown.

IX. When we turn our view to the internal state of the Lutheran church during this century, we shall find it improved in various respects. Though several blemishes yet remained that clouded its lustre, it must be acknowledged, to the honour of the Lutherans, that they cultivated all the branches of literature, both sacred and profane, with uncommon industry and success, and made several improvements in the sciences, which are too well known to stand in need of a particular mention, and of which a circumstantial enumeration would be inconsistent with the brevity required in an historical compendium. But if it cannot be denied, on one hand, that the cause of religion gained by these improvements in learning, it must be owned, on the other, that some branches of science were perverted by injudicious or ill-designing men, to corrupt the pure simplicity of genuine Christianity, and to render its doctrines abstruse and intricate. Thus it too often happens in life, that the best things are the most egregiously abused. About the commencement of this century, the sciences chiefly cultivated in the schools were logic and metaphysics, though the manner in which they were treated was almost entirely destitute of elegance, simplicity, and precision. But, in process of time, the scene changed in the seminaries of learning; and the more entertaining and agreeable branches of literature, that polish wit, excite taste, exercise judgment, and enrich memory, such as civil and natural history, philology, antiquities, criticism, and eloquence, gained the ascendency. Both these kinds of knowledge acquired also a more graceful, consistent, and regular form than that under which they had hitherto appeared. But it unfortunately happened, that, while the boundaries of science were extended from day to day, and new discoveries and improvements were constantly enriching the republic of letters, the credit of learning began sensibly to decrease, and learned men seemed gradually to lose those peculiar marks of veneration and distinction that the novelty of their character, as well as the excellence and importance of their labours, had hitherto drawn from the public. Among the various circumstances that contributed to this decline of literary glory, we may particularly reckon the multitude of those who, without natural capacity, taste, or inclination, were led, by authority or a desire of applause, to literary pursuits, and, by their ignorance or their pedantry, cast a reproach upon the republic of letters.

X. The only kind of philosophy that was taught in the Lutheran schools, during the greatest part of this century, was that of Aristotle, dressed up in that scholastic form which increased its native intricacy and subtlety; and such was the devout and excessive veneration entertained by many for this abstruse system, that any attempt to reject the Grecian oracle, or to correct its decisions, was looked upon as of the most dangerous consequence to the interests of the church, and as equally criminal with a like attempt upon the sacred writings. Those who distinguished themselves in the most extraordinary manner by their zealous and invincible attachment to the Peripatetic philosophy, were the divines of Leipsic, Tubingen, Helmstadt, and Altorf. The enchantment, however, was not universal; and there were many who, withdrawing their private judgment from the yoke of authority, were bold enough to see with their own eyes, and thus discerned the blemishes that were indeed sufficiently visible in the pretended wisdom of the Grecian sage. The first attempt to reduce his authority within narrow bounds was made by certain pious and prudent divines,[a] who, though they did not pretend to discourage all philosophical inquiries, yet were desirous of confining them to a few select subjects, and complained, that the pompous denomination of philosophy was too frequently prostituted by being applied to unintelligible distinctions, and words (or rather sounds) destitute of sense. These were succeeded in their repugnance to the Peripatetic philosophy by the disciples of Ramus, who had credit enough to banish it from several seminaries of learning, and to substitute in its place the system of their master, which was of a more practical kind, and better adapted to the purposes of life.[b] But, if the philosophy of Aristotle met with adversaries, who opposed it upon solid and rational principles, it had also enemies of a very different character, who imprudently declaimed against philosophy in general, as highly detrimental to the cause of religion and the interests of society. Such was the fanatical extravagance of Daniel Hoffman, professor at Helmstadt, who betrayed, in this controversy, an equal degree of ignorance and animosity; and such also were the followers of Robert Fludd, Jacob Behmen, and the Rosecrucians, who boasted of having stricken out, by the assistance of *fire* and *divine illumination*, a new wonderful, and celestial system of philosophy, of which mention has been already made.[c] These adversaries of the Stagirite were divided among themselves; and this diminished the strength and vigour of their opposition to the common enemy. But, even if they had been very closely united in their sentiments and measures, they would not have been able to overturn the empire of Aristotle, which was deeply rooted in the schools through long possession, and had a powerful support in the multitude of its votaries and defenders.

XI. The Peripatetic system had still more formidable

[a] Among these we find Wenceslaus Schellingius, of whom a particular account is given by Arnold, in his Histor. Eccles. et Hæret. p. ii. lib. xvii. cap. vi.

[b] See Jo. Herman ab Elswich, de variâ Aristotelis fortunâ, § xxi. p. 54, and Walchius, His. Logices, lib. ii. c. ii. § iii. v. in Parergis ejus Academicis, p. 613. [c] See above, in the General His. of the Church, § 31.

adversaries to encounter in Des-Cartes and Gassendi, whose writings were composed with such perspicuity and precision as rendered them highly agreeable to many of the Lutheran doctors of this century, who were hence induced to look with contempt on that obsolete and barren philosophy of the schools, which was expressed in uncouth terms and barbarous phrases, without taste, elegance, or accuracy. The votaries of Aristotle beheld with envy these new philosophers, used their most zealous endeavours to bring them into discredit, and, for this purpose, represented their researches and principles as highly injurious to the interests of religion and the growth of true piety. But when they found, by experience, that these methods of attack proved unsuccessful, they changed their method of proceeding, and (like a prudent general, who, besieged by a superior force, abandons his outworks and retires into the citadel) they relinquished much of their jargon, and defended only the main and essential principles of their system. To render these principles more palatable, they began to adorn them with the graces of elocution, and to mingle with their philosophical tenets the charms of polite literature. They even went so far as to confess, that Aristotle, though the prince of philosophers, was chargeable with errors and defects, which it was both lawful and expedient to correct. But these concessions only served to render their adversaries more confident and enterprising, since they were interpreted as resulting from a consciousness of their weakness, and were looked upon as a manifest acknowledgment of their defeat. In consequence of this, the enemies of the Stagirite renewed their attacks with redoubled impetuosity, and with a full assurance of victory; nor did they confine them to those branches of the Peripatetic philosophy which were allowed by its votaries to stand in need of correction, but levelled them, without distinction, at the whole system, and aimed at nothing less than its total dissolution. Grotius, indeed, who marched at the head of these philosophical reformers, proceeded with a certain degree of prudence and moderation. Puffendorf, in treating of the law of nature and of the duties of morality, threw off, with more boldness and freedom, the Peripatetic yoke, and pursued a method entirely different from that which had been hitherto observed in the schools. This freedom drew upon him a multitude of enemies, who loaded him with the bitterest reproaches; his example, however, was imitated by Thomasius, professor of law in the academy of Leipsic, and afterwards at Hall, who attacked the Peripatetics with new degrees of vehemence and zeal. This eminent man, though honourably distinguished by the excellence of his genius and the strength of his resolution, was not, perhaps, the most proper person that could be fixed upon to manage the interests of philosophy. His views, nevertheless, were vast; he aimed at the reformation of philosophy in general, and of the Peripatetic system in particular; and he assiduously employed both the power of exhortation and the influence of example, in order to persuade the Saxons to reject the Aristotelian system, which he had never read, and which most certainly he did not understand. The scheme of philosophy, that he substituted in its place, was received with little applause, and soon fell into oblivion; but his attempt to overturn the system of the Peripatetics, and to restore the freedom of philosophical inquiry, was attended with remarkable success, made, in a little time, the most rapid progress, and produced such admirable effects, that Thomasius is justly looked upon, to this day, as the chief of those bold spirits who pulled down philosophical tyranny from its throne in Germany, and gave a mortal blow to what was called the Sectarian Philosophy[a] in that country. The first seminary of learning that adopted the measures of Thomasius was that of Hall in Saxony, where he was professor; this example was followed by the rest of the German schools, by some sooner, and by others later; and thence a spirit of philosophical liberty began to spread itself into other countries where the Lutheran religion was established; so that, toward the conclusion of this century, the Lutherans enjoyed a perfect liberty of conducting their philosophical researches in that manner which they judged the most conformable with truth and reason, of departing from the mere dictates of authority in matters of science, and of proposing publicly every one his respective opinions. This liberty was not the consequence of any positive decree of the state, nor was it inculcated by any law of the church; it seemed to result from that invisible disposal of things, which we call accident, and certainly proceeded from the efforts of a few great men, seconding and exciting the natural propensity toward free inquiry, that can never be totally extinguished in the human mind. Many employed this liberty in extracting, after the manner of the ancient Eclectics, what they thought most conformable to reason, and most susceptible of demonstration, from the productions of the different schools, and connecting these extracts in such a manner as to constitute a complete body of philosophy. But some made a yet more noble use of this inestimable privilege, by employing, with indefatigable zeal and industry, their *own faculties* in the investigation of truth, and building upon solid and unchangeable principles a new and sublime system of philosophy.[b] At the head of these we may place Leibnitz, whose genius and labours have deservedly rendered his name immortal.

In this conflict between the reformers of philosophy and the votaries of Aristotle, the latter lost ground from day to day; and his system, in consequence of the extremes into which reformers often fall, became so odious, that condemnation was passed on every part of it. Hence the science of Metaphysics, which the Grecian sage had considered as the master science, as the original fountain of all true philosophy, was despoiled of its honours and fell into contempt; nor could the authority and influence even of Des-Cartes (who also set out, in his inquiries, on metaphysical principles) support it effectually against the prejudices of the times. However, when the first heat of opposition began to cool, and the rage of party to subside, this degraded science was not only recalled from its exile, by the interposition and credit of Leibnitz, but was also reinstated in its former dignity and lustre.

XII. The defects and vices of the Lutheran clergy have been circumstantially exposed and even exaggera-

[a] By the Sectarian Philosophers were meant those who followed implicitly some one of the ancient philosophical sects, without daring to use the dictates of their private judgment, to correct or modify the doctrines or expressions of these hoary guides.

[b] The curious reader will find an accurate and ample account of this revolution in philosophy, in the learned Brucker's Historia Critica Philosophiæ.

ted by many writers, who seem to require in the ministers of the Gospel a degree of perfection, which ought indeed always to be aimed at, but which no wise observer of human nature can ever hope to see generally reduced to practice. These censors represent the leading men of the Lutheran church as arrogant, contentious, despotic, and uncharitable; as destitute of Christian simplicity and candour; fond of quibbling and dispute; judging of all things by the narrow spirit of party; and treating with the utmost antipathy and aversion those who differ from them very slightly in religious matters. The less considerable among the Lutheran doctors are charged with ignorance, with a neglect of the sacred duties of their station, and with a want of talent in their characters as public teachers; and avarice, indolence, want of piety, and corruption of manners, are boldly imputed to the whole body.

It will be acknowledged, without difficulty, by those who have studied with attention and impartiality the genius, manners, and history of this century, that the Lutheran clergy were not wholly irreproachable with respect to the matters that are here laid to their charge, and that many Lutheran churches were under the direction of pastors who were highly deficient, some in zeal, others in abilities, many in both, and consequently ill qualified for propagating the truths of Christianity with wisdom and success. But this reproach is not peculiarly applicable to the seventeenth century; it is a general charge, that, with too much truth, may be brought against all the ages of the church. On the other hand, it must be acknowledged, by all such as are not blinded by ignorance or partiality, that the whole of the Lutheran clergy did not consist of these unworthy pastors, and that many of the Lutheran doctors of this century were distinguished by their learning, piety, gravity, and wisdom; and perhaps it might be difficult to decide, whether in our times, in which some pretend that the sanctity of the primitive doctors is revived in several places, there be not as many that do little honour to the pastoral character as in the times of our ancestors. It must farther be observed, that many of the defects which are invidiously charged upon the doctors of this age, were in a great measure occasioned by the infelicity of the times. They were the unhappy effects of those public calamities which a dreadful war of thirty years produced in Germany; they derived strength from the influence of a corrupt education, and were sometimes encouraged by the protection and countenance of vicious and profligate magistrates.

XIII. That the vices of the Lutheran clergy were partly owing to the infelicity of the times, will appear evident from some particular instances. It must be acknowledged that, during the greatest part of this century, neither the discourses of the pulpit, nor the instructions of the schools, were adapted to promote, among the people, just ideas of religion, or to give them a competent knowledge of the doctrines and precepts of the Gospel. The eloquence of the pulpit, as some ludicrously and too justly represent it, was reduced, in many places, to the noisy art of bawling (during a certain space of time measured by a sand-glass) upon various points of theology, which the orators understood very imperfectly, and which the people did not understand at all; and, when the important doctrines and precepts of Christianity were introduced in these public discourses, they were frequently disfigured by tawdry and puerile ornaments, wholly inconsistent with the spirit and genius of the divine wisdom that shines forth in the Gospel, and were thus, in a great measure, deprived of their native beauty, efficacy, and power. All this must be confessed; but perhaps it may not appear an object of wonder, when all things are duly considered. The ministers of the Gospel had their heads full of sonorous and empty words, of trivial distinctions and metaphysical subtleties, and very ill furnished with that kind of knowledge which is adapted to touch the heart and to reform the life; they had also few models of true eloquence before their eyes; and therefore it is not very surprising, that they dressed out their discourses with foreign and tasteless ornaments.

The charge brought against the universities, that they spent more time in subtle and contentious controversy, than in explaining the Scriptures, teaching the duties of morality, and promoting a spirit of piety and virtue, though too just, yet may also be alleviated by considering the nature and circumstances of the times. The Lutherans were surrounded with a multitude of adversaries, who obliged them to be perpetually in a posture of defence; and the Roman catholics, by threatening their destruction, contributed, in a more particular manner, to excite in their doctors that polemic spirit which unfortunately became a habit, and had an unhappy influence on the exercise both of their academical and pastoral functions. In time of war, the military art not only becomes singularly respectable, but is preferred, without hesitation, to all others, on account of its tendency to maintain the inestimable blessings of liberty and independence; and thus, in the midst of theological commotions, the spirit of controversy, by becoming necessary, gains an ascendency, which, even when the danger is over, it is unwilling to lose. It is indeed ardently to be wished, that the Lutherans had treated with more mildness and charity those who differed from them in religious opinions, and had discovered more indulgence and forbearance toward such, more especially, as by ignorance, fanaticism, or excessive curiosity, were led into error, yet without pretending to disturb the public tranquillity by propagating their particular systems. But they had unhappily imbibed a spirit of persecution in their early education; this was too much the spirit of the times, and it was even a leading maxim with our ancestors, that it was both lawful and expedient to use severity and force against those whom they looked upon as heretics. This maxim was derived from Rome; and even those who separated from that church did not find it easy to throw off, suddenly, that despotic and uncharitable spirit which had so long been the main-spring of its government, and the general characteristic of its members. In their narrow views of things, their very piety seemed to suppress the generous movements of fraternal love and forbearance; and the more they felt themselves animated with a zeal for the divine glory, the more difficult did they find it to renounce that ancient and favourite maxim, which had so often been ill interpreted and ill applied, that 'whoever is found to be an enemy to God, ought also to be declared an enemy to his country.'*

XIV. There were few or no changes introduced, du-

☞ * It is to be wished that the Lutherans had not, in many places, persevered in these severe and despotic principles longer than other Protes-

ring this century, into the form of government, the method of worship, and the external rites and ceremonies of the Lutheran church. Many alterations would indeed have been made in all these, had the princes and states of that communion judged it expedient to put in execution the plans that had been laid by Thomasius, and other eminent men, for reforming its ecclesiastical polity. These plans were built upon a new principle, which supposed, that the majesty and supreme authority of the sovereign formed the only source of church-power. On this fundamental principle, which these great men took all imaginable pains to prove, by solid and striking arguments, they raised a voluminous system of laws, which, in the judgment of many, evidently tended to these conclusions;—that the same sovereign who presides in the state ought to rule in the church; that prince and pontiff are inseparable characters; and that the ministers of the Gospel are not the ambassadors of the Deity, but the deputies or vicegerents of the civil magistrate. These reformers of Lutheranism did not stop here; they reduced within narrower bounds the few privileges and advantages that the clergy yet retained; and treated many of the rites, institutions, and customs of our church, as the remains of popish superstition. Hence an abundant source of contention was opened, and a long and tedious controversy was carried on with warmth and animosity between the clergy and civilians. We leave it to others to determine with what views these debates were commenced and fomented, and with what success they were respectively carried on. We shall only observe, that their effects and consequences were unhappy, as, in many places, they proved seriously detrimental to the reputation of the clergy, to the dignity and authority of religion, and to the peace and prosperity of the Lutheran church.[a] The present state of that church verifies too plainly this observation. It is now its fate to see few entering into its public service, who are adapted to restore the reputation it has lost, or to maintain that which it yet retains. Those who are distinguished by illustrious birth, uncommon genius, and a liberal and ingenuous turn of mind, look upon the study of theology, which has so few external honours and advantages to recommend it, as below their ambition; and hence the number of wise, learned, and eminent ministers may be said gradually to decrease. This circumstance is deeply lamented by those among us who consider with attention the dangerous and declining state of the Lutheran church; and it is to be feared, that our descendants will have reason to lament it still more bitterly.

XV. The eminent writers that adorned the Lutheran church through the course of this century, were many in number. We shall only mention those whom it is most necessary for a student of ecclesiastical history to be more particularly acquainted with; such are Giles and Nicolas Hunnius—Leonard Hutter—Joseph and John Ernest Gerard—George and Frederic Ulric Calixtus—the Mentzers—Godfrey and John Olearius—Frederic Baldwin—Albert Grawer—Matthias Hoe—two of the name of Carpzovius—John and Paul Tarnovius—John Affelman—Eilhart Luber—the Lysers—Michael Walther—Joachim Hildebrand—John Valentine Andreas—Solomon Glassius—Abraham Calovius—Theodore Hackspan—John Hulseman—Jacob Weller—Peter and John Musæus, brothers—John Conrad Danhaver—John George Dorschæus—John Arndt—Martin Geyer—John Adam Schartzer—Balthazar and John Meisner—Augustus Pfeiffer—Henry and John Muller—Justus Christopher Schomer—Sebastian Schmidt—Christopher Kortholt—the Osianders—Philip Jacob Spener—Geb. Theodore Meyer—Fridem. Bechman—and others.[b]

XVI. The doctrine of the Lutheran church remained entire during this century; its fundamental principles received no alteration, nor could any doctor of that church, who should have presumed to renounce or invalidate any of those theological points which are contained in the symbolical books of the Lutherans, have met with toleration and indulgence. It is, however, to be observed, that, in later times, various circumstances contributed to diminish, in many places, the authority of these oracles, which had so long been considered as almost infallible rules of faith and practice. Hence arose that unbounded liberty, which is at this day enjoyed by all who are not invested with the character of public teachers, of dissenting from the decisions of these symbols or creeds, and of declaring this dissent in the manner they judge the most expedient. The case was very different in former times: whoever ventured to oppose any of the received doctrines of the church, or to spread new religious opinions among the people, was called before the higher powers to give an account of his conduct, and very rarely escaped without suffering in his fortune or reputation, unless he renounced his innovations. But the teachers of novel doctrines had nothing to apprehend, when, toward the conclusion of this century, the Lutheran churches adopted the leading maxim of the Armenians, that "Christians were accountable to God alone for their religious sentiments, and that no individual could be justly punished by the magistrate for his erroneous opinions, while he conducted himself like a virtuous and obedient subject, and made no attempts to disturb the peace and order of civil society." It is to be wished, that this religious liberty, which the advocates of equity must approve, but of which the virtuous mind alone can make a wise and proper use, had never degenerated into the unbridled licentiousness that holds nothing sacred, but with an audacious insolence tramples under foot the solemn truths of religion, and is constantly endeavouring to throw contempt upon the respectable profession of its ministers.

XVII. The various branches of sacred erudition were cultivated with uninterrupted zeal and assiduity among the Lutherans, who, in no period, were without able commentators, and learned and faithful guides for the

tant churches. Until this very day, the Lutherans of Frankfort on the Maine have always refused to permit the Reformed to celebrate public worship within the bounds, or even in the suburbs of that city. Many attempts have been made to conquer their obstinacy in this respect, but hitherto without success.

[a] It has been the misfortune even of well-meaning persons to fall into pernicious extremes, in the controversies relating to the foundation, power, and privileges of the church. Too few have steered the middle way, and laid their plans with such equity and wisdom as to maintain the sovereignty and authority of the *state*, without reducing the *church* to a mere creature of civil policy. The reader will find a most interesting view of this nice and important subject in the learned and ingenious bishop Warburton's Alliance between Church and State, and in his dedication of the second volume of his Divine Legation of Moses, to the earl of Mansfield.

[b] For an account of the lives and writings of these authors, see Witte's Memoriæ Theologorum, and his Diarium Biographicum; as also Pippingius, Goesius, and other writers of literary history.

interpretation of the Holy Scriptures. It is proper to mention here Tarnovius, Gerard, Hackspan, Calixtus, Erasmus Schmidt, to whom might be added a numerous list of learned and judicious expositors of the sacred oracles. But what appears more peculiarly worthy of observation is, that the very period which some look upon as the most barren of learned productions, and the most remarkable for a general inattention to the branch of erudition now under consideration, produced that inestimable and immortal work of Solomon Glassius, which he published under the title of Sacred Philology, and than which none can be more useful for the interpretation of Scripture, as it throws an uncommon degree of light upon the language and phraseology of the inspired writers. It must, at the same time, be candidly acknowledged, that a considerable part of this century was more employed, by the professors of the different universities, in defending, with subtlety and art, the peculiar doctrines of the Lutheran church, than in illustrating and explaining the Scripture, the only genuine source of divine truth. Whatever was worthy of censure in this manner of proceeding, was abundantly repaired by the more modern divines of the Lutheran communion: for no sooner did the rage of controversy begin to subside, than the greatest part of them turned their principal studies toward the exposition and illustration of the sacred writings; and they were particularly animated in the execution of this laborious task, by observing the indefatigable industry of those among the Dutch divines, who, in their interpretations of Scripture, followed the sentiments and method of Cocceius. At the head of these modern commentators we may place, with justice, Sebastian Schmidt, who was at least the most laborious and voluminous expositor of this age. After this learned writer, may be ranked Calovius, Geyer, Schomer, and others of inferior note.[a] The contests excited by the persons called Pietists, though unhappy in several respects, were nevertheless attended with this good effect, that they engaged many to apply themselves to the study of the Scriptures, which they had too much neglected before that period, and to the perusal of the commentators and interpreters of the sacred oracles. These commentators pursued various methods, and were unequal both in their merit and success. Some confined themselves to the mere signification of the words, and the literal sense that belonged to the phrases of the inspired writers; others applied their expositions to the decision of controverted points, and attacked their adversaries, either by refuting their false interpretations, or by making use of their own commentaries to overturn their doctrines; a third sort, after unfolding the sense of Scripture, applied it carefully to the purposes of life and the direction of practice. We might mention another class of interpreters, who, by an assiduous perusal of the writings of the Cocceians, are said to have injudiciously acquired their defects, as appears by their turning the sacred history into allegory, and seeking rather the more remote and mysterious sense of Scripture, than its obvious and literal signification.

XVIII. The principal doctors of this century followed, at first, the loose method of deducing their theological doctrines from Scripture under a few general heads. This method had been observed in ancient times by Melancthon, and was vulgarly called *common-place* divinity. They, however, made use of the principles, terms, and subtle distinctions of the Peripatetic philosophy, which was yet in high reputation, in explaining and illustrating each particular doctrine. The first person that reduced theology into a regular system, and gave it a truly scientific and philosophical form, was George Calixtus, a man of great genius and erudition, who had imbibed the spirit of the Aristotelian school. His general design was not so much censured, as the particular method he followed, and the form he gave to his system; for he divided the whole science of divinity into three parts, viz. the *end*, the *subject*, the *means*; and this division, which was borrowed from Aristotle, appeared to many extremely improper. This philosophical method of arranging the truths of Christianity was followed, with remarkable zeal and emulation, by the most eminent doctors in the different schools of learning; and even in our times it has its votaries. Some indeed had the courage to depart from it, and to exhibit the doctrines of religion under a different, though still under a scientific form; but they had few followers, and struggled in vain against the empire of Aristotle, who reigned with a despotic authority in the schools.

There were, however, many pious and good men, who beheld, with great displeasure, this irruption of metaphysics into the sphere of theology, and never could be brought to approve this philosophical method of teaching the doctrines of Christianity. They earnestly desired to see divine truth freed from captious questions and subtleties, delivered from the shackles of an imperious system, and exhibited with that beautiful simplicity, perspicuity, and evidence, in which it appears in the sacred writings. Persons of this turn had their wishes and expectations in some measure answered, when, toward the conclusion of this century, the learned Spener, and others who were animated by his exhortations and example, began to inculcate the truths and precepts of religion in a more plain and popular manner, and when the eclectics had succeeded so far as to dethrone Aristotle, and to banish his philosophy from the greatest part of the Lutheran schools. Spener was not so far successful as to render universal his popular method of teaching theology; it was nevertheless adopted by a considerable number of doctors: and it cannot be denied, that, since this period, the science of divinity, delivered from the jargon of the schools, has assumed a more liberal and graceful aspect. The same observation may be applied to controversial productions; it is certain that polemics were totally destitute of elegance and perspicuity so long as Aristotle reigned in the seminaries of learning, and that they were more or less embellished and improved after the suppression and disgrace of the Peripatetic philosophy. It is, however, to be lamented, that controversy did not lose, at this period, all the circumstances which had so justly rendered it displeasing; and that the defects, that had given such offence in the theological disputants of all parties, were far from being entirely removed. These defects still subsist, though perhaps in a less shocking degree; and, whether we peruse the polemic writers of ancient or modern times, we shall find too few among them who may be said to be animated by the pure love of truth, without any mixture of pride, passion, or partiality, and whom we may pronounce free from the illusions of prejudice and self-love.

[a] See J. Franc. Buddei Isagoge in Theologiam, lib. ii. cap. viii. p. 1686.

XIX. The science of morals, which must ever be esteemed the master-science, from its immediate influence upon life and manners, was, for a long time, neglected among the Lutherans. If we except a few eminent men, such as Arndt and Gerard, who composed some popular treatises concerning the internal worship of the Deity, and the duties of Christians, there did not appear, in the former part of this century, any moral writer of distinguished merit. Hence it happened, that those who applied themselves to the business of resolving what are called Cases of Conscience, were holden in high esteem, and their tribunals were much frequented. But, as the true principles and foundations of morality were not yet established with a sufficient degree of precision and evidence, their decisions were often erroneous, and they were liable to fall into daily mistakes. Calixtus was the first who separated the objects of faith from the duties of morality, and exhibited the latter under the form of an independent science. He did not, indeed, live to finish this work, the beginning of which met with general applause; his disciples, however, employed, with some degree of success, the instructions they had received from their master, in executing his plan, and composing a system of Moral Theology. This system, in process of time, fell into discredit on account of the Peripatetic form under which it appeared; for, notwithstanding the striking dissimilarity that exists, in the very nature of things, between the beautiful science of morals, and the perplexing intricacies of metaphysics, Calixtus could not abstain from the latter in building his moral system. The moderns, however, stripped morality of the Peripatetic garment. Calling to their assistance the law of nature, which had been explained and illustrated by Puffendorf and other authors, and comparing this law with the sacred writings, they not only discovered the true springs of Christian virtue, and entered into the true spirit and sense of the divine laws, but also digested the whole science of morals into a better order, and demonstrated its principles with a new and superior degree of evidence.

XX. These improvements in theology and morality did not diffuse such a spirit of concord in the Lutheran church, as was sufficient to heal ancient divisions, or to prevent new ones. That church, on the contrary, was involved in the most lamentable commotions and tumults, during the whole course of this century, partly by the controversies that arose among its most eminent doctors, and partly by the intemperate zeal of violent reformers, the fanatical predictions of pretended prophets, and the rash measures of innovators, who studiously spread among the people singular notions and (for the most part) extravagant opinions. The controversies that divided the Lutheran doctors may be ranged under two classes, according to their different importance and extent, as some of them involved the whole church in tumult and discord, while others were less general in their pernicious effects. Of the former class there were two controversies, that gave abundant exercise to the polemic talents of the Lutheran divines during the greatest part of this century; and these turned upon the religious systems that are generally known under the denominations of *Syncretism* and *Pietism*. Nothing could be more amiable than the principles that gave rise to the former, and nothing more respectable and praiseworthy than the design that was proposed by the latter. The Syncretists,[a] animated with that fraternal love and that pacific spirit, which Jesus Christ had so often recommended as the peculiar characteristics of his true disciples, used their warmest endeavours to promote union and concord among Christians; and the Pietists had undoubtedly in view the restoration and advancement of that holiness and virtue, which had suffered so much by the influence of licentious manners on the one hand, and by the turbulent spirit of controversy on the other. These two great and amiable virtues, that gave rise to the projects and efforts of the two orders of persons now mentioned, were combated by a third, even a zeal for maintaining the truth, and preserving it from all mixture of error. Thus the love of truth was unhappily found to stand in opposition to the love of union, piety, and concord; and thus, in the present critical and corrupt state of human nature, the unruly and turbulent passions of men can, by an egregious abuse, draw the worst consequences from the best things, and render the most excellent principles and views productive of discord, confusion, and calamity.

XXI. The origin of Syncretism was owing to George Calixtus, of Sleswick, a man of eminent and distinguished abilities and merit, and who had few equals in this century, either in point of learning or genius. This great man being placed in an university,[b] which, from the very time of its foundation, had been remarkable for encouraging freedom of inquiry, improved this happy privilege, examined the respective doctrines of the various Christian sects, and found, in the notions commonly received among divines, some things defective and erroneous. He accordingly gave early intimations of his dissatisfaction at the state of theology, and lamented, in a more particular manner, the divisions and factions that reigned among the servants and disciples of the same great master. He therefore turned his views to the salutary work of softening the animosities produced by these divisions, and showed the warmest desire, not so much of establishing a perfect harmony and concord between the jarring sects, which no human power seemed capable of effecting, as of extinguishing the hatred, and appeasing the resentment, which the contending parties discovered too much in their conduct toward each other. His colleagues did not seem at all averse to this pacific project; and the surprise that this their silence or acquiescence must naturally excite, in such as are acquainted with the theological spirit of the seventeenth century, will be diminished, when it is considered, that the professors of divinity at Helmstadt bind themselves, at their admission, by an oath, to use their best and most zealous endeavours to heal the divisions, and terminate the contests that prevail among Christians. Neither Calixtus, however, nor his friends, escaped the opposition which it was natural to expect in the execution of such an unpopular and comprehensive project. They were warmly attacked, in 1639, by Statius Buscher, a Hanoverian ecclesiastic, a bigoted votary of Ramus, a declared enemy to all philosophy, and a man of great temerity and imprudence. This man, exasperated at the preference given by Calixtus and his companions to the Peripatetic philosophy over

[a] The Syncretists were also called Calixtines, from their chief, George Calixtus; and Helmstadians, from the university where their plan of doctrine and union took its rise.

[b] The university of Helmstadt, in the dutchy of Brunswick, founded in 1576.

the principles of the Ramists, composed a very malignant book entitled, Crypto-Papismus novæ Theologiæ Helmstadiensis,[a] in which Calixtus was charged with a long list of errors. Though this production made some small impression on the minds of certain persons, it is nevertheless probable that Buscher would have almost universally passed for a partial, malicious, and rash accuser, had his invectives and complaints rendered Calixtus more cautious and prudent. But the upright and generous heart of this eminent man, which disdained dissimulation to a degree that bordered upon the extreme of imprudence, excited him to speak with the utmost frankness his private sentiments, and thus to give a certain measure of plausibility to the accusations of his adversary. Both he and his colleague Conrad Horneius maintained, with boldness and perseverance, several propositions, which appeared, to many others beside Buscher, new, singular, and of a dangerous tendency; and Calixtus more especially, by the freedom and plainness with which he declared and defended his sentiments, drew upon himself the resentment and indignation of the Saxon doctors, who, in 1645, were present at the conference of Thorn. He had been chosen by Frederic William, elector of Brandenburg, as colleague and assistant to the divines sent from Konigsberg to these conferences; and the Saxon deputies were greatly incensed to see a Lutheran ecclesiastic in the character of an assistant to a deputation of reformed doctors. The first cause of offence was followed by other incidents, in the course of these conferences, which increased the resentment of the Saxons against Calixtus, and made them accuse him of leaning to the side of the reformed churches. We cannot enter here into a circumstantial account of this matter, which would lead us from our main design. We shall only observe, that, when these conferences broke up, the Saxon doctors, and more especially Hulseman, Weller, Scharfius, and Calovius, turned the whole force of their polemic weapons against Calixtus, and, in their public writings, reproached him with apostacy from the principles of Lutheranism, and with a propensity toward the sentiments both of the reformed and Romish churches. This great man did not receive tamely the insults of his adversaries. His consummate knowledge of the philosophy that reigned in the schools, and his perfect acquaintance with the history of the church, rendered him an able disputant; and accordingly he repelled, with the greatest vigour, the attacks of his enemies, and carried on, with uncommon spirit and erudition, this important controversy, until the year 1656, when death put an end to his labours, and transported him from these scenes of dissension and tumult into the regions of peace and concord.[b]

XXII. Neither the death of Calixtus, nor the decease of his principal adversaries, could extinguish the flame they had kindled: on the contrary, the contest was carried on, after that period, with greater animosity and violence than ever. The Saxon doctors, and more especially Calovius, insulted the ashes and attacked the memory of this great man with unexampled bitterness and malignity; and in the judgment of many eminent and worthy divines, who were by no means the partisans of Calixtus, conducted themselves with such imprudence and temerity, as tended to produce an open schism in the Lutheran church. They drew up a new creed, or confession of faith,[c] which they proposed to place in the class of what the members of our communion call their Symbolical Books, and which, consequently, all professors of divinity and all candidates for the ministry would be obliged to subscribe, as containing the true and genuine doctrine of the church. By this new production of intemperate zeal, the friends and followers of Calixtus were declared unworthy of the communion of that church, and were accordingly supposed to have forfeited all right to the privileges and tranquillity that were granted to the Lutherans by the laws of the empire. The reputation of Calixtus found, nevertheless, some able defenders, who pleaded his cause with modesty and candour; such were Titius, Hildebrand, and other ecclesiastics, who were distinguished from the multitude by their charity, moderation, and prudence. These good men showed with the utmost evidence, that the new creed would be a perpetual source of contention and discord, and would thus have a fatal effect upon the true interests of the church: but their counsels were overruled, and their admonitions neglected. Among the writers who opposed this creed, was Frederic Ulric Calixtus, who was not destitute of abilities, though much inferior to his father in learning, genius, and moderation. Of those who stood forth in its vindication and defence, the most considerable were Calovius and Strauchius. The polemic productions of these contending parties were multiplied from day to day, and yet remain as deplorable monuments of the intemperate zeal of the champions. The invectives, reproaches, and calumnies, with which these productions were filled, showed too plainly that many of these writers, instead of being animated with a love of truth and a zeal for religion, were rather actuated by a keen spirit of party, and by the suggestions of vindictive pride and vanity. These contests were of long duration; they were, however, at length suspended toward the close of this century, by the death of those who had been the principal actors in this scene of theological discord, by the abolition of the creed that had produced it, by the rise of debates of a different nature, and by various circumstances of inferior moment, which do not require particular notice.

XXIII. It will be proper to give here some account of the accusations adduced against Calixtus by his adversa-

[a] i. e. Popery disguised under the mask of the new theological system of Helmstadt.

[b] Those who desire to be more minutely acquainted with the particular circumstances of this famous controversy, the titles and characters of the books published on that occasion, and the doctrines that produced such warm contests and such deplorable divisions, will do well to consult Walchius, Carolus, Weisman, Arnold, and other writers; and, above all, the third volume of the Cimbria Literata of Moller, in which there is an ample account of the life, transactions, and writings of Calixtus. But, if any reader should push his curiosity still farther, and be solicitous to know the more secret springs that acted in this whole affair, the remote causes of the events and transactions relating to it, the spirit, views, and characters of the disputants, the arguments used on both sides,—in a word, those things which are principally interesting and worthy of attention in controversies of this kind,—he will find no history that will satisfy him fully in these respects. A history that would throw a proper light upon these important matters, must be composed by a man of great candour and abilities; by one who knows the world, has studied human nature, is furnished with materials and documents that lie yet concealed in the cabinets of the curious, and is not unacquainted with the spirit that reigns, and the cabals that are carried on in the courts of princes.—But were such an historian to be found, I question very much, whether, even in our times, he could publish without danger all the circumstances of this memorable contest.

[c] The title of this new creed was, Consensus repetitus Fidei veræ Lutheranæ.

ries. The principal charge was, his having formed a project, not of uniting into one ecclesiastical body, as some have understood it, the Romish, Lutheran, and Reformed churches, but of extinguishing the hatred and animosity that reigned among the members of these different communions, and joining them in the bonds of charity, mutual benevolence, and forbearance. This is the project, which was at first condemned, and is still known under the denomination of *Syncretism.*[a] Several singular opinions were also laid to the charge of this great man, and were exaggerated and blackened, as the most innocent things generally are, when they pass through the medium of malignity and party-spirit. Such were his notions concerning the obscure manner in which the doctrine of the Trinity was revealed under the Old Testament dispensation, the appearances of the Son of God during that period, the necessity of good works to the attainment of everlasting salvation, and God's being occasionally[b] the author of sin. These notions have been considered, by many of the best judges of theology, as of an indifferent nature, as opinions which, even were they false, would not affect the great and fundamental doctrines of Christianity. But the two great principles that Calixtus laid down as the foundation of all his reconciling and pacific plans, gave much greater offence than the plans themselves, and drew upon him the indignation and resentment of many. Those principles were; first, that the fundamental doctrines of Christianity (by which he meant those elementary principles from which all its truths flow) were preserved pure and entire in all the three communions, and were contained in the ancient form of doctrine, vulgarly known by the name of the Apostles' Creed; and secondly, that the tenets and opinions, which had been constantly received by the ancient doctors during the first five centuries, were to be considered as of equal truth and authority with the express declarations and doctrines of Scripture. The general plan of Calixtus was founded upon the first of these propositions; and he made use of the second to give some degree of plausibility to certain Romish doctrines and institutions, which have been always rejected by the protestant church, and to establish a happy concord between the various Christian communions that had hitherto lived in a state of dissension and separation from each other.

XXIV. The divines of Rintelen, Konigsberg, and Jena, were more or less involved in these warm contests. Those of Rintelen, more especially Henichius and Peter Musæus, had, on several occasions, and particularly at the conference of Cassel, shewn plainly that they approved the plan of Calixtus for removing the discords and animosities that reigned among Christians, and that they beheld with peculiar satisfaction that part of it which had, for its objects, union and concord among the protestant churches. Hence they were opposed with great animosity by the Saxon doctors and their adherents, in various polemic productions.[c]

The pacific spirit of Calixtus discovered itself also at Konigsberg. John Laterman, Michael Behmius, and the learned Christopher Dryer, who had been the disciples of that great man, were at little pains to conceal their attachment to the sentiments of their master. By this discovery, they drew upon them the resentment of their colleagues John Behmius and Celestine Mislenta, who were seconded by almost the whole body of the clergy of Konigsberg; and thus a warm controversy arose, which was carried on, during many years, in such a manner as did very little honour to either of the contending parties. The interposition of the civil magistrate, together with the decease of Behmius and Mislenta, put an end to this intestine war, which was succeeded, however, by a new contest of long duration between Dryer and his associates on one side, and several foreign divines on the other, who considered the system of Calixtus as highly pernicious, and looked upon its defenders as the enemies of the church. This new controversy was managed, on both sides, with as little equity and moderation as those which preceded it.[d]

XXV. It must, at the same time, be acknowledged, to

[a] It is neither my design nor my inclination to adopt the cause of Calixtus; nor do I pretend to maintain that his writings or his doctrines are exempt from error. But the love of truth obliges me to observe, that it has been the ill fortune of this eminent man to fall into the hands of bad interpreters; and that even those who imagine they have been more successful than others in investigating his true sentiments, have most grievously misunderstood them. Calixtus is commonly supposed to have formed the plan of a formal reconciliation of the protestants with the church of Rome and its pontiffs; but this notion is entirely groundless, since he publicly and expressly declared, that the Protestants could by no means enter into the bonds of concord and communion with the Romish church, as it was constituted at this time; and that, if there had ever existed any prospect of healing the divisions that reigned between it and the Protestant churches, this prospect had entirely vanished since the council of Trent, whose violent proceedings and tyrannical decrees had rendered the union now under consideration absolutely impossible. He is farther charged with having either approved or excused the greatest part of those errors and superstitions, that are looked upon as a dishonour to the church of Rome; but this charge is abundantly refuted, not only by the various treatises in which he exposed the falsehood and absurdity of the doctrines and opinions of that church, but also by the declarations of the Roman catholics themselves, who acknowledge that Calixtus attacked them with much more learning and ingenuity than had been discovered by any other protestant writer.* It is true, he maintained that the Lutherans and Roman Catholics did not differ about the fundamental doctrines of the Christian faith; and it is to be wished, that he had never asserted any such thing, or, at least, that he had expressed his meaning in more proper and inoffensive terms. It must however be considered, that he always looked upon the popes and their votaries, as having adulterated these fundamental doctrines with an impure mixture or addition of many opinions and tenets, which no wise and good Christian could adopt; and this consideration diminishes a good deal the extravagance of an assertion, which, otherwise, would deserve the severest censure. We shall not enter farther into a review of the imputations that were cast upon Calixtus, by persons more disposed to listen to his accusers, than to those who endeavour, with candour and impartiality, to represent his sentiments and his measures in their true point of view. But if it should be asked here, what this man's real design was, we answer, that he laid down the following maxims: first, "that if it were possible to bring back the church of Rome to the state in which it was during the first five centuries, the Protestants would be no longer justified in rejecting its communion: secondly, that the modern members of the Romish church, though polluted with many intolerable errors, were not all equally criminal; and, that such of them, more especially, as sincerely believed the doctrines they had learned from their parents or masters, and by ignorance, education, or the power of habit, were hindered from perceiving the truth, were not to be excluded from salvation, or deemed heretics, provided they gave their assent to the doctrines contained in the Apostle's Creed, and endeavoured seriously to govern their lives by the precepts of the Gospel." I do not pretend to defend these maxims, which seem, however, to have many patrons in our times; I would only observe, that the doctrine they contain is much less intolerable than that which was commonly imputed to Calixtus.

[b] *Per accidens.*

[c] See Abrah. Calovii Historia Syncretistica, p. 618.—Jo. Georgii Walchii Introductio in Controversias Lutheran. vol. I. p. 286.

[d] See Christopher Hartknoch's Church-History of Prussia, book ii. chap. x. p. 602.—Moller's Cimbria Literata, tom. iii. p. 150.—See also the Acts and Documents contained in the famous collection, entitled, Unschuldige Nachrichten, A. 1740. p. 144. A. 1742. p. 29. A. 1745. p. 91.

* Bossuet, in his Traité de la Communion sous les deux Especes, speaks thus of the eminent man now under consideration; "Le fameux George Calixte, le plus habile des Lutheriens de notre tems, qui a ecrit le plus doctement contre nous," &c.

the immortal honour of the divines of Jena, that they discovered the most consummate prudence and the most amiable moderation in the midst of these theological debates; for, though they ingenuously confessed, that all the sentiments of Calixtus were not of such a nature, as to be reasonably adopted without exception, yet they maintained, that the greatest part of his tenets were much less pernicious than the Saxon divines had represented them, and that several of them were innocent, and might be freely admitted without any danger to the cause of truth. Solomon Glassius, an ecclesiastic renowned for the mildness of his temper and the equity of his proceedings, examined with the utmost candour and impartiality the opposite sentiments of the doctors who were engaged in this important controversy, and published the result of this examination, by the express order of Ernest, prince of Saxe-Gotha, surnamed the Pious.[a] John Musæus, a man of superior learning and exquisite penetration and judgment, so far adopted the sentiments of Calixtus and Horneius, as to maintain that good works might, in a certain sense, be considered as necessary to salvation; and that, of the erroneous doctrines imputed to the former of these divines, several were of little importance. It is very probable, that the followers of Calixtus would have willingly submitted this whole controversy to the arbitration of such candid and impartial judges. But this laudable moderation so highly offended the Saxon doctors, that they began to suspect the university of Jena of several erroneous opinions, and marked out Musæus, in a particular manner, as a person who had in various respects apostatized from the true and orthodox faith.[b]

XXVI. These debates were suppressed and succeeded by new disputes, which are commonly known under the denomination of the *Pietistical Controversy*. This dispute arose from the zeal of a certain set of persons, who, no doubt, with pious and upright intentions, endeavoured to stem the torrent of vice and corruption, and to reform the licentious manners both of the clergy and the people. But, as the best things may be abused, so this reforming spirit inflamed persons who were ill qualified to exert it with wisdom and success. Many, deluded by the suggestions of an irregular imagination and an ill-informed understanding, or guided by principles and views of a criminal nature, spread abroad new and singular opinions, false visions, unintelligible maxims, austere precepts, and imprudent clamours against the discipline of the church; all which excited dreadful tumults, and kindled the flames of contention and discord. The commencement of Pietism was indeed laudable and decent. It was set on foot by the pious and learned Philip James Spener, who, by the private societies which he formed at Francfort, with a view of promoting vital religion, roused the luke-warm from their indifference, and excited a spirit of vigour and resolution in those who had been satisfied to lament, in silence, the progress of impiety. The remarkable effect of these pious meetings was increased by a book published by this well-meaning man, under the title of Pious Desires, in which he exhibited a striking view of the disorders of the church, and proposed the remedies that were proper to heal them. Many persons of good intentions were highly pleased both with the proceedings and writings of Spener; and indeed the majority of those who had the cause of virtue and practical religion at heart, applauded the designs of this good man, though an apprehension of abuses restrained numbers from encouraging them openly. These abuses actually happened. The remedies proposed by Spener to heal the disorders of the church fell into unskilful hands, were administered without sagacity or prudence, and thus, in many cases, proved to be worse than the disease itself. The religious meetings above-mentioned (or the *Colleges of Piety*, as they were usually called by a phrase borrowed from the Dutch,) tended in many places to kindle in the breasts of the multitude the flames of a blind and intemperate zeal, whose effects were impetuous and violent, instead of that pure and rational love of God, whose fruits are benign and peaceful. Hence complaints arose against these institutions of Pietism, as if, under a striking appearance of sanctity, they led the people into false notions of religion, and fomented in those who were of a turbulent and violent character, the seeds and principles of mutiny and sedition.

XXVII. These first complaints would have been undoubtedly hushed, and the tumults which they occasioned would have subsided by degrees, had not the contests that arose at Leipsic, in 1689, added fuel to the flame. Some pious and learned professors of philosophy, and particularly Franckius, Schadius, and Paulus Antonius, the disciples of Spener, who at that time was ecclesiastical superintendant of the court of Saxony, began to consider with attention the defects that prevailed in the ordinary method of instructing the candidates for the ministry; and this review persuaded them of the necessity of using their best endeavours to supply what was deficient, and to correct what was amiss. For this purpose, they undertook to explain in their colleges certain books of Scripture, in order to render these genuine sources of religious knowledge better understood, and to promote a spirit of practical piety and vital religion in the minds of their hearers. The novelty of this method drew attention, and rendered it singularly pleasing to many; accordingly, these lectures were much frequented, and their effects were visible in the lives and conversations of several persons, whom they seemed to inspire with a deep sense of the importance of religion and virtue. Whether these first effusions of religious fervour, which were, in themselves, most certainly laudable, were always kept within the strict bounds of reason and discretion, is a question not easily decided. If we are to believe the report of common fame, and the testimonies of several persons of great weight, this was by no means the case; and many things were both said and done in these *Biblical Colleges* (as they were called) which, though they might be looked upon, by equitable and candid judges, as worthy of toleration and indulgence, were contrary to custom, and far from being consistent with prudence. Hence rumours were spread, tumults excited, animosities kindled, and the matter at length brought to a public trial, in which the pious and learned men above-mentioned were, indeed, declared free from the errors and heresies that had been laid to their charge, but were, at the same time, prohibited from carrying on that

[a] This piece, which did not appear in public till after the death of Glassius, in 1662, exhibits a rare and shining instance of theological moderation, and is worthy of a serious and attentive perusal.

[b] For an account of the imputations cast upon the divines of Jena, and more especially on Musæus, see a judicious and solid work of the latter, entitled, Der Jenischen Theologen Ausfuhrliche Erklarung, &c. See also Jo. Georgii Walchii Introductio in Controversias Ecclesiæ Lutheranæ, vol. i. p. 405.

plan of religious instruction which they had undertaken with such zeal. It was during these troubles and divisions that the invidious denomination of Pietist was first invented; it may, at least, be affirmed, that it was not commonly known before this period. It was at first applied by some giddy and inconsiderate persons to those who frequented the Biblical Colleges, and lived in a manner suitable to the instructions and exhortations that were addressed to them in those seminaries of piety. It was afterwards used to characterise all who were either distinguished by the excessive austerity of their manners, or who, regardless of truth and opinion, were only intent upon practice, and turned the whole vigour of their efforts toward the attainment of religious feelings and habits. But, as it is the fate of all those denominations by which peculiar sects are distinguished, to be variously and often very improperly applied, so the title of Pietist was frequently given, in common conversation, to persons of eminent wisdom and sanctity, who were equally remarkable for their adherence to truth and their love of piety; and, not seldom, to persons whose motley characters exhibited an enormous mixture of profligacy and enthusiasm, and who deserved the title of delirious fanatics rather than any other denomination.

XXVIII. This contest was by no means confined to Leipsic, but diffused its contagion, with incredible celerity, through all the Lutheran churches, in the different states and kingdoms of Europe; for, from this time, in all the cities, towns, and villages, where Lutheranism was professed, there suddenly started up persons of various ranks and professions, of both sexes, learned and illiterate, who declared that they were called, by a divine impulse, to pull up iniquity by the root, to restore to its primitive lustre, and propagate through the world, the declining cause of piety and virtue, to govern the Church of Christ by wiser rules than those by which it was at present directed; and who, partly in their writings, and partly in their private and public discourses, pointed out the means and measures that were necessary to bring about this important revolution. All those who were stricken with this imaginary impulse, unanimously agreed, that nothing could have a more powerful tendency to propagate among the multitude solid knowledge, pious feelings, and holy habits, than the private meetings which had been first contrived by Spener, and were afterwards introduced into Leipsic. Several religious assemblies were accordingly formed in various places, which, though they differed in some circumstances, and were not all composed and conducted with equal wisdom, piety, and prudence, were intended to promote the same general purpose. In the mean time, these unusual, irregular and tumultuous proceedings, filled, with uneasy and alarming apprehensions, both those who were intrusted with the government of the church, and those who sat at the helm of the state. These apprehensions were justified by this important consideration, that the pious and well-meaning persons who composed these assemblies, had indiscreetly admitted into their community a number of extravagant and hot-headed fanatics, who foretold the approaching destruction of Babel, (by which they meant the Lutheran church,) terrified the populace with fictitious visions, assumed the authority of prophets honoured with a divine commission, obscured the sublime truths of religion by a gloomy kind of jargon of their own invention, and revived doctrines that had long before been condemned by the church. These enthusiasts also asserted, that the *millennium*, (or thousand-years' reign of the saints on earth,) mentioned by St. John, was near at hand. They endeavoured to overturn the wisest establishments, and to destroy the best institutions, and desired that the power of preaching and administering public instruction might be given promiscuously to all sorts of persons. Thus was the Lutheran church torn asunder in the most deplorable manner, while the votaries of Rome stood by and beheld, with a secret satisfaction, these unhappy divisions. The most violent debates arose in all the churches; and persons, whose differences were occasioned rather by mere words and questions of little consequence, than by any doctrines or institutions of considerable importance, attacked one another with the bitterest animosity; and, in many countries, severe laws were at length enacted against the Pietists.[a]

XXIX. These revivers of piety were of two kinds, who, by their different manner of proceeding, deserve to be placed in two distinct classes. One sect of these practical reformers proposed to carry on their plan without introducing any change into the doctrine, discipline, or form of government, established in the Lutheran church. The other maintained, on the contrary, that it was impossible to promote the progress of real piety among the Lutherans, without making considerable alterations in their doctrine, and changing the whole form of their ecclesiastical discipline and polity. The former had at their head the learned and pious Spener, who, in 1691, removed from Dresden to Berlin, and whose sentiments were adopted by the professors of the new university at Halle, and particularly by Franckius and Paulus Antonius, who had been invited thither from Leipsic, where they began to be suspected of Pietism. Though few pretended to treat either with indignation or contempt the intentions and purpose of these good men (which, indeed, no one could despise without affecting to appear the enemy of practical religion and virtue,) yet many eminent divines, and more especially the professors and pastors of Wittenberg, were of opinion, that, in the execution of this laudable purpose, several maxims were adopted, and certain measures employed, that were prejudicial to the truth, and also detrimental to the interests of the church. Hence they thought themselves obliged to proceed publicly, first against Spener, in 1695, and afterwards against his disciples and adherents, as the inventors and promoters of erroneous and dangerous opinions. These debates are of a recent date; so that those who are desirous of knowing more par-

[a] This whole matter is amply illustrated by the learned John George Walchius, in his Introductio ad Controversias, vol. ii. and iii. who exhibits successively the various scenes of this deplorable contest, with a view of the principal points that were controverted, and his judgment concerning each, and a particular account of the writers who displayed their talents on this occasion. It would, indeed, be difficult for any one man to give an ample and exact history of this contest, which was accompanied with so many incidental circumstances, and was, upon the whole, of such a tedious and complicated nature. It is therefore to be wished, that a society of prudent and impartial persons, furnished with a competent knowledge of human nature and political transactions, and also with proper materials, would undertake to compose the history of Pietism. If several persons were employed in collecting from public records, and also from papers that are yet concealed in the cabinets of the curious, the events which happened in each country where this controversy reigned; and if these materials, thus carefully gathered on the spot, were put into the hands of a man capable of digesting the whole this would produce a most interesting and useful history.

ticularly how far the principles of equity, moderation, and candour, influenced the conduct and directed the proceedings of the contending parties, may easily receive satisfactory information.

XXX. These debates turned upon a variety of points; and therefore the matter of them cannot be comprehended under any one general head. If we consider them indeed in relation to their origin, and the circumstances that gave rise to them, we shall be able to reduce them to some fixed principles. It is well known that those who had the advancement of piety most zealously at heart, entertained a notion that no order of men contributed more to retard its progress than the clergy, whose peculiar vocation it was to inculcate and promote it. While they considered this as the root of the evil, it was natural that their plans of reformation should begin here; and, accordingly, they laid it down as an essential principle, that none should be admitted into the ministry, but such as had received a proper education, were distinguished by their wisdom and sanctity of manners, and had hearts filled with divine love. Hence they proposed, in the first place, a thorough reformation of the schools of divinity; and they explained clearly enough what they meant by this reformation, which consisted in the following points: That the systematical theology, which reigned in the colleges, and was composed of intricate and disputable doctrines, and obscure and unusual forms of expression, should be totally abolished; that polemical divinity, which comprehended the controversies subsisting between Christians of different communions, should be less eagerly studied, and less frequently treated, though not entirely neglected; that all mixture of philosophy and human learning with divine wisdom was to be most carefully avoided; that, on the contrary, all those who were intended for the ministry, should be accustomed from their early youth to the perusal and study of the Scriptures; that they should be instructed in a plain system of theology, drawn from these unerring sources of truth; and that the whole course of their education was to be so directed, as to render them useful in life, by the practical power of their doctrine and the commanding influence of their example. As these maxims were propagated with the greatest industry and zeal, and were explained inadvertently by some, without those restrictions which prudence seemed to require, these professed patrons and revivers of piety were suspected of designs that could not but render them obnoxious to censure. They were supposed to despise philosophy and learning, to treat with indifference, and even to renounce, all inquiries into the nature and foundations of religious truth, to disapprove the zeal and labours of those who defended it against such as either corrupted or opposed it, and to place the whole of their theology in certain vague and incoherent declamations concerning the duties of morality. Hence arose those famous disputes concerning the use of philosophy and the value of human learning, considered in connexion with the interests of religion—the dignity and usefulness of systematic theology—the necessity of polemic divinity—the excellence of the mystic system—and also concerning the true method of instructing the people.

The second great object, that employed the zeal and attention of the persons now under consideration, was, that the candidates for the ministry should not only, for the future, receive such an academical education as would tend rather to solid utility than to mere speculation, but also that they should dedicate themselves to God in a peculiar manner, and exhibit the most striking examples of piety and virtue. This maxim, which, when considered in itself, must be acknowledged to be highly laudable, not only gave occasion to several new regulations, calculated to restrain the passions of the studious youth, to inspire them with pious sentiments, and to excite in them holy resolutions; but also produced another maxim, which was a lasting source of controversy and debate, namely, "that no person, who was not himself a model of piety and divine love, was qualified to be a public teacher of piety, or a guide to others in the way of salvation." This opinion was considered by many as derogatory from the power and efficacy of the word of God, which cannot be deprived of its divine influence by the vices of its ministers, and a sort of revival of the long-exploded errors of the Donatists; and what rendered it peculiarly liable to an interpretation of this nature was, the imprudence of some Pietists, who inculcated it without those restrictions that were necessary to render it unexceptionable. Hence arose endless and intricate debates concerning the following questions; "whether the religious knowledge acquired by a wicked man can be termed theology?" "whether a vicious person can, in effect, obtain a true knowledge of religion?"—"how far the office and ministry of an impious ecclesiastic can be pronounced salutary and efficacious?"—"whether a licentious and ungodly man can be susceptible of illumination?"—and other questions of a like nature.

XXXI. These revivers of declining piety went yet farther. In order to render the ministry of their pastors as successful as possible, in rousing men from their indolence, and in stemming the torrent of corruption and immorality, they judged two things indispensably necessary. The first was, to suppress entirely, in the course of public instruction, and more especially in that delivered from the pulpit, certain maxims and phrases which the corruption of men leads them frequently to interpret in a manner favourable to the indulgence of their passions. Such, in the judgment of the Pietists, were the following propositions:—"No man is able to attain that perfection which the divine law requires: good works are not necessary to salvation: in the act of justification, on the part of man, faith alone is concerned, without good works." Many, however, were apprehensive, that, by the suppression of these propositions, truth itself must suffer deeply, and that the Christian religion, deprived thus of its peculiar doctrines, would be exposed, naked and defenceless, to the attacks of its adversaries. The second step they took, in order to give efficacy to their plans of reformation, was to form new rules of life and manners, much more rigorous and austere than those which had been formerly practised, and to place in the class of sinful and unlawful gratifications several kinds of pleasure and amusement, which had hitherto been looked upon as innocent in themselves, and which could only become good or evil, in consequence of the respective characters of those who used them with prudence, or abused them with intemperance. Thus, dancing, public sports, pantomimes, theatrical diversions, the reading of humorous and comical books, with several other kinds of pleasure and entertainment, were prohibited by

the Pietists, as unlawful and unseemly, and, therefore, by no means of an indifferent nature. Many, however, thought this rule of moral discipline far too rigid and severe; and thus was revived the ancient contest of the schoolmen, concerning the famous question, whether any human actions are truly indifferent? i. e. equally removed from moral good on the one hand, and from moral evil on the other; and whether, on the contrary, it be not true, that all actions, whatever, must be either considered as good or as evil? The discussion of this question was attended with a variety of debates upon the several points of the prohibition now mentioned; and these debates were often carried on with animosity and bitterness, and very rarely with that precision, temper, and judgment, which the nicety of the matters in dispute required. The third point, on which the Pietists insisted, was, that beside the stated meetings for public worship, private assemblies should be holden for prayer and other religious exercises. But many were of opinion, that the cause of true piety and virtue was rather endangered than promoted by these assemblies; and experience and observation seemed to confirm this opinion. It would be both endless and unnecessary to enumerate all the little disputes that arose from the appointment of these private assemblies, and, in general, from the notions entertained, and the measures pursued by the Pietists.[a] It is nevertheless proper to observe, that the lenity and indulgence shown by these people to persons whose opinions were erroneous, and whose errors were by no means of an indifferent nature, irritated their adversaries to a very high degree, and made many suspect, that the Pietists laid a much greater stress upon practice than upon belief, and that, separating what ought ever to be inseparably joined, they held virtuous manners in higher esteem than religious truth. Amidst the prodigious numbers that appeared in these controversies it was not at all surprising, if the variety of their characters, capacities, and views, be duly considered, that some were chargeable with imprudence, others with intemperate zeal, and that many, to avoid what they looked upon as unlawful, fell injudiciously into the opposite extreme.

XXXII. The other class of Pietists already mentioned, whose reforming views extended so far, as to change the system of doctrine, and the form of ecclesiastical government, established in the Lutheran church, comprehended persons of various characters and different ways of thinking. Some of them were totally destitute of reason and judgment; their errors were the reveries of a disordered brain; and they were rather to be considered as lunatics than as heretics. Others were less extravagant, and tempered the singular notions, which they had derived from reading or meditation, with a certain mixture of the important truths and doctrines of religion. Of this class we shall mention those only who were distinguished from the rest by superior merit and reputation. Among these we find Godfrey Arnold, a native of Saxony, a man of extensive reading, tolerable parts, and richly endowed with that natural and unaffected eloquence, which is so wonderfully adapted to touch and to persuade. This man disturbed the tranquillity of the church, toward the conclusion of this century, by a variety of theological productions, that were full of new and singular opinions, and more especially by his ecclesiastical history, which he had the assurance to impose upon the public, as a work composed with candour and impartiality. His natural complexion was dark, melancholy and austere; and these seeds of fanaticism were so expanded and nourished by the perusal of the mystic writers, that the flame of enthusiasm was kindled in his breast, and broke forth in his conduct and writings with peculiar vehemence. He looked upon the Mystics as superior to all other writers, and even as the only depositories of true wisdom; reduced the whole of religion to certain internal feelings and motions, of which it is difficult to form a just idea; neglected entirely the study of truth; and employed the whole power of his genius and eloquence in enumerating, deploring, and exaggerating, the vices and corruptions of human nature. If it is universally allowed to be the first and most essential obligation of an historian to avoid all appearance of partiality, and neither to be influenced by personal attachments nor by private resentment in the recital of facts, it may fairly be acknowledged, that no man could be less fit for writing history than Arnold. His whole history, as every one must see who looks into it with the smallest degree of attention, is the production of a violent spirit, and is dictated by a vehement antipathy to the doctrines and institutions of the Lutheran church. A fundamental principle that influences the judgment, and directs the opinions and decisions of this historian, through the whole course of his work, is, that all the abuses and corruptions that have found admittance into the church since the time of the apostles, have been introduced by its ministers and rulers, men of vicious and abandoned characters. From this principle he draws the following goodly consequence: that all those who opposed the measures of the clergy, or felt their resentment, were persons of distinguished sanctity and virtue; and that, on the contrary, such as either favoured the ministers of the church or were favoured by them, were strangers to the spirit of true and genuine piety. Hence proceeded Arnold's unaccountable partiality to almost all that bore the denomination of heretics;[b] whom he defended with the utmost zeal, without having always understood their doctrine, and, in some cases, without having even examined their arguments. This partiality was highly detrimental to his reputation, and rendered his history peculiarly obnoxious to censure. He did not, however, continue in this way of thinking: but, as he advanced in years and experience, perceived the errors into which he had been led by the impetuosity of his passion and the contagious influence of pernicious examples. This sense of his mistakes corrected the vehemence of his natural temper and the turbulence of his party spirit, so that, as we learn from witnesses worthy of credit, he became at last a lover of truth and a pattern of moderation.[c]

XXXIII. Arnold was far exceeded in fanatical malignity and insolence by John Conrad Dippelius, a Hessian divine, who assumed the denomination of the Christian

[a] These debates were first collected, and also needlessly multiplied, by Schelvigius, in his Synopsis Controversarium sub Pietatis Prætextu motarum, published in 1701. The reader will also find the arguments, used by the contending parties in this dispute, judiciously summed up in two different works of Langius, one entitled Anti-Barbarus, and the other the Middle Way, (*die Mittel-strasse*;) the former composed in Latin, the latter in German.*

☞ [b] Arnold's history is entitled Historia Ecclesiastica et Hæretica. Dr. Mosheim's account of this learned man is drawn up with much severity, and perhaps is not entirely destitute of partiality. See the Life of Arnold in the General Dictionary.

[c] See Coleri Vita Arnoldi, and also the Nouveau Diction. Histor. et Critique, tom. i. p. 485.

* See also the Timotheus Verinus of Val. Ern. Loscher.

Democritus, inflamed the minds of the simple by a variety of productions, and excited considerable tumults and commotions near the close of this century. This vain, supercilious, and arrogant doctor, who seemed formed by nature for a satirist and a buffoon, instead of proposing any new system of religious doctrine and discipline, was solely employed in overturning those which were received in the protestant church. His days were principally spent in throwing out sarcasms and invectives against all denominations of Christians; and the Lutherans, to whose communion he belonged, were more especially the objects of his raillery and derision, which, on many occasions, spared not those things which had formerly been looked upon as the most respectable and sacred. It is much to be doubted, whether he had formed any clear and distinct notions of the doctrines he taught, since, in his views of things, the power of imagination domineered evidently over the dictates of reason and common sense. But, if he really understood the religious maxims he was propagating, he certainly had not the talent of rendering them clear and perspicuous to others; for nothing can be more ambiguous and obscure than the expressions under which they are conveyed, and the arguments by which they are supported. A man must have the gift of divination, to be able to deduce a regular and consistent system of doctrine from the various productions of this incoherent and unintelligible writer, who was a chemist into the bargain, and whose brain seems to have been heated into a high degree of fermentation by the fire of the laboratory. If the rude, motley, and sarcastic writings of this wrong-headed reformer should reach posterity, it will be certainly a just matter of surprise to our descendants, that a considerable number of their ancestors should have been so blind as to choose, for a model of genuine piety and a teacher of religion, a man who had audaciously violated the first and most essential principles of solid piety and sound sense.[a]

XXXIV. The mild and gentle temper of John William Petersen, minister and first member of the ecclesiastical consistory of Lunenburg, distinguished him remarkably from the fiery enthusiast now mentioned. But the mildness of this good-natured ecclesiastic was accompanied with a want of resolution, that might be called weakness, and a certain floridness and warmth of imagination, which rendered him peculiarly susceptible of illusion himself, and a fit instrument to lead others innocently into error. Of this he gave a very remarkable specimen in 1691, by maintaining publicly that Rosamond Juliana, countess of Asseburg (whose disordered brain suggested to her the most romantic and chimerical notions) was honoured with a vision of the Deity, and commissioned to make a new declaration of his will to mankind. He also revived and propagated openly the absolute doctrine of the Millennium, which Rosamond had confirmed by her pretended authority from above. This first error produced many; for error is fertile, especially in those minds where imagination has spurned the yoke of reason, and considers all its airy visions as solid and important discoveries. Accordingly, Petersen went about prophesying with his wife,[b] who also gave herself out for a kind of oracle, and boasted of her extensive knowledge of the secrets of heaven. They talked of a general restitution of all things; at which grand and solemn period all intelligent beings were to be restored to happiness, the gates of hell opened, and wicked men, together with evil spirits, delivered from the guilt, power and punishment of sin. They supposed that two distinct natures, and both of them human, were united in Christ; one assumed in heaven before the formation of this globe, the other derived, upon earth, from the Virgin Mary. These opinions were swallowed down by many among the multitude, and were even embraced by some of superior rank; they met, however, with great opposition, and were refuted by a considerable number of authors, to whom Petersen, who was amply furnished with leisure and eloquence, wrote voluminous replies. In the year 1692, he was deposed; and, from that period, passed his days in the tranquillity of a rural retreat in the territory of Magdeburg, where he cheered his solitude by epistolary commerce, and spent the remainder of his life in composition and study.[c]

XXXV. It is not easy to determine whether John Caspar Schade and George Bosius may be associated properly with the persons now mentioned. They were both good men, full of zeal for the happiness and salvation of their brethren; but their zeal was neither directed by prudence, nor tempered with moderation. The former, who was minister at Berlin, propagated several notions that seemed crude and uncouth; and, in 1697, inveighed with the greatest bitterness against the custom that prevails in the Lutheran church of confessing privately to the clergy. These violent remonstrances excited great commotions, and were even attended with popular tumults. Bosius performed the pastoral functions at Soraw; and, to awaken sinners from their security, and prevent their treating, with negligence and indifference, interests that are most important by being eternal, denied that God would continue always propitious and placable with respect to those offenders, whose incorrigible obstinacy he had foreseen from all eternity; or that he would offer to them beyond a certain period, marked in his decrees, those succours of grace which are necessary to salvation. This tenet, in the judgment of many grave divines, seemed highly injurious to the boundless mercy of God, and was accordingly refuted and condemned in several treatises: it found, nevertheless, an eminent patron and defender in the learned Rechenberg, professor of divinity at Leipsic, not to mention others of less note, who appeared in its behalf.[d]

XXXVI. Among the controversies of inferior moment that divided the Lutheran church, we shall first mention those that broke out between the doctors of Tubingen and Giessen so early as the year 1616. The principal part of this debate related to the abasement and humilia-

[a] His works were all published in 1747; and his memory is still highly honoured and respected by many, who consider him as having been, in his day, an eminent teacher of true piety and wisdom. No kind of authors find such zealous readers and patrons as those who deal largely in invective, and swell themselves, by a vain self-sufficiency, into an imagined superiority over the rest of mankind. Besides, Dipperius was an excellent chemist, and a good physician; and this procured him many friends and admirers, as all men are fond of riches and long life, and these two sciences were supposed to lead to the one and the other.

[b] Her name was Johanna Eleonora à Merlau.

[c] Petersen wrote an account of his own life in German; his wife added her life to it, by way of supplement; and these pieces of biography will satisfy such as are desirous of a particular account of the character, manners, and talents, of this extraordinary pair. For an account of the troubles they excited at Lunenburgh, see Moller's Cimbria Literata, tom. ii. p. 639; the Unschuldigen Nachrichten, An. 1748, p. 974; An. 1749, p. 30—200.

[d] See the first part of Walchius' Introductio ad Controversias, cap. iv.

tion, or to what divines call the *exinanition* of Jesus Christ; and the great point was, to know in what this exinanition properly consisted, and what was the precise characteristic of this singular situation. That the man Christ possessed, even in the most dreadful periods of his abasement, the divine properties and attributes he had received in consequence of the hypostatic union, was unanimously agreed on by both parties; but they differed in their sentiments relating to this subtle and intricate question, whether Christ during his mediatorial sufferings and sacerdotal state, really suspended the exertion of these attributes, or only concealed this exertion from the view of mortals? The latter was maintained by the doctors of Tubingen, while those of Giessen were inclined to think, that the exertion of the divine attributes was really suspended in Christ during his humiliation and sufferings. This main question was followed by others which were much more subtle than important, concerning the manner in which God is present with all his works, the reasons and foundation of this universal presence, the true cause of the omnipresence of Christ's body, and others of a like intricate and unintelligible nature. The champions who distinguished themselves on the side of the doctors of Tubingen were, Lucas Osiander, Melchior Nicolas, and Theodore Thummius. The most eminent of those who adopted the cause of the divines of Giessen were Balthasar Menzer and Justus Feverborn. The contest was carried on with zeal, learning, and sagacity: it is to be wished that one could add, that it was managed with wisdom, dignity, and moderation. This, indeed, was far from being the case; for such was the complexion of the age, that many things were now treated with indulgence, or beheld with approbation, which the wisdom and decency of succeeding times have justly endeavoured to discountenance and correct. In order to terminate these disagreeable contests, the Saxon divines were commanded by their sovereign, to offer themselves as arbitrators between the contending parties in 1624: their arbitration was accepted; but it did not at all contribute to decide the matters in debate. Their decisions were vague and ambiguous, and were therefore not adapted to give satisfaction. They declared, that they could not fully or entirely approve the doctrine of either; but insinuated, at the same time, that a certain degree of preference was due to the opinions maintained by the doctors of Giessen.[a] Those of Tubingen rejected the decision of the Saxon arbitrators; and it is very probable, that the divines of Giessen would have appealed from it also, had not the public calamities, in which Germany began to be involved at this time, suspended this miserable contest, by imposing silence upon the disputants, and leaving them in the quiet possession of their respective opinions.

XXXVII. Before the cessation of the controversy now mentioned, a new one was occasioned, in 1621, by the writings of Herman Rathman, minister at Dantzic, a man of eminent piety, some learning, and a zealous patron and admirer of Arndt's famous book concerning true Christianity. This good man was suspected by his colleague Corvinus, and several others, of entertaining sentiments derogatory from the dignity and power of the sacred writings. These suspicions they derived from a book published by him in 1621, concerning Christ's Kingdom of Grace, which, according to the representations of his adversaries, contained the following doctrine: "That the word of God, as it stands in the sacred writings, has no innate power to illuminate the mind, to excite in it a principle of regeneration, and thus to turn it to God: that the external word shows, indeed, the way to salvation, but cannot effectually lead men to it; but that God himself, by the ministry of another, and an internal word, works such a change in the minds of men, as is necessary to render them agreeable in his sight, and enables them to please him by their words and actions." This doctrine was represented by Corvinus and his associates as the same which had been formerly maintained by Schwenckfeld, and was professed by the Mystics in general. But whoever will be at the pains to examine with attention the various writings of Rathman on this subject, must soon be convinced, that his adversaries either misunderstood his true sentiments, or wilfully misrepresented them. His real doctrine may be comprised in the four following points: "first, that the divine word, contained in Scripture, is endowed with the power of healing the minds of men, and bringing them to God; but that, secondly, it cannot exert this power in the minds of corrupt men, who resist its divine operation and influence; and that, in consequence, thirdly, it is absolutely necessary, that the word be preceded or accompanied by some divine energy, which may prepare the minds of sinners to receive it, and remove those impediments that oppose its efficacy; and, fourthly, that it is by the power of the holy spirit, or internal word, that the external word is rendered capable of exerting its efficacy in enlightening and sanctifying the minds of men."[b] There is, indeed, some difference between these opinions and the doctrine commonly received in the Lutheran church, relating to the efficacy of the divine word; but a careful perusal of the writings of Rathman on this subject, and a candid examination of his inaccurate expressions, will persuade the impartia reader, that this difference is neither great nor important and he will only perceive, that this pious man had not the talent of expressing his notions with order, perspicuity and precision. However that may have been, this contest grew more general from day to day, and, at length, extended its polemic influence through the whole Lutheran church, the greatest part of whose members followed the example of the Saxon doctors in condemning Rathman, while a considerable number, dazzled by the lustre of his piety, and persuaded of the innocence of his doctrine, espoused his cause. He died in 1628, when this controversy was at the greatest height, and the warmth and animosity of the contending parties gradually subsided.

XXXVIII. It would be repugnant to the true end of history, as well as to all principles of candour and equity to swell this enumeration of the controversies that divided the Lutheran church, with the private disputes of individuals concerning particular points of doctrine and worship. Some writers have, indeed, followed this me-

[a] Jo. Wolf. Jäger, Histor. Eccles. et. Polit. sæc. XVII. decenn. iii. p. 329.—Christ. Eberh. Weisman, Histor. Ecclesiast. sæc. XVII. p. 1178. —Walchius, p. 206.—See also Carolus, Arnold, and the other writers, who have written the ecclesiastical history of these times.

[b] See Moller's Cimbria Literata, tom. iii. p. 559.—Hartknoch's German work, entitled, Preussische Kirchen-Geschichte, book iii. ch. viii. p. 812. Arnold's Kirchen Historie, part iii. chap. xii.

thod, not so much with a design to enrich their histories with a multitude of facts, and to show men and opinions in all their various aspects, as with a view to render the Lutherans ridiculous or odious. In the happiest times, and in the best-modelled communities, there will always remain sufficient marks of human imperfection, and abundant sources of private contention, at least, in the imprudence, inadvertency, and misconceptions of some, and the impatience and severity of others; but it must betray a great want of sound judgment, as well as of candour and impartiality, to form a general estimate of the state and character of a whole church upon such particular instances of imperfection and error. Certain singular opinions and modes of expression were censured by many in the writings of Tarnovius and Affelman, two divines of Rostoch, who were otherwise men of distinguished merit. This, however, will surprise us less if we consider, that these doctors often expressed themselves improperly, when their sentiments were just; and that, when their expressions were accurate and proper, they were frequently misunderstood by those who pretended to censure them. Joachim Lutkeman, whose reputation was considerable, and, in many respects, well deserved, conceived the idea of denying that Christ remained *a true man* during the three days that intervened from his death to his resurrection. This sentiment appeared highly erroneous to many; and hence arose a contest, which was merely a dispute about words, resembling many other debates, which, like bubbles, are incessantly swelling and vanishing on the surface of human life. Of this kind, more especially, was the controversy which, for some time, exercised the talents of Boetius and Balduin, professors of divinity (the former at Helmstadt, and the latter at Wittenberg,) and had for its subject the following question, whether the wicked shall one day be restored to life by the merits of Christ? In the duchy of Holstein, Reinboth distinguished himself by the singularity of his opinions. After the example of Calixtus, he reduced the fundamental doctrines of religion within narrower bounds than were usually prescribed to them; he also considered the opinion of those Greeks, who denied that the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Son, as an error of very little consequence. In both these respects, his sentiments were adopted by many; they, however, met with opposition from several quarters, and were censured with peculiar warmth by the learned John Conrad Danhaver, professor of divinity at Strasbourg: in consequence of this, a kind of controversy was kindled between these eminent men, and was carried on with more vehemence than the nature and importance of the debated points could justify.[a] But these and other contests of this nature, must not be admitted into that list of controversies, from which we are to form a judgment of the internal state of the Lutheran church during this century.

XXXIX. We cannot make the same observation with regard to certain controversies, which were of a personal rather than a real nature, and related to the orthodoxy or unsoundness of certain men, rather than to the truth or falsehood of particular opinions; for these are more particularly connected with the internal state and history of the church, than the contests last mentioned. It is not unusual for those who professedly embark in the cause of declining piety, and aim, in a solemn, zealous, and public manner, at its revival and restoration, to be elated with high and towering views, and warmed with a certain enthusiastic, though noble fervour. This ardent elevation of mind is by no means a source of accuracy and precision; on the contrary, it produces many unguarded expressions, and prevents men of warm piety from framing their language by those rules which are necessary to render it clear, accurate, and proper; it frequently dictates expressions and phrases that are sonorous and emphatic, but, at the same time, allegorical and ambiguous; and leads pious and even sensible men to adopt uncouth and vulgar forms of speech, employed by writers whose style is as low and barbarous as their intentions are upright and pious, and whose practical treatises on religion and morality have nothing to recommend them but the zeal and fervour with which they are penned. Persons of this warm and enthusiastic turn fall with more facility than any other set of men into the suspicion of heresy, on account of the inaccuracy of their expressions. This many doctors found to be true, by a disagreeable experience, during the course of this century; but it was, in a more particular manner, the fate of Stephen Prætorius, minister of Saltzwedel, and of John Arndt, whose piety and virtue have rendered his memory precious to the friends of true religion. Prætorius had, so early as the preceding century, composed certain treatises, designed to revive a spirit of vital religion, and awaken in the minds of men a zeal for their future and eternal interests. These productions, which were frequently republished during this century, were highly applauded by many, while, in the judgment of others, they abounded with expressions and sentiments, that were partly false, and partly adapted by their ambiguity to lead men into error. It cannot be denied, that there are in the writings of Prætorius some improper and unguarded expressions, which may too easily deceive the ignorant and unwary, as also several marks of a credulity that borders upon weakness; but those who peruse his works with impartiality will be fully persuaded of the uprightness of his intentions.

The unfeigned piety and integrity of Arndt could not secure him from censure. His famous book concerning true Christianity, which is still perused with the utmost pleasure and edification by many persons eminent for the sanctity of their lives and manners, met with a warm and obstinate opposition. Osiander, Rostius, and other doctors, inveighed against it with great asperity, pretended to find in it various defects, and alleged, among other things, that its style was infected with the jargon of the Paracelsists, Weigelians, and other Mystico-chemical philosophers. It must, indeed, be acknowledged, that this eminent man was highly disgusted at the philosophy that, in his time, reigned in the schools; nor can it be denied, that he had a high, perhaps an excessive degree of respect for the chemists, and an ill-placed confidence in their obscure decisions and pompous undertakings. This led him sometimes into conversation with those fantastic philosophers, who, by the power and ministry of fire, pretended to unfold both the secrets of nature and the mysteries of religion. But, notwithstanding this, he was declared exempt from any errors of moment by a multitude of grave and pious divines, among whom were Egard, Dilger, Breler, Gerard,

[a] For a general account of these controversies, see Arnold's Kirchen Hist. p. ii. lib. xvii. cap. vi. p. 957. That which was occasioned by Reinboth is amply and circumstantially related by Moller, in part ii. of his Introd. ad Hist. Chersonesi Cimbricæ, and in his Cimbria Literata, t. ii.

and Dorschæus; and in the issue the censures and opposition of his adversaries seemed rather to give a new lustre to his reputation than to cover him with reproach.[a]

We may place, in the class now under consideration, Valentine Weigel, a minister of the church of Zscopavia in Misnia; for, though he died in the preceding century, yet it was in this that the greatest part of his writings were published, and also censured as erroneous and of a dangerous tendency. The science of chemistry, which at this time was making such a rapid progress in Germany, proved also detrimental to this ecclesiastic; who, though in the main a man of probity and merit, neglected the paths of right reason, and chose rather to wander in the devious wilds of a chimerical philosophy.[b]

XL. There were a set of fanatics among the Lutherans, who in the flights of their enthusiasm far surpassed those now mentioned, and who had such a high notion of their own abilities as to attempt melting down the present form of religion, and casting a new system of piety after a model drawn from their wanton and irregular fancies; it is with some account of the principal of these spiritual projectors that we shall conclude the history of the Lutheran church during this century.

At the head of this visionary tribe we may place Jacob Behmen, a taylor at Gorlitz, who was remarkable for the multitude of his patrons and adversaries, and whom his admirers commonly called the German Theosophist. This man had a natural propensity toward the investigation of mysteries, and was fond of abstruse and intricate inquiries of every kind; and having, partly by books, and partly by conversation with certain physicians,[c] acquired some knowledge of the doctrine of Robert Fludd and the Rosecrusians, which was propagated in Germany with great ostentation during this century, he struck out of the element of fire, by the succours of imagination, a species of theology much more obscure than the numbers of Pythagoras, or the intricacies of Heraclitus. Some have bestowed high praises on this enthusiast, on account of his piety, integrity, and sincere love of truth and virtue; and we shall not presume to contradict these encomiums. But such as carry their admiration of his doctrine so far as to honour him with the character of an inspired messenger of Heaven, or even of a judicious and wise philosopher, must be themselves deceived and blinded in a very high degree; for never did there reign such obscurity and confusion in the writings of any mortal, as in the miserable productions of Jacob Behmen, which exhibit a motley mixture of chemical terms, crude visions, and mystic jargon. Among other dreams of a disturbed and eccentric fancy, he entertained the following chimerical notion: "That the divine grace operates by the same rules, and follows the same methods, which the divine providence observes in the natural world, and that the minds of men are purged from their vices and corruptions in the same way that metals are purified from their dross;" and this maxim was the principle of his fire-theology. Behmen had a considerable number of followers in this century, the most eminent of whom were John Louis Giftheil, John Angelus Werdenhagen, Abraham Frankenberg, Theodore Tzetsch, Paul Felgenhauer, Quirinus Kuhlman, John Jacob Zimmermann; and he has still many votaries and admirers even in our times. Some of his followers retained, notwithstanding their attachment to his extravagant system, a certain degree of moderation and good sense, while others seemed entirely out of their wits, and by their phrensy excited the compassion of those who were the spectators of their conduct; such were Kuhlman and Gichtel, of whom the former was burned at Moscow in 1684; but, indeed, it may be affirmed in general, that none of his disciples propagated his doctrine, or conducted themselves, in such a manner as to do honour either to their master or to his cause in the judgment of the wise.[d]

XLI. Another class of persons, who deserve to be placed immediately after Behmen, were they, whom a disordered brain persuaded that they were prophets sent from above, and that they were divinely inspired with the power of prediction. A considerable number of these delirious fanatics arose in this century, more especially at that juncture when the house of Austria was employed in maintaining its power in the empire, against the united armies of Sweden, France, and Germany. It is remarkable, that pretended prophets and diviners are never more numerous than at those critical and striking periods when great revolutions are expected, or sudden and heavy calamities have happened, as such periods, and the scenes they exhibit, inflame the imagination of the fanatic, and may be turned to the profit of the impostor. The most eminent of the fanatical prophets now under consideration, were Nicholas Drabicius, Christopher Kotter, Christina Poniatovia (all of whom found an eloquent defender and patron in John Amos Comenius,) Joachim Greulich, Anne Vetter, Mary Frölich, and George Reichard; beside several others, who audaciously assumed the same character. It is not necessary to enter into a circumstantial detail of the history of this visionary tribe, since none of them arose to such a degree of reputation and consequence, as to occasion any considerable tumults by their pretended predictions. It is sufficient to have observed in general, that, even in this century, there were among the Lutherans some crazy fanatics, who, under the impulse of a disordered imagination, assumed the character and authority of prophets sent from above to enlighten the world.[e]

XLII. It will not, however, be improper to mention,

[a] See Arnoldi Hist. Eccles. p. ii. lib. xvii. cap. vi. p. 940.—Weismanni Histor. Eccles. sæc. XVII. p. 1174, 1189.—Godof. Balth, Scharfii. Supplementum Historiæ Litisque Arndtianæ.

[b] There is an account of Weigel, more ample than impartial, given by Arnold, lib. xvii. cap. xvii. p. 1088.

[c] Tobias Kober and Balthaser Walther.

[d] It is needless to mention the writers who employed their pens in stemming the torrent of Behmen's enthusiasm. The works of this fanatic are in every body's hands, and the books that were composed to refute them are well known, and to be found every where. All that has been alleged, in his favour and defence, has been carefully collected by Arnold, who is, generally speaking, peculiarly eloquent in the praises of those whom others treat with contempt. For an account of Kuhlman, and his unhappy fate see the German work, entitled, Unschuld. Nachrichten, An. 1748.

☞ Behmen, however, had the good fortune to meet with, in our days, a warm advocate and an industrious disciple, in the late well-meaning but gloomy and visionary Mr. William Law, who employed himself, for many years, in preparing a new edition and translation of Behmen's works, which, after his death, a friend gave to the world.

[e] Arnold is to be commended for giving us an accurate collection of the transactions and visions of these enthusiasts, in the third and fourth parts of his History of Heretics, since those who are desirous of full information in this matter may easily see, by consulting this historian, that the pretended revelations of these prophets were no more than the phantoms of a disordered imagination. A pious but ignorant man, named Benedict Bahnsen, who was a native of Holstein, and lived at Amsterdam about the middle of the seventeenth century, was so delighted with the effusions and writings of these fanatics, that he collected them carefully, and published them. In 1670, a catalogue of his library

somewhat more circumstantially, the case of those, who, though they did not arrive at that enormous height of folly which leads men to pretend to divine inspiration, yet deceived themselves and deluded others, by entertaining and propagating the strangest fancies, and the most monstrous and impious absurdities. Some time after the commencement of this century, Isaiah Stiefel and Ezekiel Meth, natives of Thuringia, were observed to throw out the most extraordinary and shocking expressions, while they spoke of themselves and their religious attainments. These expressions, in the judgment of many, amounted to nothing less, than attributing to themselves the divine glory and majesty, and thus implied a blasphemous, or rather a phrenetic, insult on the Supreme Being and his eternal Son. It is nevertheless scarcely credible, however irrational we may suppose them to have been, that these fanatics should have carried their perverse and absurd fancies to such an amazing height; and it would perhaps be more agreeable both to truth and charity to suppose, that they only imitated the pompous and turgid language of the mystic writers in such an extravagant manner, as to give occasion to the heavy accusation above stated. Considering the matter even in this candid and charitable light, we may see by their examples what an effect the constant perusal of the writings of the Mystics may have in shedding darkness, delusion, and folly, into the imaginations of weak and ignorant men.[a] The reveries of Paul Nagel, professor of divinity at Leipsic, were highly absurd, but of a less pernicious tendency than those already mentioned. This prophetic dreamer, who had received a superficial tincture of mathematical knowledge, pretended to see, in the position of the stars, the events that were to happen in church and state; and, from a view of these celestial bodies, affected to foretell, in a more particular manner, the erection of a new and most holy kingdom in which Christ should reign here upon earth.[b]

XLIII. Christian Hoburg, a native of Lunenburg, a man of a turbulent and inconstant spirit, and not more remarkable for his violence, than for his duplicity, threw out the most bitter reproaches and invectives against the whole Lutheran church without exception,[c] and thereby involved himself in various perplexities. He long deceived the multitude by his dissimulation and hypocrisy; and, by a series of frauds, which he undoubtedly looked upon as lawful, he so far disguised his true character that he appeared to many, and especially to persons of a candid and charitable turn, much less contemptible than he was in reality; and though the acrimony and violence of his proceedings were condemned, yet they were supposed to be directed, not against religion itself, but against the licentiousness and vices of its professors, and particularly of its ministers. At length, however, the mask fell from the face of this hypocrite, who became an object of general indignation and contempt, and, deserting the communion of the Lutheran church, went over to the Mennonites.[d] There was a striking resemblance between this petulant railer and Frederic Breckling; the latter, however, surpassed even the former in impetuosity and malignity. Breckling had been pastor, first in the duchy of Holstein, and afterwards at Zwoll, a city in the United Provinces, where he was desposed from his ministry, and lived many years afterward without being attached to any religious sect or community. There are several of his writings extant, which, indeed, recommend warmly the practice of piety and virtue, and seem to express the most implacable abhorrence of vicious persons and licentious manners; and yet, at the same time, they demonstrate plainly that their author was destitute of that charity, prudence, meekness, patience, and love of truth, which are essential and fundamental virtues of a real Christian.[e] It is undoubtedly a just matter of surprise, that these vehement declaimers against the established religion and its ministers, who pretend to be so much more sagacious and sharp-sighted than their brethren, do not perceive a truth, which the most simple may learn from daily observation; even that nothing is more odious and disgusting than an angry, petulant, and violent reformer, who comes to heal the disorders of a community, armed as it were with fire and sword, with menaces and terrors. We may also wonder, that these men are not aware of another consideration equally obvious, namely, that it is scarcely credible, that a *spiritual* physician will cure another with entire success of the disorders under which he himself is known to labour.

George Laurence Seidenbecher, pastor at Eisfeld in Saxony, adopted himself, and propagated among the multitude, the doctrine of the Millennium, which scarcely ever gains admittance but in disordered brains, and rarely produces any other fruits than incoherent dreams and idle visions. Seidenbecher was censured on account of this doctrine, and deposed from his pastoral charge.[b]

XLIV. It would be superfluous to name the other fanatics that seem to demand a place in the class now before us, since they almost all laboured under the same disorder, and such uniformity prevailed in their sentiments and conduct, that the history of one may in a great measure be considered as the history of all. We shall therefore conclude this crazy list with a short account of the very worst of the whole tribe, namely, Martin Seidel, a native of Silesia, who endeavoured to form a sect in Poland toward the conclusion of the preceding century and the commencement of this, but could not find followers, even among the Socinians; so wild were his views, and so extravagant his notions. This audacious adventurer in religious novelty was of opinion, that God had, indeed, promised a Saviour or Messiah to the Jews; but that this Messiah had never appeared, and never would appear, on account of the sins of the Jewish people, which rendered them unworthy of this great deliverer. Hence he concluded, that it was erroneous to look upon Christ as the Messiah; that the only office of Jesus was, to interpret and republish the law of nature, which had been

was printed at Amsterdam, which was full of chemical, fanatical, and pretendedly-prophetic books.

[a] See Arnold's Historia Eccles. p. iii. cap. iv. p. 32.—Thomasius' German work, entitled, Histoire der Weisheit und Narrheit, vol. i.

[b] Arnold, p. iii. cap. v. p. 53.—Andr. Caroli Memorabilia Ecclesiæ, sæc. XVII. in parte i. lib. iii. cap. iv. p. 513.

[c] Hoburg, in some of his petulant and satirical writings, assumed the names of Elias Prætorius and Bernard Baumann.

[d] Arnold, p. iii. cap. xiii. p. 130.—Andr. Caroli Mem. Eccles. vol. i. p. 1065. Jo. Hornbeck's Summa Controvers. p. 535.—Moller's Cimbria Literata, tom. ii. p. 337.

[e] Arnold has given an account of Breckling, in the third and fourth parts of his History; he has also published some of his writings, which sufficiently demonstrate the irregularity and exuberance of his fancy. There is a particular account of this degraded pastor given in the Cimbria Literata, tom. iii. p. 72.

[f] There is a circumstantial account of this man given by Alb. Meno. Verpoorten, in his Commentat. de Vitâ et Institutis G. L. Seidenbecheri.

perverted and obscured by the vices, corruptions, and ignorance of men; and that the whole duty of men, and all the obligations of religion, were fulfilled by an obedience to this law, republished and explained by Jesus Christ. To render this doctrine more defensible and specious, or, at least, to get rid of a multitude of arguments and express declarations that might be drawn from the Scriptures to prove its absurdity, he boldly rejected all the books of the New Testament. The small number of disciples, that adopted the fancies of this intrepid innovator, were denominated *semi-judaizers*.[a] Had he appeared in our times, he would have given less offence than at the period in which he lived; for, if we except his singular notion concerning the Messiah, his doctrine was such as would at present be highly agreeable to many persons in Great-Britain, Holland, and other countries.[b]

CHAPTER II.

The History of the Reformed Church.

I. IT has been already observed, that the Reformed Church, considered in the most comprehensive sense of that term, as forming a *whole*, composed of a great variety of parts, is rather united by the principles of moderation and fraternal charity, than by a perfect uniformity in doctrine, discipline, and worship. It will, therefore, be proper first to take a view of those events which related to this great body collectively considered, and afterwards to enter into a detail of the most memorable occurrences that happened in the particular communities of which it is composed. The principal accessions it received during this century have already been mentioned, when, in the history of the Lutheran church, we related the changes and commotions that happened in the principalities of Hesse-Cassel and Brandenburg.[c] These, however, were not the only changes that took place in favour of the reformed church. Its doctrine was embraced, early in this century, by Adolphus, duke of Holstein; and it was naturally expected, that the subjects would follow the example of their prince: but this expectation was disappointed by the death of Adolphus, in 1616.[d] Henry, duke of Saxony, withdrew also from the communion of the Lutherans, in whose religious principles he had been educated, and, in 1688, embraced the doctrine of the reformed church at Dessau, in consequence, as some allege, of the solicitations of his duchess.[e] In Denmark, about the beginning of this century, there were still a considerable number of persons who secretly espoused the sentiments of that church, and more especially could never reconcile themselves to the Lutheran doctrine of Christ's bodily presence with the sacrament of the eucharist. They were confirmed in their attachment to the tenets of the reformed by Hemming, and the other followers of Melanchthon, whose secret ministry and public writings were attended with considerable success. The face of things, however, changed; and the reformed in Denmark saw their expectations vanish, and their credit sink, in 1614, when Canute, bishop of Gothenburg, who had given too plain intimations of his propensity to the doctrines of Calvin, was deprived of his episcopal dignity.[f] The progress of the reformed religion in Africa, Asia, and America, is abundantly known; it was carried into those distant regions by the English and Dutch emigrants, who formed settlements there for the purposes of commerce, and founded flourishing churches in the various provinces where they fixed their habitations. It is also known, that, in several places where Lutheranism was established, the French, German, and British members of the reformed church were allowed to enjoy the free exercise of their religion.

II. Of all the calamities that tended to diminish the influence, and eclipse the lustre, of the reformed church, none proved more dismal in its circumstances, and more unhappy in its effects, than the deplorable fate of that church in France. From the time of the accession of Henry IV. to the throne of that kingdom, this church had acquired the form of a body-politic.[g] Its members were endowed with considerable privileges; they were also secured against insults of every kind by a solemn edict, and possessed several fortified places, particularly the strong city of Rochelle; in which, to render their security still more complete, they were permitted to have their own garrisons. This body politic was not, indeed, always under the influence and direction of leaders eminent for their prudence, or distinguished by their permanent attachment to the interests of the crown, and the person of the sovereign. Truth and candour oblige us to acknowledge, that the Reformed conducted themselves, on some occasions, in a manner inconsistent with the demands of regular subordination. Sometimes, amidst the broils and tumults of faction, they joined the parties that opposed the government; at others, they took important steps without the king's approbation or consent; they even went so far as to solicit, more than once, without so much as disguising their measures, the alliance and friendship of England and Holland, and formed views which, at least in appearance, were scarcely consistent with the tranquillity of the kingdom, or with a proper respect for the authority of its monarch. Hence contests arose in 1621, and subsisted long, between Louis XIII. and his protestant subjects; and these civil broils furnished a pretence for the severe and despotic maxim of

[a] See Gustavi Georgii Zeltneri Historia Crypto-Socinismi Altorffini, vol. i. p. 268, 335.

☞ [b] We are much at a loss to know what Dr. Mosheim means by this insinuation, as also the persons he has in view; for, on one hand, it is sufficiently evident he cannot mean the deists; and, on the other, we know of no denomination of Christians, who "boldly reject all the books of the New Testament." Our author probably meant that the part of Seidel's doctrine which represents Christ's mission as only designed to republish and interpret the law of nature, and the whole religious and moral duty of man, as consisting in an obedience to this law, would have been well received by many persons in Great-Britain and Holland; but he should have said so; nothing requires such precision as accusations.

[c] See sect. ii. part ii. chap. i. sect. i. ii. where the History of the Lutheran church commences with an account of the loss which that church sustained by the secession of Maurice, landgrave of Hesse-Cassel, and John Sigismund, elector of Brandenburg, who embraced solemnly the doctrine of the reformed church, the former in 1604, and the latter in 1614.

[d] Jo. Molleri Introd. ad Histor. Chersonesi Cimbricæ, p. ii. p. 101.—Erici Pontoppidani Annales Ecclesiæ Danicæ Diplomatici, tom. iii. p. 691.

[e] See Moebii Selectæ Disp. Theolog. p. 1137. The duke of Saxony published a Confession of his Faith, containing the reasons of his change. This piece, which the divines of Leipsic were obliged by a public order to refute, was defended against their attacks by the learned Isaac de Beausobre, at that time pastor at Magdeburg, in a book entitled, "Defense de la Doctrine des Reformés, et en particulier de la Confession de S. A. S. Mon-Seigneur le Duc Henri de Saxe, contre un Livre composé par la Faculté de Theologie à Leipsic."

[f] Pontoppidani Annal. Eccles. Danicæ, tom. iii. p. 695.

[g] *Imperium in imperio*, i. e. an empire within an empire.

Richelieu, the first minister of that monarch, that the kingdom could never enjoy the sweets of peace, or the satisfaction that was founded upon the assurance of public safety, before the protestants were deprived of their towns and strong-holds, and before their rights and privileges, together with their ecclesiastical polity, were crushed to pieces, and totally suppressed. This haughty minister, after many violent efforts and hard struggles, at length obtained his purpose; for, in 1628, Rochelle, the chief bulwark of the reformed interest in France, was taken, after a long and difficult siege, and annexed to the crown. From this fatal event the party, defenceless and naked, dated its decline; since, after the reduction of their chief city, these protestants had no other resource than the pure clemency and generosity of their sovereign.[a] Those who judge of the reduction of this place by the maxims of civil policy, consider the conduct of the French court as entirely consistent with the principles both of wisdom and justice; since nothing can be more detrimental to the tranquillity and safety of any nation, than a body politic erected in its bosom, independent of the supreme authority of the state, and secured against its influence or inspection by an external force; and if the French monarch, satisfied with depriving the Protestants of their strong-holds, had continued to maintain them in the possession of that liberty of conscience, and that free exercise of their religion, for which they had shed so much blood, and to the enjoyment of which their eminent services to the house of Bourbon had given them such a fair and illustrious claim, it is highly probable that they would have borne with patience this infraction of their privileges, and the loss of that liberty which had been confirmed to them by the most solemn edicts.

III. But the court and the despotic minister were not satisfied with this success. Having destroyed that form of civil polity which had been annexed to the reformed church as a security for the maintenance of its religious privileges, and was afterwards considered as detrimental to the supreme authority of the state, they proceeded still farther, and regardless of the royal faith, confirmed by the most solemn declarations, perfidiously invaded those privileges of the church which were merely of a spiritual and religious nature. At first, the court, and the ministers of its tyranny, put in practice all the arts of insinuation and persuasion, in order to gain over the heads of the reformed church, and the more learned and celebrated ministers of that communion. Pathetic exhortations and alluring promises were tried; artful interpretations of those doctrines of popery which were most disagreeable to the Protestants were brought forward; in a word, every insidious method was employed to conquer their aversion to the church of Rome. Richelieu exhausted all the resources of his dexterity and artifice, and eagerly practised, with the most industrious assiduity, all the means that he thought the most adapted to seduce the protestants into the Romish communion. When all these stratagems were observed to produce little or no effect, barbarity and violence were employed to extirpate and destroy a set of men, whom mean perfidy could not seduce, and whom weak arguments were insufficient to convince. The most inhuman laws that the blind rage of bigotry could dictate, the most oppressive measures that the ingenious efforts of malice could invent, were put in execution to damp the courage of a party become odious by their resolute adherence to the dictates of their consciences, and to bring them by force under the yoke of Rome. The French bishops distinguished themselves by their intemperate and unchristian zeal in this horrid scene of persecution and cruelty: many of the protestants sunk under the weight of despotic oppression, and yielded up their faith to armed legions, that were sent to convert them; a considerable number fled from the storm, and deserted their families, their friends, and their country; and the greatest part persevered, with a noble and heroic constancy, in the purity of that religion, which their ancestors had delivered, and happily separated, from the manifold superstitions of a corrupt and idolatrous church.

IV. When at length every method which artifice or perfidy could invent had been practised in vain against the protestants under the reign of Louis XIV., the bishops and Jesuits, whose counsels had a peculiar influence in the cabinet of that prince, judged it necessary to extirpate by fire and sword, this resolute people, and thus to ruin, as it were by one mortal blow, the cause of the Reformation in France. Their insidious arguments and importunate solicitations had such an effect upon the weak and credulous mind of Louis, that, in 1685, trampling on the most solemn obligations, and regardless of all laws, human and divine, he revoked the edict of Nantes, and thereby deprived the protestants of the liberty of serving God according to their consciences. This revocation was accompanied with the applause of Rome; but it excited the indignation even of many Roman Catholics, whose bigotry had not effaced or suspended, on this occasion, their natural sentiments of generosity and justice. It was, moreover, followed by a measure still more tyrannical and shocking, even an express order, addressed to all the reformed churches, to embrace the Romish faith. The consequences of this cruel and unrighteous proceeding were highly detrimental to the true interests and the real prosperity of the French nation,[b] by the prodigious emigrations it occasioned among the Protestants, who sought, in various parts of Europe, that religious liberty, and that humane treatment, which their mother-country had so cruelly refused them. Those among them, whom the vigilance of their enemies guarded so closely as to

[a] See Le Clerc, Vie du Cardinal Richelieu, tom. i. p. 69, 77, 177, 199, 269.—Le Vassor, Histoire de Louis XIII. tom. iii. p. 676, tom. iv. p. 1, and the following volumes. See also the third, fourth, and fifth volumes of the Memoirs of Sully (the friend and confidant of Henry IV.) who, though a protestant, acknowledges frankly the errors of his party.

[b] See the Life of Isaac de Beausobre, written by the ingenious Armand de la Chapelle, and subjoined to Beausobre's Remarques Historiques, Critiques, et Philologiques sur le Nouveau Testament.

☞ Some late hireling writers, employed by the Jesuits, have been audacious enough to plead the cause of the revocation of the edict of Nantes. But it must be observed, to the honour of the French nation, that these impotent attempts, to justify the measures of a persecuting and unrelenting priesthood, have been treated almost universally at Paris with indignation and contempt. They who are desirous of seeing a true statement of the losses the French nation sustained, by the revocation of that famous edict, have only to consult the curious and authentic account of the state of that nation, taken from memorials drawn up by the intendants of the several provinces, for the use of the duke of Burgundy, and published in 1727 with the following title: "Etat de la France, extrait, par M. le Comte de Boulainvilliers, des Memoirés dressés par les Intendans du Royaume, par l'Ordre du Roi Louis XIV. à la Solicitation du Duc de Bourgogne." See also Voltaire, Sur la Tolerance, p. 41 and 201; and, for an account of the conduct of the French court toward the protestants at that dismal period, see the incomparable memorial of the learned and pious Claude, entitled, Plaintes des Protestans de France.

prevent their flight, were exposed to the brutal rage of an unrelenting soldiery, and were assailed by every barbarous form of persecution that might tend to subdue their courage, exhaust their patience, and thus engage them to a feigned and external profession of popery, which in their consciences they beheld with the utmost aversion and disgust. This crying act of perfidy and injustice in a prince, who, on other occasions, gave evident proofs of his generosity and equity, sufficient to show, in their true and genuine colours, the spirit of the Romish church and pontiffs, and the manner in which they stand affected to those whom they consider as *heretics*. It is peculiarly adapted to convince the impartial and attentive observer, that the most solemn oaths, and the most sacred treaties, are never looked upon by this church and its pontiffs as respectable and obligatory, when the violation of them may contribute to advance their interest, or to accomplish their views.

V. The Waldenses, who lived in the vallies of Piedmont, and had embraced the doctrine, discipline, and worship of the church of Geneva, were oppressed and persecuted, in the most inhuman manner, during the greatest part of this century, by the ministers of Rome. This persecution was carried on with peculiar marks of rage and enormity in the years 1655, 1686, and 1696, and seemed to portend nothing less than the total extinction of that unhappy nation.[a] The most horrid scenes of violence and bloodshed were exhibited on this theatre of papal tyranny; and the small numbers of the Waldenses that yet survive, are indebted for their existence and support, precarious and uncertain as it is, to the continual intercession made for them by the English and Dutch governments, and also by the Swiss cantons, who never cease to solicit the clemency of the duke of Savoy in their behalf.

The church of the Palatinate, which had been long at the head of the Reformed churches in Germany, declined apace from the year 1685, when a catholic prince was raised to that electorate. This decline became at length so visible, that, instead of being the first, it was the least considerable of all the Protestant assemblies in that country.

VI. The eminent and illustrious figure that the principal members of the reformed church made in the learned world is too well known, and the reputation they acquired, by a successful application to the various branches of literature and science, is too well established, to require our entering into a circumstantial detail upon that head. We shall also pass in silence the names of those celebrated men who have acquired immortal fame by their writings, and transmitted their eminent usefulness to succeeding times in their learned and pious productions. Out of the copious list of famous authors that adorned this church, it would be difficult to select the most eminent; and this is a sufficient reason for our silence.[b] The supreme guide and legislator of such as applied themselves to the study of philosophy had been Aristotle, who, for a long time, reigned unrivalled in the reformed, as well as in the Lutheran schools, and was exhibited, in both, not in his natural and genuine aspect, but in the motley and uncouth form in which he had been dressed up by the scholastic doctors. But, when Gassendi and Des-Cartes appeared, the Stagirite began to decline, and his fame and authority diminished gradually. Among the French and Dutch, many adopted the Cartesian philosophy on its first promulgation; and a considerable number of the English embraced the principles of Gassendi, and were singularly pleased with his prudent and candid manner of investigating truth. The Aristotelians every where, and more especially in Holland, were greatly alarmed at this revolution in the philosophical world, and set themselves, with all their vigour, to oppose its progress. They endeavoured to persuade the people, that the cause of truth and religion must suffer considerably by the efforts that were made to dethrone Aristotle, and bring into disrepute the doctrine of his interpreters; but the principal cause of their anxiety and zeal, was the apprehension of losing their places in the public schools; a thought which they could not bear with any degree of patience.[c] However, the powerful lustre of truth, which unfolded daily more and more its engaging charms, and the love of liberty, which had been kept in chains by Peripatetic tyranny, obliged this obstinate sect to yield, and reduced them to silence; and hence it is, that the doctors of the reformed church carry on, at this day, their philosophical inquiries with the same freedom that is observable among the Lutherans. It may, indeed, be a question with some, whether Aristotle be not, even yet, secretly revered in some of the English universities. It is at least certain, that, although, under the government of Charles II. and in the two succeeding reigns, the mathematical philosophy had made a most extensive progress in Great-Britain, there were, both at Oxford and Cambridge, some doctors who preferred the ancient system of the schools to the new discoveries now under consideration.

VII. All the interpreters and expositors of Scripture that made a figure in the reformed church about the commencement of this century, followed scrupulously the method of Calvin in their illustrations of the sacred writings, and unfolded the true and natural signification of the words of Scripture, without perplexing their brains to find out deep mysteries in plain expressions, or to force, by the inventive efforts of fancy, a variety of singular notions from the metaphorical language that is frequently

[a] Leger, Histoire Generale des Eglises Vaudoises, p. ii. c. vi. p. 72.—Gilles, Histoire Ecclesiast. des Eglises Vaudoises, ch. xlix. p. 353.—A particular history of the persecution suffered by these victims of papal cruelty in 1686, appeared at Rotterdam in 1688.

☞ See also a pamphlet, entitled, An Account of the late Persecutions of the Waldenses by the duke of Savoy and the French king in 1686; and likewise a detail of the miseries endured by these unfortunate objects of papal persecution in the years 1655, 1662, 1663, and 1686, related by Peter Boyer, in his history of the Vaudois.

☞ [b] The list of the eminent divines and men of learning who were ornaments to the Reformed church in the seventeenth century, is indeed extremely ample. Among those who adorned Great Britain, we shall always remember, with peculiar veneration, the immortal names of Newton, Barrow, Cudworth, Boyle, Chillingworth, Usher, Bedell, Hall, Pocock, Fell, Lightfoot, Hammond, Calamy, Walton, Baxter, Pearson, Stillingfleet, Mede, Parker, Oughtred, Burnet, Tillotson, and many others well known in the literary world. In Germany we find Pareus, Scultet, Fabricius, the two Altings, Pelargus, and Bergius; in Switzerland and Geneva, Hospinian, the two Buxtorfs, Hottinger, Heidegger, and Turretin. In the churches and universities of Holland, we meet with the following learned divines: Drusus, Amama, Gomar, Rivet, Cloppenburg, Vossius, Cocceius, Voet, Des-Marets, Heidan, Momma, Burman, Wittichius, Hornbeck, the Spanheims, Le Moine, De Maestricht, and others. Among the French doctors, we may reckon Cameron, Chamier, Du-Moulin, Mestrezat, Blondel, Drelincourt, Daillé, Amyrault, the two Capels, De la Place, Gamstole, Croy, Morus, Le Blanc, Pajon, Bochart, Claude, Allix, Jurieu, Basnage, Abbadie, Beausobre, L'Enfant, Martin, Des-Vignoles, &c.

[c] See Baillet's Vie de René Des-Cartes.

used by the inspired writers. This attachment to the method of Calvin, was indeed considerably diminished, in the sequel, by the credit and influence of two celebrated commentators, who struck out new paths in the sphere of sacred criticism. These were Hugo Grotius, and John Cocceius. The former departed less from the manner of interpretation generally received than the latter. Like Calvin, he followed in his commentaries, both in the Old and New Testament, the literal and obvious signification of the words employed by the sacred writers; but he differed considerably from that great man in his manner of explaining the predictions of the prophets. The hypothesis of Grotius, upon that important subject, amounts to this: "That the predictions of the ancient prophets were all accomplished in the events to which they directly pointed before the coming of Christ; and that therefore the natural and obvious sense and import of the words and phrases, in which they were delivered, do not terminate in our blessed Lord; but that in some of these predictions, and more especially in those which the writers of the New Testament apply to Christ, there is, beside the literal and obvious signification, a hidden and mysterious sense, that lies concealed under the external mask of certain persons, events, and actions, which are *representative* of the person, ministry, sufferings, and merits of the Son of God."

The method of Cocceius was entirely different from this. He looked upon the whole history of the Old Testament as a perpetual and uninterrupted representation or mirror of the history of the divine Saviour, and of the Christian church; he maintained, moreover, that all the prophecies have a literal and direct relation to Christ; and he finished his romantic system by laying it down as a certain maxim, that all the events and revolutions which shall happen in the church, until the end of time, are prefigured and pointed out, though not all with the same degree of evidence and perspicuity, in different places of the Old Testament.[a] Each of these eminent commentators had his zealous disciples and followers. The Arminians in general, many of the English and French divines, together with those warm votaries of ancient Calvinism who are called Voetians (from their chief Gisbert Voet, the Great adversary of Cocceius,) adopted the method of interpreting Scripture introduced by Grotius. On the other hand, many of the Dutch, Swiss, and Germans, were singularly delighted with the learned fancies of Cocceius. There are, however, still great numbers of prudent and impartial divines, who, considering the extremes into which these two eminent critics ran, and disposed to profit by what is really solid in both their systems, neither reject nor embrace their opinions in the aggregate, but agree with them both in some things, and differ from them both in others. It may also be observed, that neither the followers of Grotius nor those of Cocceius are agreed among themselves, and that these two general classes of expositors may be divided into many subordinate ones. A considerable number of English divines of the episcopal church refused to adopt the opinions, or to respect the authority, of these modern expositors; they appealed to the decisions of the primitive fathers, and maintained, that the sacred writings ought always to be understood in that sense *only*, which has been attributed to them by these ancient doctors of the rising church.[b]

VIII. The doctrines of Christianity, which had been so sadly disfigured among the Lutherans by the obscure jargon and the intricate tenets of the scholastic philosophy, met with the same fate in the Reformed churches. The first successful effort, that prevented these churches from falling entirely under the Aristotelian yoke, was made by the Arminians, who were remarkable for expounding, with simplicity and perspicuity, the truths and precepts of religion, and who censured, with great plainness and severity, those ostentatious doctors, who affected to render them obscure and unintelligible, by expressing them in the *terms*, and reducing them under the *classes* and divisions, used in the schools. The Cartesians and Cocceians contributed also to deliver theology from the chains of the Peripatetics; though it must be allowed, that it had not, in some respects, a much better fate in the hands of these its deliverers. The Cartesians applied the principles and tenets of their philosophy, in illustrating the doctrines of the Gospel; the Cocceians imagined, that they could not give a more sublime and engaging aspect to the Christian religion, than by representing it under the notion, of a *covenant* concluded between God and man;[c] and both these modes of proceeding were disliked by the wisest and most learned divines of the reformed church. They com-

[a] It is become almost a proverbial saying, that in the Books of the Old Testament Cocceius finds Christ every where, while Grotius meets him no where. The first part of this saying is certainly true; the latter much less so: for it appears, with sufficient evidence, from the Commentaries of Grotius, that he finds Christ prefigured in many places of the Old Testament, not, indeed, *directly* in the *letter* of the prophecies, where Cocceius discovers him, but *mysteriously*, under the appearance of certain persons, and in the *secret* sense of certain transactions.

☞ [b] These have been confuted by the learned Dr. Whitby, in his important work, concerning the Interpretation of Scripture after the Manner of the Fathers, which was published in 1714, under the following title: "Dissertatio de Scripturarum Interpretatione secundum Patrum Commentarios," &c.—In this dissertation, which was the forerunner of the many remarkable attempts that were afterwards made to deliver the right of private judgment in matters of religion, from the restraints of human authority, the judicious author has shown, first, that the Scripture is the only rule of faith, and that by it alone we are to judge of the doctrines that are necessary to salvation; secondly, that the fathers, both of the primitive times and also of succeeding ages, are extremely deficient and unsuccessful in their explications of the sacred writings; and, thirdly, that it is impossible to terminate the debates concerning the Trinity, by the opinions of the fathers, the decisions of councils, or by any tradition which is really universal. The contradictions, absurdities, the romantic conceits and extravagant fancies, that are to be found in the commentaries of the fathers, were never represented in such a ridiculous point of view as they are in this performance. The worst part of the matter is, that such a production as Dr. Whitby's, in which all the mistakes of these ancient expositors are culled out and compiled with such care, may tend to prejudice young students even against what may be good in their writings, and thus give them a disgust to a kind of study, which, when conducted with impartiality and prudence, has its uses. It is the infirmity of our nature to be fond of extremes.

☞ [c] It is somewhat surprising, that Dr. Mosheim should mention this circumstance as an invention of Cocceius, or as a manner of speaking peculiar to him. The representation of the Gospel dispensation under the idea of a *Covenant*, whether this representation be literal or metaphorical, is to be found, almost every where, in the Epistles of St. Paul, and of the other apostles, though rarely, (scarcely more than twice) in the Gospels. The same phraseology has also been adopted by Christians of almost all denominations. It is, indeed, a manner of speaking that has been grossly abused by those divines, who, urging the metaphor too closely, exhibit the sublime transactions of the divine wisdom under the narrow and imperfect forms of human tribunals, and thus lead to false notions of the springs of action, as well as of the dispensations and attributes of the Supreme Being. We have remarkable instances of this abuse, in a book lately translated into English; I mean the Œconomy of the Covenants, by Witsius, in which that learned and pious man, who has deservedly gained an eminent reputation by other valuable productions, has inconsiderately introduced the captious, formal, and trivial terms, employed in human courts, into his descriptions of the stupendous scheme of redemption.

plained with reason, that the tenets and distinctions of the Cartesian philosophy had as evident a tendency to render the doctrines of Christianity obscure and intricate as the abstruse terms, and the endless divisions and subdivisions of the Peripatetics. They observed also, that the metaphor of a covenant, applied to the Christian religion, must be attended with many inconveniences, by leading uninstructed minds to form a variety of ill-grounded notions, which is the ordinary consequence of straining metaphors; and that it must contribute to introduce into the colleges of divinity the captious terms, distinctions, and quibbles, that are employed in the ordinary courts of justice, and thus give rise to the most trifling and ill-judged discussions and debates about religious matters. Accordingly, the greatest part, both of the British and French doctors, refused to admit the intricacies of Cartesianism or the imagery of Cocceius into their theological system, and followed the free, easy, and unaffected method of the Arminian divines in illustrating the truths, and enforcing the duties of Christianity.

IX. We have had occasion to observe, that Dr. William Ames, a Scottish divine, was one of the first among the Reformed who attempted to treat morality as a separate science, to consider it abstractedly from its connexion with any particular system of doctrine, and to introduce new light, and a new degree of accuracy and precision, into this master-science of life and manners. The attempt was laudable, had it been well executed; but the system of this learned writer was dry, theoretical, and subtle, and was thus much more adapted to the instruction of the studious than to the practical direction of the Christian. The Arminians, who are known to be much more zealous in enforcing the duties of Christianity than in illustrating its truths, and who generally employ more pains in directing the will than in enlightening the understanding, engaged several authors of note to exhibit the precepts and obligations of morality in a more useful, practical, and popular manner; but the English and French surpassed all the moral writers of the reformed church in penetration and solidity, and in the ease, freedom, and perspicuity, of their method and compositions. Moses Amyrault, a man of a sound understanding and subtle genius, was the first French divine who distinguished himself in this kind of writing. He composed an accurate and elaborate system of morality, in a style, indeed, that is now obsolete; and those more moderate French writers, such as La Placette and Pictet, who acquired such a high reputation on account of their moral writings, owe to the excellent work now mentioned a considerable part of their glory. While England groaned under the horrors and tumults of a civil war, it was chiefly the Presbyterians and Independents that employed their talents and their pens in promoting the cause of practical religion. During this unhappy period, indeed, these doctors were remarkable for the austere gravity of their manners, and for a melancholy complexion and turn of mind which appeared abundantly in their compositions. Some of these were penned with such rigour and severity, as discovered either a total ignorance of the present imperfect state of humanity, or an entire want of indulgence for its unavoidable infirmities. Others were composed with a spirit of enthusiasm, that betrayed an evident propensity to the doctrine of the Mystics. But, when Hobbes appeared, the scene changed. A new set of illustrious and excellent writers arose to defend the truths of religion, and the obligations of morality, against this author, who aimed at the destruction of both, since he subjected the unchangeable nature of religion to the arbitrary will of the sovereign, and endeavoured to efface the eternal distinction that exists between moral good and evil. Cudworth, Cumberland, Sharrock, and others,[a] alarmed at the view of a system so false in its principles, and so pernicious in its effects, rendered eminent service to the cause of religion and morals by their immortal labours, in which, rising to the first principles of things, and opening the primitive and eternal fountains of truth and good, they illustrated clearly the doctrines of the one with the fairest evidence, and established the obligations of the other on the firmest foundations.

X. About the commencement of this century, the college of Geneva was in such high repute among the reformed churches, that it was resorted to from all quarters by persons who were desirous of a learned education, and more especially by those students of theology, whose circumstances in life permitted them to frequent this famous seminary.[b] Hence it very naturally happened, that the opinions of Calvin, concerning the decrees of God and divine grace, became daily more general, and were gradually introduced every where into the schools of learning. There was not, however, any public law or confession of faith that obliged the pastors of the reformed churches, in any part of the world, to conform their sentiments to the theological doctrines that were adopted and taught at Geneva.[c] And accordingly there were many, who either rejected entirely the doctrine of that college on these intricate points, or received it with certain restrictions and modifications. Even those who were in general attached to the theological system of Geneva, did not perfectly agree about the manner of explaining the doctrines relating to the divine decrees. The majority were of opinion, that God had only *permitted* the first man to fall into transgression, without positively *predetermining* his fall. But others went much farther, and presumptuously forgetting their own ignorance on the one hand, and the wisdom and equity of the divine counsels on the other, maintained, that God, in order to exercise and display his awful justice and his free mercy, had decreed from all eternity the transgression of Adam, and so ordered the course of events, that our first parents could not possibly avoid their unhappy fall. Those who held this latter sentiment were denominated *Supralapsarians*, to distinguish them from the *Sublapsarian* doctors, who maintained the doctrine *of permission* already mentioned.

XI. It is remarkable that the Supralapsarian and Sublapsarian divines forgot their debates and differences, as matters of little consequence, and united their force against those who thought it their duty to represent the Deity, as extending his goodness and mercy to all mankind. This gave rise, soon after the commencement of this century,

[a] See Leland's View of the Deistical Writers, vol. 1. p. 48.

[b] The lustre and authority of the college of Geneva began gradually to decline, from the time that, the United Provinces being formed into a free and independent republic, universities were founded at Leyden, Franeker, and Utrecht.

[c] See, for a full demonstration of this assertion, Grotius' Apologeticus, &c.; as also several treatises, written in Dutch by Theod. Volkh. Coornhert, of whom Arnold makes particular mention in his Historia Eccles. tom. ii.

to a deplorable schism, which all the efforts of human wisdom have since been unable to heal. James Arminius, professor of divinity in the university of Leyden, rejected, the doctrine of the church of Geneva, in relation to the deep and intricate points of predestination and grace; and maintained, with the Lutherans, that God has excluded none from salvation by an absolute and eternal decree. He was joined in these sentiments by several persons in Holland, who were eminently distinguished by the extent of their learning, and the dignity of their stations; but he met with the warmest opposition from Francis Gomar, his colleague, and from the principal professors in the Dutch universities. The magistrates exhorted the contending parties to moderation and charity; and observed, that, in a free state, their respective opinions might be treated with toleration, without any detriment to the essential interests of true religion. After long and tedious debates, which were frequently attended with popular tumults and civil broils, this intricate controversy was, by the counsels and authority[a] of Maurice, prince of Orange, referred to the decision of the church, assembled in a general synod at Dordrecht, in 1618. The most eminent divines of the United Provinces, and many learned deputies from the churches of England, Scotland, Switzerland, Bremen, Hesse, and the Palatinate, were present at this numerous and solemn assembly. It was by the sentence of these judges, that the Arminians lost their cause, and were declared corruptors of the true religion. It must be observed, at the same time, that the doctors of Geneva, who embraced the Sublapsarian system, triumphed over their adversaries in this synod; for, though the patrons of the Supralapsarian cause were far from being contemptible either in point of number or of abilities, yet the moderation and equity of the British divines prevented the synod from giving its sanction to the opinions of that presumptuous sect. Nor indeed would even the Sublapsarians have obtained the accomplishment of their desires, had the doctors of Bremen, who for weighty reasons were attached to the Lutherans, been able to execute their purposes.[b]

XII. It is greatly to be doubted, whether this victory, gained over the Arminians, was, upon the whole, advantageous or detrimental to the church of Geneva in particular, and to the reformed church in general. It is at least certain, that, after the synod of Dordrecht, the doctrine of absolute decrees, lost ground from day to day; and its patrons were put to the hard necessity of holding fraternal communion with those whose doctrine was either professedly Arminian, or at least nearly resembled it. The leaders of the vanquished Arminians were eminently distinguished by their eloquence, sagacity, and learning; and, being highly exasperated by the injurious and oppressive treatment they met with, in consequence of their condemnation, they defended themselves, and attacked their adversaries with such spirit and vigour, and also with such dexterity and eloquence, that multitudes were persuaded of the justice of their cause. It is particularly to be observed, that the authority of the synod of Dordrecht was far from being universally acknowledged among the Dutch; the provinces of Friseland, Zealand, Utrecht, Guelderland, and Groningen, could not be persuaded to adopt its decisions; and though, in 1651, they were at length gained over so far as to intimate, that they would see with pleasure the reformed religion maintained upon the footing on which it had been placed and confirmed by the synod, yet the most eminent adepts in Belgic jurisprudence deny that this intimation has the force or character of a law.[c]

In England, the face of religion changed considerably, in a very little time after the famous synod now mentioned; and this change, which was entirely in favour of Arminianism, was principally effected by the counsels and influence of William Laud, archbishop of Canterbury. This revolution gave new courage to the Arminians; and, from that period to the present time, they have had the pleasure of seeing the decisions and doctrines of the synod, relating to the points in debate between them and the Calvinists, treated in England, with something more than mere indifference, beheld by some with aversion, and by others with contempt.[d] And, indeed, if we consider the genius and spirit of the church of England during this period, we shall plainly see, that the doctrine of the Gomarists, concerning predestination and grace, could not meet there with a favourable reception, since the leading English divines were zealous in modelling its doctrine and discipline after the sentiments and institutions that were received in the primitive times, and since those early fathers of the church, whom they followed with a profound submission, had never presumed, before Augustine, to set limits to the extent of the divine grace and mercy.

The reformed churches in France seemed, at first, disposed to give a favourable reception to the decisions of this famous synod; but, as these decisions were highly displeasing to the votaries of Rome among whom they lived, and kindled anew their rage against the protestants, the latter thought it their duty to be circumspect in this matter; and, in process of time, their real sentiments, and the doctrines they taught, began to differ extremely from those of the Gomarists. The churches of Brandenburg and Bremen, which made a considerable figure among the reformed in Germany, would never suffer their doctors to be tied down to the opinions and tenets of the Dutch divines; and thus it happened, that the liberty of private judgment, (with respect to the doctrines of predestination and grace,) which the spirit that prevailed among the divines of Dordrecht seemed so much calculated to suppress or discourage, acquired rather new vigour, in consequence of the arbitrary proceedings of that assembly; and the reformed church was immediately divided into Universalists, Semi-Universalists, Supralapsarians, and Sublapsarians, who, indeed, notwithstanding their dissensions, which sometimes become violent and tumultuous, live generally in the exercise of mutual toleration, and are reciprocally restrained by many reasons from indulging a spirit of hostility and persecution. What is still more remarkable, and therefore ought not to be passed over in silence, we see the city of Geneva, which was the parent, the nurse, and the guardian of the doctrine of

☞[a] It was not by the authority of prince Maurice, but by that of the States-General, that the national synod was assembled at Dordrecht. The states were not indeed unanimous; three of the seven provinces protested against the holding of this synod, viz. Holland, Utrecht, and Over-Yssel.

[b] We shall give, in the History of the Arminians, a list of the writers who appeared in this controversy, and a more particular account of the transactions of the synod of Dordrecht.

[c] See the very learned and illustrious president Bynkershoek's Quæstiones Juris publici, lib. ii. cap. xviii.

[d] Sev. Lintrupii Dissertatio de Contemptu Concilii Dordraceni in Angliâ, in Dissert. Theologicis Hect. Godofr. Masii, tom. i. n. xix.

absolute predestination and particular grace, not only display sentiments of charity, forbearance, and esteem for the Arminians, but become itself almost so far Arminian, as to deserve a place among the churches of that communion.

XIII. While the reformed church in France yet subsisted, its doctors departed, in several points, from the common rule of faith that was received in the other churches of their communion. This, as appears from several circumstances, in a great measure resulted from their desire of diminishing the prejudices of the catholics against them, and of repelling a part of the odious conclusions which were drawn by their adversaries from the doctrines of Dordrecht, and laid to their charge with that malignity which popish bigotry so naturally inspires. Hence we find, in the books that were composed by the doctors of Saumur and Sedan after the synod, many things which seem conformable, not only to the sentiments of the Lutherans, concerning grace, predestination, the person of Christ, and the efficacy of the sacraments, but also to certain peculiar opinions of the Romish church. This moderation may be dated from the year 1615, when the opinion of John Piscator, pastor at Herborn, concerning the obedience of Christ, was tacitly adopted, or at least pronounced free from error, by the synod of the isle of France,[a] though it had been condemned and rejected in several preceding assemblies of the same nature.[b] Piscator maintained, that it was not by his obedience to the divine law that Christ made a satisfaction to that law in our stead, since this obedience was his duty considered as a man; and, therefore, being obliged to obey this law himself, his observance of it could not merit any thing for others from the Supreme Being. This opinion, as every one may see, tended to confirm the doctrine of the Romish church, concerning the merit of good works, the natural power of man to obey the commands of God, and other points of a like nature.[c] These less important concessions were followed by others of a much more weighty and momentous kind, of which some were so erroneous that they were strongly disapproved and rejected, even by those of the French protestants themselves, who were the most remarkable for their moderation, charity, and love o peace.[d]

XIV. The doctors of Saumur revived a controversy, that had for some time been suspended, by their attempts to reconcile the doctrine of predestination, as it had been taught at Geneva, and confirmed at Dordrecht, with the sentiments of those who represent the Deity as offering the displays of his goodness and mercy to all mankind. The first person who made this fruitless attempt was John Cameron, whose sentiments were supported and illustrated by Moses Amyrault, a man of uncommon sagacity and erudition. The latter applied himself, from the year 1634, with unparalleled zeal, to this arduous work, and displayed in it extraordinary exertions of capacity and genius; and so ardently was he bent on bringing it into execution, that he made, for this purpose, no small changes in the doctrine commonly received among the reformed in France. The form of doctrine which he had devised, in order to accomplish this important reconcilation, may be briefly summed up in the following propositions: "That God desires the happiness of all men, and that no mortal is excluded, by any divine decree, from the benefits that are procured by the death, sufferings, and gospel of Christ:

"That, however, no one can be made a partaker of the blessings of the Gospel, and of eternal salvation, without believing in Jesus Christ:

"That such, indeed, is the immense and universal goodness of the Supreme Being, that he refuses to none the power of believing, though he does not grant unto all his assistance and succour, that they may wisely improve this power to the attainment of everlasting salvation:

"And, that, in consequence of this, multitudes perish through their own fault, and not from any want of goodness in God."[e]

---

[a] Aymon, Actes de tous les Synodes Nationaux des Eglises Reformées de France, tom. ii. p. 275, 276.

[b] See Aymon, tom. i. p. 400, 401, 457. tom. ii. p. 13.—Bossuet, Histoire des Variations des Eglises Protestantes, livr. xii. tom. ii. p. 268, where this prelate, with his usual malignity and bitterness, reproaches the protestants with their inconstancy. The learned Basnage has endeavoured to defend the reformed churches against this charge, in the second volume of his Histoire de l'Eglise, p. 1533: but his defence is not satisfactory. ☞ To Dr. Mosheim, who speaks more than once of the reformed church and its doctors with partiality and prejudice, this defence may not appear satisfactory; it has, nevertheless, been judged so by many persons of uncommon discernment; and we invite the reader to judge for himself.

☞ [c] It does not appear to me that any one, who looks with an unprejudiced eye, can see the least connexion between the opinion of Piscator (which I shall not here either refute or defend,) and the popish doctrine which maintains the merit of good works; for, though we are not justified (i. e. pardoned or treated as if we had not offended) in consequence of Christ's active obedience to the divine law, yet we may be so by his death and sufferings; and it is really to these, that the Scriptures, in many places, ascribe our acceptance. Now a person who ascribes his acceptance and salvation to the death and mediation of Christ, does not surely give any countenance to the doctrine of the strict and rigorous merit of works, although he should not be so *sharp-sighted* as to perceive the influence which certain doctors attribute to what is called Christ's *active obedience*. But let it be observed here, in a particular manner, that the opinion of Piscator is much more unfavourable to popery than our author imagined, since it overturns totally, by a direct and most natural consequence, the popish doctrine concerning works of supererogation, which is as monstrous an absurdity in morals, as transubstantiation is in the estimation of common sense; for, if Christ, in his universal and perfect obedience to the divine laws, did no more than he was morally obliged to do by his character as a man, is it not absurd, if not impious, to seek in the virtue of the Romish saints (all of whom were very imperfect, and some of them very worthless mortals) an exuberance of obedience, a superabundant quantity of virtue, to which they were not obliged, and which they are supposed to deposit in the hands of the popes, who are empowered to distribute it, for love or money, among such as have need of it to make up their accounts?

[d] This affirmation is groundless, and I wish it were not liable to the charge of malignity. The accusation that Dr. Mosheim brings here against the reformed church in France is of too serious a nature not to require the most evident and circumstantial proofs. He has, however, alleged none; nor has he given any one instance of these weighty and momentous concessions that were made to popery. It was not, indeed, in his power either to give arguments or examples of a satisfactory kind; and it is highly probable, that the unguarded words of Elias Saurin, minister of Utrecht, in relation to the learned Louis Le Blanc, professor of Sedan (which dropped from the pen of the former, in his Examen de la Theologie de M. Jurieu,) are the only testimony Dr. Mosheim had to allege, in support of an accusation, which he has not limited to any one person, but inconsiderately thrown out upon the French churches in general. Those who are desirous of a full illustration of this matter, and yet have not an opportunity of consulting the original sources of information, may satisfy their curiosity by perusing the articles *Beaulieu* and *Amyrault* in Bayle's Dictionary, and the articles *Pajon* and *Papin* in M. de Chauffepied's supplement to that work. Any concessions that seem to have been made by the protestant doctors in France to their adversaries, consisted in giving an Arminian turn to some of the more rigid tenets of Calvin relating to original sin, predestination, and grace; and this turn would undoubtedly have been given to these doctrines, had popery been out of the question. But these concessions are not certainly what our historian had in view; nor would he, in effect, have treated such concessions as erroneous.

[e] See Jo. Wolfg. Jaegeri Hist. Eccles. sæc. XVII. decenn. iv. p. 522.

☞ This mitigated view of the doctrine of predestination has only

Those who embraced this doctrine were called Universalists, because they represented God as willing to show mercy to all mankind; and Hypothetical Universalists, because the condition of faith in Christ was necessary to render them the objects of this mercy. It is the opinion of many, that this doctrine differs little from that which was established by the synod of Dordrecht: but such do not seem to have attentively considered either the principles whence it is derived, or the consequences to which it leads. The more I examine this reconciling system, the more I am persuaded, that it is no more than Arminianism or Pelagianism artfully dressed up, and ingeniously covered with a half-transparent veil of specious, but ambiguous expressions; and this judgment is confirmed by the language that is used in treating this subject by the modern followers of Amyrault, who express their sentiments with greater courage, plainness, and perspicuity, than the spirit of the times permitted their master to do. A cry was raised in several French synods, against the doctrine of Amyrault; but, after it had been carefully examined by them, and defended by him at their public meetings with his usual eloquence and erudition, he was honourably acquitted.[a] The opposition he met with from Holland was still more formidable, as it came from the celebrated pens of Rivet, Spanheim, Des-Marets, and other learned adversaries. He nevertheless answered them with great spirit and vigour; and his cause was powerfully supported afterwards by Daillé, Blondel, Mestrezat, and Claude.[b] This controversy was carried on for a long time, with great animosity, and little fruit to those who opposed the opinions of the French innovator: for the sentiments of Amyrault were not only received in all the colleges of the Huguenots in France, and adopted by divines of the highest note in that nation, but also spread themselves as far as Geneva, and were afterwards disseminated by the French protestants, who fled from the rage of persecution, through all the reformed churches of Europe; and they now are so generally received, that few have the courage to oppose or decry them.

XV. The desire of mitigating certain doctrines of the reformed church, which drew upon it the heaviest censures from both the Roman catholics and some protestant communions, was the true origin of the opinion propagated, in the year 1640, by Joshua de la Place, concerning the imputation of original sin. This divine, who was the intimate friend of Amyrault, and his colleague at Saumur, rejected the opinion generally received in the schools of the reformed, that the personal and actual transgression of the first man is imputed to his posterity. He maintained, on the contrary, that God imputes to every man his natural corruption, his personal guilt, and his propensity to sin; or, to speak in the theological style, he affirmed, that original sin is indirectly, and not directly, imputed to mankind. This opinion was condemned as erroneous, in 1642, by the synod of Charenton, and many Dutch and Helvetic doctors of great name endeavoured to refute it,[c] while the love of peace and union prevented its author from defending it in a public and open manner.[d] But neither the sentence of the synod, nor the silence of M. de la Place, could preclude this sentiment from making a deep impression on the minds of many, who deemed it conformable to the plainest dictates of justice and equity; nor could they prevent its being transmitted, with the French exiles, into other countries.

In the class of those who, to diminish or avoid the resentment of the papists, made concessions inconsistent with truth, and detrimental to the purity of the protestant religion, many place Louis Capel, professor at Saumur, who, in a voluminous and elaborate work,[e] undertook to prove that the Hebrew points were not used by the sacred writers, and were a modern invention added to the text by the Masoretes.[f] It is at least certain, that this hypothesis was highly agreeable to the votaries of Rome, and seemed manifestly adapted to diminish the authority of the Scriptures, and to put them upon a level with oral tradition, if not to render their decisions still less respectable and certain.[g] On these accounts, the system of this famous professor was opposed, with the most ardent efforts of erudition and zeal, by several doctors both of the reformed and Lutheran churches, who were eminent for their knowledge of the Hebrew language, and their general acquaintance with Oriental learning.[h]

XVI. Though these great men gave offence to many, by the freedom and novelty of their sentiments, yet they had the approbation and esteem of the greatest part of the reformed churches; and the equity of succeeding generations removed the aspersions that envy had thrown upon them during their lives, and made ample amends for the injuries they had received from several of their contemporaries. This was far from being the case of those doctors who either openly attempted to bring about a complete reconciliation and union between the reformed and Romish churches, or explained the doctrines of Christianity in such

one defect; but it is a capital one. It represents God as desiring a thing (*i. e.* salvation and happiness) for all, which, in order to its attainment, requires a degree of his assistance and succour, which he refuses to many. This rendered grace and redemption universal only in words, but partial in reality, and therefore did not at all mend the matter. The Supralapsarians were consistent with themselves; but their doctrine was harsh and terrible, and was founded on the most unworthy notions of the Supreme Being; and, on the other hand, the system of Amyrault was full of inconsistencies; even the Sublapsarian doctrine has its difficulties, and rather palliates than removes the horrors of Supralapsarianism. What then is to be done? from what quarter shall the candid and well-disposed Christian receive that solid satisfaction and wise direction, which neither system is adapted to administer? These he will receive by turning his dazzled and feeble eye from the secret decrees of God, which were neither designed to be rules of action, nor sources of comfort to mortals here below; and by fixing his view upon the mercy of God, as it is manifested through Christ, upon the pure laws and sublime promises of his gospel, and the equity of his present government and his future tribunal.

[a] See Aymon's Actes des Synodes Nationaux des Eglises Reformées en France, tom. ii. p. 571, 604.—Blondel's Actes Authentiques des Eglises Reformées touchant la Paix et la Charité fraternelle.

[b] Bayle's Dictionary, vol. i. at the articles *Amyrault* and *Blondel*; and vol. ii. at the article *Daillé*.—See Christ. Pfaffius, de Formulâ Consensus, cap. i.

[c] Aymon, tom. ii. p. 680.

[d] Christ. Eberh. Weismanni Histor. Eccles. sæc. XVII. p. 817.

[e] This work, which is entitled, Arcanum Punctuationis Revelatum, may be found with its Vindiciæ in the works of Capel, printed at Amsterdam in 1689, and in the Critica Sacra Veteris Testamenti, published at Paris in 1650.

[f] ☞ It was also Capel who affirmed that the characters which compose the Hebrew text, were such as the Chaldeans used after the Babylonian captivity, the Jews having always made use of the Samaritan characters before that period.

[g] ☞ This absurd notion of the tendency of Capel's hypothesis is now almost entirely exploded by the learned world. Be that as it may, the hypothesis in question is by no means peculiar to Capel; it was adopted by Luther, Zuingle, Calvin, the three great pillars of the Reformation; as also by Munster, Olivetan, Masius, Scaliger, Casaubon, Drusius, De Dieu, Walton, and Bochart, those eminent men, who have thrown such light on sacred philology; so that Capel had only the merit of supporting it by new arguments, and placing it in a striking and luminous point of view.

[h] See B. Jo. Christ. Wolfii Biblioth. Hebraica.

a manner as lessened the difference between the communions, and thereby rendered the passage from the former to the latter less disgusting and painful. The attempts of these advocates of peace were looked upon as odious; and in the issue they proved utterly unsuccessful. The most eminent of these reconciling doctors were Louis Le Blanc, professor at Sedan, and Claude Pajon, minister of Orleans,[a] who were both remarkable for the persuasive power of their eloquence, and discovered an uncommon degree of penetration and sagacity in their writings and negotiations. The former passed in review many of the controversies that divided the two churches, and seemed clearly to prove, that some of them were merely disputes about words, and that the others were of much less consequence than was generally imagined.[b] This manner of stating the differences between the two churches drew upon Le Blanc the indignation of those who considered all attempts to soften and modify controverted doctrines as dangerous and detrimental to the cause of truth.[c] On the other hand, the acuteness and dexterity with which he treated this delicate affair, made a considerable impression upon many persons, and procured him disciples, who still entertain his reconciling sentiments, but either conceal them entirely, or discover them with caution, as they are known to be displeasing to the greatest part of the members of both communions.

XVII. The modifications under which Pajon exhibited some of the doctrines of the reformed church, were also extremely offensive and unpopular. This ecclesiastic applied the principles and tenets of the Cartesian philosophy, of which he was a warm and able defender, to an explication of the opinions of that church relating to the corruption of human nature, the state of its moral faculties and powers, the grace of God, and the conversion of sinners; and, in the judgment of many, he gave an erroneous interpretation of these opinions. It is, indeed, very difficult to determine what were the real sentiments of this man; nor is it easy to say, whether this difficulty be most owing to the affected obscurity and ambiguity under which he disguised them, or to the inaccuracy with which his adversaries, through negligence or malignity, have represented them. If we may give credit to the latter, his doctrine amounts to the following propositions: "That the corruption of man is less, and his natural power to amend his ways greater, than is generally imagined:—That original sin lies in the understanding alone, and consists principally in the obscurity and imperfection of our ideas of divine things:—That this imperfection of the human understanding has a pernicious influence upon the will, excites in it vicious propensities, and thus leads it to sinful actions:—That this internal disorder is healed, not by the mere efforts of our natural faculties and powers, but by the assistance and energy of the Holy Spirit, operating upon the mind by the divine word as its mean or instrument:—That, however, this word is not endowed with any divine intrinsic energy, either natural or supernatural, but only with a moral influence, i. e. it corrects and improves the understanding, in the same manner as human truth does, even by imparting clear and distinct notions of spiritual and divine things, and furnishing solid arguments for the truth and divinity of the Christian religion, and its perfect conformity with the dictates of right reason;—and that, in consequence, every man, if no internal or external impediments destroy or suspend the exertion of his natural powers and faculties, may, by the use of his own reason, and a careful and assiduous study of there vealed will of God, be enabled to correct what is amiss in his sentiments, affections, and actions, without any extraordinary assistance from the Holy Ghost."[d]

Such is the account of the opinions of Pajon, given by his adversaries. On the other hand, if we take our ideas of his doctrine from himself, we shall find this account disingenuous and erroneous. Pajon intimates plainly his assent to the doctrines that were confirmed by the synod of Dordrecht, and which are contained in the catechisms and confessions of faith of the reformed churches; he complains that his doctrine has been ill understood or wilfully perverted; and he observes, that he did not deny entirely an immediate operation of the Holy Spirit on the minds of those who are really converted to God, but only such an immediate operation as was not accompanied with the ministry and efficacy of the divine word; or, to express the matter in other terms, he declared that he could not adopt the sentiments of those who represent that word as no more than an instrument void of intrinsic efficacy, a mere external sign of an immediate operation of the Spirit of God.[e] This last declaration is, however, both obscure and captious. Be that as it may, Pajon concludes by observing, that we ought not to dispute about the manner in which the Holy Spirit operates upon the minds of men, but content ourselves with acknowledging, that this spirit is the true and original author of all that is good in the affections of our heart, and the actions that proceed from them. Notwithstanding these declarations, the doctrine of this learned and ingenious ecclesiastic was not only deemed heterodox by some of the most eminent divines of the reformed church, but was also condemned, in 1677, by several synods in France, and, in 1686, by a synod assembled at Rotterdam.

XVIII. This controversy, which seemed to be brought to a conclusion by the death of Pajon, was revived, or rather continued, by Isaac Papin, his nephew, a native of Blois, who, by his writings and travels, was highly instrumental in communicating to England, Holland, and Germany, the contagion of these unhappy debates. This ecclesiastic expressed his sentiments without ambiguity or reserve, and zealously propagated the doctrine of his uncle, which, according to his crude and harsh manner of representing it, he reduced to the two following propositions:—

☞ [a] It is difficult to conceive what could engage Dr. Mosheim to place Pajon in the class of those who explained the doctrines of Christianity in such a manner, as to diminish the difference between the doctrines of the reformed and papal churches. Pajon was, indeed, a moderate divine, and leaned toward the Arminian system; and this propensity was not uncommon among the French protestants. But few doctors of this time wrote against popery with more learning, zeal, and judgment, than Claude Pajon, as appears from his excellent treatise against Nicole, entitled, "Examen du Livre qui porte pour titre prejugez legitimes contre les Calvinistes."

[b] In his Theses Theologicæ, which are highly worthy of an attentive perusal. [c] See Bayle's Dictionary, at the article *Beaulieu*.

[d] Fred. Spanheim's Append. ad Elenchum Controversiar. tom. iii. op. p. 882.—Jurieu's Traité de la Nature et de la Grace, p. 35.—Val. Ern. Loscher's Exercit. de Claud. Pajonii ejusque Sectatorum Doctrina et Fatis.

[e] All these declarations made by Pajon may be seen in a confession of his faith, supposed to have been drawn up by himself, and published by the learned M. de Chauffepied, in his Nouveau Dictionnaire Histor et Critique, tom. ii. p. 164.

"That the natural powers and faculties of man are more than sufficient to lead him to the knowledge of divine truth:

"That, in order to produce that amendment of the heart, which is called regeneration, nothing more is requisite than to put the body, if its habit is bad, into a sound state by the power of physic, and then to set truth and falsehood before the understanding, and virtue and vice before the will, in their genuine colours, clearly and distinctly, so that their nature and properties may be fully apprehended."

This and the other opinions of Papin were refuted with a considerable degree of acrimony, in 1686, by the famous Jurieu, professor of divinity, and pastor of the French church at Rotterdam; and they were condemned in the following year by the synod of Bois-le-duc. In 1688, they were condemned, with still greater marks of severity, by the French synod at the Hague, where a sentence of excommunication was pronounced against their author. Exasperated at these proceedings, Papin returned into France in 1690, where he publicly abjured the protestant religion, and embraced the communion of the church of Rome, in which he died in 1709.[a] It has been affirmed by some, that this ingenious man was treated with great rigour and injustice, and that his theological opinions were unfaithfully represented by his violent and unrelenting adversary, Jurieu, whose warmth and impetuosity in religious controversy are well known. How far this affirmation may be supported by evidence, we cannot pretend to determine. A doctrine in some degree resembling that of Pajon, was maintained in several treatises, in 1684, by Charles le Cene, a French divine of uncommon learning and sagacity, who gave a new and very singular translation of the Bible.[b] But he entirely rejected the doctrine of original sin, and of the impotency of human nature; and asserted, that it was in every man's power to amend his ways, and arrive at a state of obedience and virtue, by the mere use of his natural faculties, and an attentive study of the divine word; more especially, if these were seconded by the advantage of a good education, and the influence of virtuous examples. Hence several divines pretend that his doctrine is, in many respects, different from that of Pajon.[c]

XIX. The church of England had, for a long time, resembled a ship tossed on a boisterous and tempestuous ocean. The opposition of the Papists on the one hand, and the discontents and remonstrances of the Puritans on the other, had kept it in a perpetual ferment. When, on the death of Elizabeth, James I. ascended the throne, the latter conceived the warmest hopes of seeing more serene and prosperous days, and of being delivered from the vexations and oppressions to which they had been constantly exposed on account of their attachment to the discipline and worship of the church of Geneva. These hopes were so much the more natural, as the king had received his education in Scotland, where the Puritans prevailed, and had, on some occasions, made the strongest declarations of his attachment to their ecclesiastical constitution.[d] And some of the first steps taken by this prince seemed to encourage those hopes, as he appeared desirous of assuming the character and office of an arbitrator, in order to accommodate matters between the church and the Puritans.[e] But these expectations soon vanished; and, under his government, affairs assumed a new aspect. As the desire of unlimited power and authority was his reigning passion, so all his measures, whether of a civil or religious nature, were calculated to answer the purposes of his ambition. The presbyterian form of ecclesiastical government seemed less favourable to his views than the episcopal hierarchy, as the former exhibits a kind of republic, which is administered by various rules of equal authority, while the latter approaches much nearer to the spirit and genius of monarchy. The very name of a republic, synod, or council, was odious to James, who dreaded every thing that had a popular aspect; hence he distinguished the bishops with peculiar marks of his favour, extended their authority, increased their prerogatives, and publicly adopted and inculcated the following maxim, 'No bishop, no king.' At the same time, as the church of England had not yet abandoned the Calvinistical doctrines of predestination and grace, he also adhered to them for some time, and gave his theological representatives, in the synod of Dordrecht, an order to join in the condemnation of the sentiments of Arminius, in relation to these deep and intricate points. Abbot, archbishop of Canterbury, a man of remarkable gravity,[f] and of eminent zeal both for civil

[a] See Jurieu de la Nature et de la Grace—Molleri Cimbria Literata, tom. ii. p. 608.

[b] This translation was published at Amsterdam in 1741, and was condemned by the French synod in Holland.

[c] See the learned and laborious M. Chauffepied's Nouv. Diction. tom. ii. p. 160

☞ [d] In a general assembly holden at Edinburgh, in 1590, this prince is said to have made the following public declaration: I praise God that I was born in the time of the light of the Gospel, and in such a place as to be the king of the sincerest (i. e. *purest*) kirk in the world. The kirk of Geneva keep pasche and yule (i. e. Easter and Christmas.) What have they for them? They have no institution. As for our neighbour kirk of England, their service is an evil-said mass in English; they want nothing of the mass but the liftings (i. e. *the elevation of the host.*) I charge you, my good ministers, doctors, elders, nobles, gentlemen, and barons, to stand to your purity, and to exhort your people to do the same; and I, forsooth, as long as I brook my life, shall do the same." Calderwood's History of the Church of Scotland, p. 256.

[e] The religious disputes between the church and the puritans induced James to appoint a conference between the two parties at Hampton-Court, at which nine bishops, and as many dignitaries of the church, appeared on one side, and four puritan ministers on the other. The king himself took a considerable part in the controversy against the latter; and this was an occupation well adapted to his taste; for nothing could be more pleasing to this royal pedant, than to dictate magisterially to an assembly of divines upon points of faith and discipline, and to receive the applause of these holy men for his superior zeal and learning. The conference continued three days. On the first day, it was managed between the king and the bishops and deans, to whom James proposed some objections against certain expressions in the liturgy, and a few alterations in the ritual of the church; in consequence of which, some slight alterations were made. On the two following days, the puritans were admitted, whose proposals and remonstrances may be seen in Neal's History of the Puritans, vol. ii. Dr. Warner, in his Ecclesiastical History of England, observes, that this author must be read with caution, on account of his unfairness and partiality: why therefore did he not take his account of the Hampton-Court conference from a better source? The different accounts of the opposite parties, and more particularly those published by Dr. Barlow, dean of Chester, on one hand, and Patrick Galloway, a Scottish writer, on the other, (both of whom were present at the conference,) must be carefully consulted, in order to our forming a proper idea of these theological transactions. James at least obtained, on this occasion, the applause he had in view. The archbishop of Canterbury (Whitgift) said, that "undoubtedly his majesty spoke by the special assistance of God's spirit;" and Bancroft, falling on his knees, with his eyes raised to—James, expressed himself thus: "I protest, my heart melteth for joy, that Almighty God, of his singular mercy, has given us such a king, as since Christ's time has not been."

☞ [f] The earl of Clarendon says, in his History of the Rebellion, that "Abbot was a man of very morose manners, and of a very sour aspect, which at that time was called *gravity*." If, in general, we strike a medium between what Clarendon and Neal say of this prelate, we shall probably arrive at the true knowledge of his character. See

and religious liberty, whose lenity toward their ancestors the Puritans still celebrate in the highest strains,[a] used his utmost endeavours to confirm the king in the principles of Calvinism, to which he himself was thoroughly attached. But scarcely had the British divines returned from the synod of Dordrecht, and given an account of the laws that had been enacted, and the doctrines that had been established by that famous assembly, when the king, and the greatest part of the episcopal clergy, discovered, in the strongest terms, their dislike of these proceedings, and judged the sentiments of Arminius, relating to the divine decrees, preferable to those of Gomar and of Calvin.[b] This sudden change in the theological opinions of the court and clergy, was certainly owing to a variety of reasons, as will appear evident to those who have any acquaintance with the spirit and transactions of these times. The principal one, if we are not deceived, must be sought in the plans of a farther reformation of the church of England, which were proposed by several eminent ecclesiastics, whose intention was to bring it to as near a resemblance as was possible of the primitive church; and every one knows, that the peculiar doctrines to which the victory was assigned by the synod were absolutely unknown in the first ages of the Christian church.[c] Be that as it may

the History of the Rebellion, vol. i. p. 88; and Neal's History of the Puritans, vol. ii. p. 243. It is certain, that nothing can be more unjust and partial than Clarendon's account of this eminent prelate, particularly when he says, that "he neither understood nor regarded the constitution of the church." But it is too much the custom of this writer, and others of his stamp, to give the denomination of latitudinarian indifference to that charity, prudence, and moderation, by which alone the best interests of the church (though not the personal views of many of its ambitious members) can be established upon firm and permanent foundations. Abbot would have been reckoned a good churchman by some, if he had breathed that spirit of despotism and violence, which, being essentially incompatible with the spirit and character of a people, not only free, but jealous of their liberty, has often endangered the church, by exciting that resentment which always renders opposition excessive. Abbot was so far from being indifferent about the constitution of the church, or inclined to the presbyterian discipline, (as the noble author affirms,) that it was by his zeal and dexterity that the clergy of Scotland, who had refused to admit the bishops as moderators in their synods, were brought to a more tractable temper, and affairs put into such a situation as afterwards produced the entire establishment of the episcopal order in that nation. It is true, that Abbot's zeal in this affair was conducted with great prudence and moderation; and it was by these that his zeal was rendered successful. Nor have these his transactions in Scotland, where he went as chaplain to the lord-treasurer Dunbar, been sufficiently attended to by historians: they even seem to have been entirely unknown to some, who have pretended to depreciate the conduct and principles of this virtuous and excellent prelate. King James, who had been so zealous a presbyterian in appearance before his accession to the crown of England, had scarcely set his foot out of Scotland, when he conceived the design of restoring the ancient form of episcopal government in that kingdom; and it was Abbot's conduct there that brought him to that high favour with the king, which, in a short time, raised him from the deanery of Winchester to the see of Canterbury. For it was by Abbot's mild and prudent counsels, that Dunbar procured that famous act of the general assembly fo Scotland, by which it was provided, "that the king should have the calling of all general assemblies, that the bishops (or their deputies) should be perpetual moderators of the diocesan synods, that no excommunication should be pronounced without their approbation, that all presentations of benefices should be made by them, that the deprivation or suspension of ministers should belong to them, that the visitation of the diocese should be performed by the bishop or his deputy only, and that the bishop should be moderator of all conventions for exercisings or *prophesyings* (i. e. preaching) within their bounds." See Calderwood's True History of the Church of Scotland, p. 588, 589. Heylin's History of the Presbyterians, p. 381, 382; and above all, Speed's History of Great Britain, book x. The writers who seem the least disposed to speak favourably of this wise and good prelate, bear testimony, nevertheless, to his eminent piety, his exemplary conversation, and his inflexible probity and integrity; and it may be said with truth, that, if his moderate measures had been pursued, the liberties of England would have been secured, popery discountenanced, and the church prevented from running into those excesses which afterwards proved so injurious to it. If Abbot's candour failed him on any occasion, it was in the representations, which his rigid attachment, not to the discipline, but to the doctrinal tenets of Calvinism, led him to give of the Arminian doctors. There is a remarkable instance of this in a letter of his to Sir Ralph Winwood, dated at Lambeth, the first of June, 1613, and occasioned by the arrival of Grotius in England, who had been expressly sent from Holland, by the Remonstrants, or Arminians, to mitigate the king's displeasure and antipathy against that party. In this letter, the archbishop represents Grotius (with whom he certainly was not worthy to be named, either in point of learning, sagacity, or judgment) as a pedant, and mentions, with a high degree of complacency and approbation, the absurd and impertinent judgment of some civilians and divines, who called this immortal ornament of the republic of letters, a *smatterer* and a *simple fellow*. See Winwood's Memorials, vol. iii. p. 459.

[a] See Wood's Athenæ Oxoniens. t. i. p. 583.—Neal's History of the Puritans, vol. ii. ch. iv. p. 242.—Clarendon's History of the Rebellion vol. i.

[b] See Heylin's History of the Five Articles.—Neal, vol. ii. ch ii. p. 117. The latter author tells us, that the following verses were made in England, with a design to pour contempt on the synod, and to turn its proceedings into ridicule:

"Dordrechti Synodus, nodus; chorus integer, æger;
Conventus, ventus; sessio, stramen. Amen!"*

With respect to James, those who are desirous of forming a just idea of the character, proceedings, and theological fickleness and inconstancy of that monarch, must peruse the writers of English history, more especially Larrey and Rapin. The majority of these writers tell us, that, toward the close of his life, James, after having deserted from the Calvinists to the Arminians, began to discover a strong propensity toward popery; and they affirm positively, that he entertained the most ardent desire of bringing about an union between the churches of England and Rome. In this, however, these writers seem to have gone too far; for, though many of the proceedings of this injudicious prince justly deserve the sharpest censure, yet it is both rash and unjust to accuse him of a design to introduce popery into England. It is not to be believed, that a prince, who aspired to arbitrary power and uncontrolled dominion, could ever have entertained a thought of submitting to the yoke of the Roman pontiff.† The truth of the matter seems to be this, that, toward the end of his reign, James began to have less aversion to the doctrines and rites of the Romish church, and permitted certain religious observances, that were conformable to the spirit of that church, to be used in England. This conduct was founded upon a manner of reasoning, which he had learned from several bishops of his time, that the primitive church is the model which all Christian churches ought to imitate in doctrine and worship: that, in proportion as any church approaches to this original standard of truth and purity, it must become proportionably pure and perfect; and that the Romish church retained more of the spirit and manner of the primitive church than the Puritan or Calvinist churches. ☞ Of these three propositions, the two first are undoubtedly true, and the last is evidently and demonstrably false. Besides, this makes nothing to the argument: for, as James had a manifest aversion to the Puritans, it could, in his eyes, be no very great recommendation of the Romish church, that it surpassed that of the Puritans in doctrine and discipline.

[c] Dr. Mosheim has annexed the following note to this passage: "Perhaps the king entered into these ecclesiastical proceedings with the more readiness, when he reflected on the civil commotions and tumults that an attachment to the presbyterian religion had occasioned in Scotland. There are also some circumstances that intimate plainly enough, that James, before his accession to the crown of England, was very far from having an aversion to popery." Whoever, indeed, looks into the Historical View of the Negociations between the Courts of England, France, and Brussels, from the year 1592 to 1617, extracted from the manuscript State Papers of Sir Thomas Edmondes and Anthony Bacon, Esq., and published in 1749 by the learned and judicious Dr. Birch, will be persuaded, that, about the year 1595, this fickle and unsteady prince had really formed an intention of embracing the faith of Rome. See, in the curious collection now mentioned, the postscript of a letter from Sir Thomas Edmondes to the lord high treasurer, dated the 20th of December, 1595. We learn also, from the Memoirs of Sir Ralph

☞ * It would be a difficult, and indeed an impracticable task, to justify all the proceedings of this synod; and it is much to be wished, that they had been more conformable to the spirit of Christian charity, than the representations of history, impartially weighed, show them to have been. We are not, however, to conclude, from the insipid monkish lines here quoted by Dr. Mosheim, that the transactions and decisions of that synod were universally condemned or despised in England. It had its partisans in the established church, as well as among the Puritans: and its decisions, in point of doctrine, were looked upon by many, and not without reason, as agreeable to the tenor of the book of articles established by law in the church of England.

† This remark is confuted by fact, observation, and the perpetual contradictions that are observable in the conduct of men: besides, see the note [c].

this change was very injurious to the Puritans; for, the king being indisposed to the opinions and institutions of Calvinism, those sectaries were left without defence, and exposed anew to the animosity and hatred of their adversaries, which had been, for some time, suspended, but now broke out with redoubled vehemence, and at length kindled a religious war, whose consequences were deplorable beyond expression. In 1625 this prince died, of whom it may be observed, that he was the bitterest enemy of the doctrine and discipline of the Puritans, to which he had been in his youth most warmly attached; the most inflexible and ardent patron of the Arminians, in whose ruin and condemnation in Holland he had been highly instrumental; and the most zealous defender of episcopal government, against which he had more than once expressed himself in the strongest terms. He left the constitution of England, both ecclesiastical and civil, in a very unsettled and fluctuating state, languishing under intestine disorders of various kinds.

XX. His son and successor Charles, who had imbibed his political and religious principles, had nothing so much at heart as to bring to perfection what his father had left unfinished. All the exertions of his zeal, and the whole tenor of his administration, were directed toward the three following objects: "The extending the royal prerogative, and raising the power of the crown above the authority of the law—the reduction of all the churches in Great-Britain and Ireland under the jurisdiction of bishops, whose government he looked upon as of divine institution, and also as the most adapted to guard the privileges and majesty of the throne—and, lastly, the suppression of the opinions and institutions that were peculiar to Calvinism, and the modelling of the doctrine, discipline, ceremonies, and polity of the church of England, after the spirit and constitution of the primitive church." The person whom the king chiefly intrusted with the execution of this arduous plan, was William Laud, bishop of London, who was raised, in 1633, to the see of Canterbury, and exhibited in these high stations a mixed character, composed of great qualities and great defects. The voice of justice must celebrate his fortitude, his erudition, his zeal for the sciences, and his munificence and liberality to men of letters; and, at the same time, even charity must acknowledge, with regret, his inexcusable imprudence, his excessive superstition, his rigid attachment to the sentiments, rites, and institutions of the ancient church, which made him behold the Puritans and Calvinists with horror,[a] and that violent spirit of animosity and persecution which discovered itself in the whole course of his ecclesiastical administration.[b] This haughty prelate executed the plans of his royal master, and fulfilled the views of his own ambition, without using those mild and moderate methods, which prudence employs in the prosecution of unpopular schemes. He carried things with a high hand: when he found the laws opposing his views, he treated them with contempt, and violated them without hesitation; he loaded the Puritans with injuries and vexations, and aimed at nothing less than their total extinction; he publicly rejected, in 1625, the Calvinistical doctrine of predestination, and, notwithstanding the opposition and remonstrances of Abbot, substituted the Arminian system in its place;[c] he revived many religious ceremonies, which though stamped with the sanction of anti-

Winwood, that, in 1596, James sent Mr. Ogilvie, a Scottish baron, into Spain, to assure his catholic majesty, that he was then ready and resolved to embrace popery, and to propose an alliance with that king and the pope against the queen of England. See State Tracts, vol. i. p. 1. See also an extract of a letter from Tobie Matthew, D. D. dean of Durham, to the lord-treasurer Burghley, containing an information of Scotch affairs, in Strype's Annals, vol. iv. p. 201. Above all, see Harris' Hist. and Critical Account of the Life and Writings of James I., p. 29, note (N.) This last writer may be added to Larrey and Rapin who have exposed the pliability and inconsistency of this self-sufficient monarch.

[a] See Wood's Athenæ Oxon. t. ii. p. 55.—Heylin's Cyprianus Angelicus, or Hist. of Life and Death of Wm. Laud.—Clarendon's His. vol. i.

[b] "Sincere he undoubtedly was, (says Mr. Hume,) and, however misguided, actuated by religious principles in all his pursuits; and it is to be regretted, that a man of such spirit, who conducted his enterprises with such warmth and industry, had not entertained more enlarged views, and embraced principles more favourable to the general happiness of human society."

[c] See Mich. le Vassor, Hist. de Louis XIII. tom. v. p. 262.

☞ This expression may lead the uninformed reader into a mistake, and make him imagine that Laud had caused the Calvinistical doctrine of the xxxix Articles to be abrogated, and the tenets of Arminius to be substituted in their place. It may therefore be proper to set this matter in a clearer light. In 1625, Laud wrote a small treatise to prove the orthodoxy of the Arminian doctrines; and, by his credit with the duke of Buckingham, had Arminian and anti-puritanical chaplains placed about the king. This step increased the debates between the Calvinistical and Arminian doctors, and produced the warmest animosities and dissensions. To calm these, the king issued out a proclamation, dated the 14th of January, 1626, the literal tenor of which was, in truth, more favourable to the Calvinists than to the Arminians, though, by the manner in which it was interpreted and executed by Laud, it was turned to the advantage of the latter. In this proclamation it was said expressly, "that his majesty would admit no innovations in the *doctrine*, discipline, or government of the church;" (N. B. *The doctrine of the church, previously to this, was Calvinistical,*) "and therefore charges all his subjects, and especially the clergy, not to publish or maintain, in preaching or writing, any *new inventions* or *opinions*, contrary to the said doctrine and discipline established by law, &c." It was certainly a very singular instance of Laud's indecent partiality, that this proclamation was employed to suppress the books that were expressly written in the defence of the xxxix Articles, while the writings of the Arminians, who certainly opposed these articles, were publicly licensed. I do not here enter into the merits of the cause; I only speak of the tenor of the proclamation, and the manner of its execution.

This manner of proceeding showed how difficult and arduous a thing it is to change systems of doctrine established by law, since neither Charles, who was by no means diffident of his authority, nor Laud, who was far from being timorous in the use and abuse of it, attempted to reform articles of faith, that stood in direct opposition to the Arminian doctrines, which they were now promoting by the warmest encouragements, and which were daily gaining ground under their protection. Instead of reforming the xxxix Articles, which step would have met with great opposition from the house of commons, and from a considerable part of the clergy and laity, who were still warmly attached to Calvinism, Laud advised the king to have these articles reprinted, with an ambiguous declaration prefixed to them, which might tend to silence or discourage the reigning controversies between the Calvinists and Arminians, and thus secure to the latter an unmolested state, in which they would daily find their power growing under the countenance and protection of the court. This declaration, which, in most editions of the Common Prayer, is still to be found at the head of the articles, is a most curious piece of political theology; and, if it had not borne hard upon the right of private judgment, and been evidently designed to favour one party, though it carried the aspect of a perfect neutrality, it might have been looked upon as a wise and provident measure to secure the tranquillity of the church; for, in the tenor of this declaration, precision was sacrificed to prudence and ambiguity; and even contradictions were preferred to consistent, clear, and positive decisions, that might have fomented dissensions and discord. The declaration seemed to favour the Calvinists, since it prohibited the affixing any new sense to any article: it also in effect favoured the Arminians, as it ordered all curious search about the contested points to be laid aside, and these disputes to be shut up in God's promises, as they are set forth to us in the holy scriptures, and in the general meaning of the articles of the church of England according to them. But what was singularly preposterous in this declaration was, its being designed to favour the Arminians, and yet prohibiting expressly any person, either in sermons or writings, from giving his own sense or comment as the meaning of the article, and ordering every one, on the contrary, to take each article in its literal and grammatical sense, and to submit to it in the full and plain meaning thereof; for certainly, if the 17th article has a plain, literal, and grammatical meaning, it is a meaning unfavourable to Arminianism; and bishop Burnet was obliged afterwards to acknowledge,

quity, were nevertheless marked with the turpitude of superstition, and had been on that account justly abrogated; he forced bishops upon the Scots, who were zealously attached to the discipline and ecclesiastical polity of Geneva, and had shown, on all occasions, the greatest reluctance against an episcopal government; and, lastly, he gave many, and very plain intimations, that he looked upon the Romish church, with all its errors, as more pure, more holy, and preferable upon the whole to those Protestant churches which were not subject to the jurisdiction of bishops. By these his unpopular sentiments and violent measures, Laud drew an odium on the king, on himself, and on the episcopal order in general. Hence, in 1644, he was brought before the public tribunals of justice, declared guilty of high treason, and condemned to lose his head on a scaffold; which sentence was accordingly executed.

After the death of Laud, the dissensions that had reigned for a long time between the king and parliament, grew still more violent, and rose at length to so great a height, that they could not be extinguished but by the blood of that excellent prince. The great council of the nation, heated by the violent suggestions of the Puritans and Independents,[a] abolished episcopal government; condemned and abrogated every thing in the ecclesiastical establishment that was contrary to the doctrine, worship, and discipline of the church of Geneva; turned the vehemence of their opposition against the king himself, and, having brought him into their power by the fate of arms, accused him of treason against the majesty of the nation; and, in 1649, while the eyes of Europe were fixed with astonishment on this strange spectacle, ordered him to be decapitated on a public scaffold. Such are the calamities that flow from religious zeal without knowledge, from that enthusiasm and bigotry which inspire a blind and immoderate attachment to the external unessential parts of religion, and to certain doctrines ill-understood! These broils and tumults tended also unhappily to confirm the truth of an observation often made, that all religious sects, while they are kept under and oppressed, are remarkable for inculcating the duties of moderation, forbearance, and charity toward those who dissent from them; but, as soon as the scenes of persecution are removed, and they in their turn arrive at power and pre-eminence, they forget their own precepts and maxims, and leave both the recommendation and practice of charity to those who groan under their yoke. Such, in reality, was the behaviour of the Puritans during their transitory exaltation; they showed as little clemency and equity to the bishops and other patrons of episcopacy, as they had received from them when the reins of government were in their hands.[b]

XXI. The Independents, who have been just mentioned among the promoters of civil discord in England, are generally represented by the British writers in a much worse light than the Presbyterians or Calvinists. They are commonly accused of various enormities, and they are even charged with the crime of parricide, as having borne a principal part in the death of the king. But whoever will be at the pains of examining, with impartiality and attention, the writings of that sect, and their confession of faith, must soon perceive, that many crimes have been imputed to them without foundation, and will probably be induced to think, that the bold attempts of the civil Independents (i. e. of those warm republicans who were the declared enemies of monarchy, and wished to extend the liberty of the people beyond all bounds of wisdom and prudence) have been unjustly laid to the charge of those independents whose principles were merely of a religious kind.[c] The religious Independents derived their

that, without enlarging the sense of the articles, the Arminians could not subscribe them consistently with their opinions, or without violating the demands of common candour and sincerity. See Burnet's remarks on the examination of his exposition, &c. p. 3.

This renders it probable, that the declaration now mentioned (in which we see no royal signature, no attestation of any officer of the crown, no date, in short, no mark to show where, when, or by what authority it was issued out) was not composed in the reign of king Charles. Burnet, indeed, was of opinion, that it was composed in that reign to support the Arminians, who, when they were charged with departing from the true sense of the articles, answered, "that they took the articles in their literal and grammatical sense, and therefore did not prevaricate." But this reasoning does not appear conclusive to the acute and learned author of the Confessional. He thinks it more probable that the declaration was composed, and first published, in the latter part of king James' reign; for though, says he, there be no evidence that James ever turned Arminian in principle, yet this was the party that adhered to him in his measures, and which it became necessary for him on that account to humour, and to render respectable in the eyes of the people by every expedient that might not bring any reflection on his own consistency. "And whoever (continues this author) considers the quibbling and equivocal terms in which this instrument is drawn, will, I am persuaded, observe the distress of a man divided between his principles and his interests, that is, of a man exactly in the situation of king James I. in the three last years of his reign." It is likely then, that this declaration was only republished at the head of the articles, which were reprinted by the order of Charles I.

[a] The origin of this sect has been already mentioned.

[b] Beside Clarendon and the other writers of English history already mentioned, see Neal's History of the Puritans, vol. ii. and iii.

[c] This sect is of recent date, and still subsists in England; there is, nevertheless, not one, either of the ancient or modern sects of Christians, that is less known, or has been more loaded with groundless aspersions and reproaches. The most eminent English writers, not only among the patrons of episcopacy, but even among those very presbyterians with whom those sectaries are now united, have thrown out against them the bitterest accusations and severest invectives that the warmest indignation could invent. They have not only been represented as delirious, mad, fanatical, illiterate, factious, and ignorant both of natural and revealed religion, but also as abandoned to all kinds of wickedness and sedition, and as the only authors of the odious parricide committed on the person of Charles I.* And as the writers who have given these representations, are considered by foreigners as the best and most authentic narrators of the transactions that passed in their own country, and are therefore followed as the surest guides, the Independents appear, almost every where, under the most unfavourable aspect. It must indeed be candidly acknowledged, that, as every class and order of men consist of persons of very different characters and qualities, the independent sect has been likewise dishonoured by several turbulent, factious, profligate, and flagitious members. But if it be a constant maxim with the wise and prudent, not to judge of the spirit and principles of a sect from the actions or expressions of a handful of its members, but from the manners, customs, opinions, and behaviour of the generality of those who compose it, from the writings and discourses of its learned men, and from its public and avowed forms of doctrine, and confessions of faith, I make no doubt that, by this rule of estimating matters, the Independents will appear to have been unjustly loaded with so many accusations and reproaches.

We shall take no notice of the invidious and severe animadversions that have been made upon this religious community by Clarendon, Echard, Parker, and so many other writers. To set this whole matter in the clearest and most impartial light, we shall confine ourselves to the account of the Independents given by a writer, justly celebrated by the English themselves, and who, though a foreigner, is generally supposed to have had an accurate knowledge of the British nation, its history, parties, sects, and revolutions. This writer is Rapin de Thoyras, who, (in the twenty-first book of his History of England) represents the Independents under such horrid colours, that, were his portrait just they

* Durell, (whom nevertheless Louis de Moulin, the most zealous defender of the Independents, commends on account of his ingenuity and candour,) in his Historia Rituum Sanctæ Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ, c. i. p. 4, expresses himself thus: "Fateor, si atrocis illius tragœdiæ tot actus fuerint, quot ludicrarum esse solent, postremum fere Independentium fuisse;—adeo ut non acute magis, quam vere, dixerit L'Estrangius noster, Regem primo à Presbyterianis interemtum, Carolum deinde ab Independentibus interfectum.

denomination from the following principle, which they held in common with the Brownists;——that every Christian congregation ought to be governed by its own laws, without depending on the jurisdiction of bishops,

would not deserve to enjoy the light of the sun, or to breathe the free air of Britain, much less to be treated with indulgence and esteem by those who have the cause of virtue at heart. Let us now examine the account which this illustrious historian gives of this sect. He declares, in the first place, that, notwithstanding all the pains he had taken to trace out the true origin of it, his inquiries had been entirely fruitless; his words may be thus translated: "After all my researches, I have not been able to discover, precisely, the origin of the Independent sect, or faction." It is very surprising to hear a man of learning, who had employed seventeen years in composing the History of England, and had admittance to so many rich and famous libraries, express his ignorance of a matter, about which it was so easy to acquire ample information. Had he only looked into the work of the learned Hornbeck, entituled, Summa Controversiarum, lib. x. p. 775, he would have found, in a moment, what he had been so long and so laboriously seeking in vain. Rapin proceeds to the doctrines and opinions of the Independents, and begins this part of his work by a general declaration of their tendency to throw the nation into disorder and combustion. He says, "It is at least certain, that their principles were* very proper to put the kingdom in a flame; and this they did effectually." What truth may be in this assertion, will be seen by what follows. Their sentiments concerning government were, if we are to believe this writer, of the most pernicious kind, since, according to him, they wanted to overturn the monarchy, and to establish a democracy in its place: his words are, "With regard to the state, they abhorred monarchy, and approved only a republican government." I will not pretend to deny, that there were among the Independents several persons who were unfriendly to a kingly government; persons of this kind were to be found among the Presbyterians, Anabaptists, and all the other religious sects and communities that flourished in England during this tumultuous period; but I want to see it proved, in an evident and satisfactory manner, that these republican principles were embraced by all the Independents, and formed one of the distinguishing characteristics of that sect. There is, at least, no such thing to be found in their public writings. They declared, on the contrary, in a public memorial drawn up by them in 1647, that, as magistracy in general is the ordinance of God, "they do not disapprove any form of civil government, but do freely acknowledge, that a kingly government, bounden by just and wholesome laws, is both allowed by God, and also a good accommodation unto men." I omit the mention of several other circumstances which unite to prove that the Independents were far from looking with abhorrence on a monarchical government.

Their sentiments of religion, according to Rapin, were highly absurd, since he represents their principles as entirely opposite to those of all other religious communities: "As to religion, (says he,) their principles were contrary to those of all the rest of the world." With respect to this accusation, it may be proper to observe, that there are extant two Confessions of Faith, one of the English Independents in Holland, and another drawn up by the principal members of that community in England. The former was composed by John Robinson, the founder of the sect, and was published at Leyden in 1619, under the following title: "Apologia pro Exulibus Anglis, qui Brownistæ vulgo appellantur:" the latter appeared at London, for the first time, in 1658, and was thus entitled: "A declaration of the Faith and Order owned and practised in the Congregational churches in England, agreed upon, and consented unto by their elders and messengers, in their meeting at the Savoy, October 12, 1658. Hornbeck gave, in 1659, a Latin translation of this Declaration, and subjoined it to his Epistolæ ad Duræum de Independentismo. It appears evidently from these two public and authentic pieces not to mention other writings of the Independents, that they differed from the presbyterians or calvinists in no single point of any consequence, except that of ecclesiastical government. To put this matter beyond all doubt, we have only to attend to the following passage in Robinson's Apology for the English Exiles, p. 7, 11, where that founder of the Independent sect expresses his own private sentiments, and those of his community, in the plainest manner: "Profitemur coram Deo et hominibus, adeo nobis convenire cum ecclesiis reformatis Belgicis in re religionis, ut omnibus et singulis earundem ecclesiarum fidei articulis, prout habentur in harmoniâ confessionum fidei, parati simus subscribere.—Ecclesias reformatas pro veris et genuinis habemus, cum iisdem in sacris Dei communionem profitemur, et, quantum in nobis est, colimus." It clearly appears from this declaration, that, instead of differing totally from all other Christian societies, it may rather be said of the Independents, that they perfectly agreed with the far greater part of the reformed churches. To show, as he imagines, by a striking example, the absurdity of their religion and worship, our eminent historian tells us, that they not only reject all kind of ecclesiastical government, but, moreover, allow all their members promiscuously, and without exception, to perform in public the pastoral functions, i. e. to preach, pray, and expound the Scriptures; his words are, "They were not only averse to episcopacy and the ecclesiastical hierarchy," this charge is true, but it may equally be brought against the Presbyterians, Brownists, Anabaptists, and all the various sects of Non-conformists,) "but they would not so much as endure ordinary ministers in the church. They maintained, that every man might pray in public, exhort his brethren, and interpret the Scriptures, according to the talents with which God had endowed him. So with them every one preached, prayed, admonished, interpreted the Scriptures, without any other call than what he himself drew from his zeal and supposed gifts, and without any other authority than the approbation of his auditors." This whole charge is evidently false and groundless. The Independents have, and always have had, *fixed* and *regular* ministers, approved by their people; nor do they allow to teach in public every person who thinks himself qualified for that important office. The celebrated historian has here confounded the Independents with the Brownists, who, as is well known, permitted all to pray and preach in public without distinction. We shall not enlarge upon the other mistakes into which he has fallen on this subject; but only observe, that if so eminent a writer, and one so well acquainted with the English nation, has pronounced such an unjust sentence against this sect, we may the more easily excuse an inferior set of authors, who have loaded them with groundless accusations.

It will, however, be alleged, that, whatever may have been the religious sentiments and discipline of the Independents, innumerable testimonies concur in proving, that they were chargeable with the death of Charles I. and many will consider this single circumstance as a sufficient demonstration of the impiety and depravity of the whole sect. I am well aware, indeed, that many of the most eminent and respectable English writers have given the Independents the denomination of Regicides; and if, by the term Independents, they mean those licentious republicans, whose dislike of a monarchical form of government carried them to the most pernicious and extravagant lengths, I grant that this denomination is well applied. But if, by this term, we are to understand a religious sect, the ancestors of those who still bear the same title in England, it appears very questionable to me, whether the unhappy fate of the worthy prince above-mentioned ought to be imputed entirely to that set of men. They who affirm that the Independents were the only authors of the death of king Charles, must mean one of these two things, either that the regicides were animated and set on by the seditious doctrines of that sect, and the violent suggestions of its members, or that all who were concerned in this atrocious deed were themselves Independents, zealously attached to the religious community now under consideration. Now it may be proved with the clearest evidence, that neither was the case. There is nothing in the doctrines of this sect, so far as they are known to me, that seems in the least adapted to excite men to such a horrid deed; nor does it appear from the history of those times, that the Independents were a whit more exasperated against Charles, than were the Presbyterians. And as to the latter supposition, it is far from being true, that all those who were concerned in bringing this unfortunate prince to the scaffold were Independents, since we learn from the best English writers, and from the public declarations of Charles II., that this violent faction was composed of persons of different sects. That there were Independents among them may be easily conceived. After all, this matter will be best unravelled by the English writers, who know best in what sense the term is used, when it is applied to those who brought Charles I. to the block.†

On inquiring, with particular attention, into the causes of the odium that has been cast upon the Independents, and of the heavy accusations

† Tout-à-fait propres à mettre l'Angleterre en combustion.

☞ * Dr. Mosheim's defence of the Independents is certainly specious; but he has not sufficiently distinguished the times; and he has, perhaps, in defending them, strained too far that equitable principle, that we must not impute to a sect any principles that are not contained in, or deducible from, their religious system. This maxim does not entirely answer here the purpose to which it is applied. The religious system of a sect may be in itself pacific and innocent, while incidental circumstances, or certain associations of ideas, may render that sect more turbulent and restless than others, or at least involve it in political factions and broils. Such perhaps was the case of the Independents at certain periods, and more especially at the period now under consideration. When we consider their religious form of government, we shall see evidently, that a principle of analogy (which influences the sentiments and imaginations of men much more than is generally supposed) must naturally have led the greatest part of them to republican notions of civil government; and it is farther to be observed, that, from a republican government, they must have expected much more protection and favour, than from a kingly one. When these two points are considered, together with their situation under the reign of Charles I. when the government was unhinged, when affairs were in great confusion, when the minds of men were suspended upon the issue of the national troubles, and when the eager spirit of party, nourished by hope, made each faction expect that the chaos would end in some settled system, favourable to their respective views, sentiments, and passions; we may be induced to think, that the Independents, at that time, were much more tumultuous and republican than the sect which bears that denomination in our times. The reader who would form just ideas of the matter of fact, must examine the relations given by the writers of both parties. See particularly the histories of Clarendon, Neal, Burnet, and Hume.

or being subject to the authority of synods, presbyteries, or any ecclesiastical assembly composed of the deputies from different churches.[a] It is in this their notion of ecclesiastical government, that the difference, between them and the Presbyterians, principally consists; for their religious doctrines, if we except some points of very little moment, are almost entirely the same with those of the church of Geneva. The founder of this sect was John Robinson, a man who had much of the solemn piety of the times, and was master of a congregation of Brownists that had settled at Leyden. This well-meaning man, perceiving the defects that reigned in the discipline of Brown, and in the spirit and temper of his followers, employed his zeal and diligence in correcting them, and in modelling anew the society, in such a manner as to render it less odious to its adversaries, and less liable to the just censure of those true Christians, who looked upon charity as the end of the commandment. The Independents, accordingly, were much more commendable than the Brownists in two respects. They surpassed them both in the moderation of their sentiments, and the order of their discipline. They did not, like Brown, pour forth bitter and uncharitable invectives against the churches that were governed by rules entirely different from theirs, nor pronounce them, on that account, unworthy of the Christian name. On the contrary, though they considered their own form of ecclesiastical government as of divine institution, and as originally introduced by the authority of the apostles, or by the apostles themselves, yet they had candour and charity enough to acknowledge that true religion and solid piety might flourish in those communities, which were under the jurisdiction of bishops, or the government of synods and presbyteries. They were also much more attentive than the Brownists to the establishment of a regular ministry in their communities; for, while the latter allowed promiscuously all ranks and orders of men to teach in public, and to perform the other pastoral functions, the Independents had, and still have, a certain number of ministers, chosen respectively by the congregations where they are fixed; nor is any person among them permitted to speak in public, before he has submitted to a proper examination of his capacity and talents, and has been approved by the heads of the congregation. This community, which was originally formed in Holland in 1610, made at first but a very small progress in England;[b] it worked its way slowly, and in a clandestine manner; and its members concealed their principles from public view, to avoid the penal laws that had been enacted against Non-conformists. But during the reign of Charles I., when, amidst the shocks of civil and religious discord, the authority of the bishops and the cause of episcopacy began to decline, and more particularly about the year 1640, the Independents became more courageous, and came forth, with an air of resolution and confidence, to public view. After this period, their affairs took a prosperous turn; and, in a little time, they became so considerable, both by their numbers, and by the reputation they acquired, that they vied in point of pre-eminence and credit, not only with the bishops, but also with the Presbyterians, while these were in the very zenith of their power. This rapid progress of the Independents, no doubt, arose from a variety of causes; among which justice obliges us to reckon the learning of their teachers, and the regularity and sanctity of their manners.[c] Dur-

and severe invectives with which they have been loaded, I was more peculiarly struck with the three following considerations, which will perhaps furnish a satisfactory account of this matter. In the first place, the denomination is ambiguous, and is not peculiar to any one distinct order of men. For, not to enumerate the other notions that have been annexed to this term, it is sufficient to observe, that it is used sometimes by the English writers to denote those who aim at the establishment of a purely democratical or popular government, in which the body of the people is clothed with the supreme dominion. Such a faction there was in England, composed, in a great measure, of persons of an enthusiastical character and complexion; and to it, no doubt, we are to ascribe those scenes of sedition and misery, whose effects are still justly lamented. The violence and folly that dishonoured the proceedings of this tumultuous faction have been, if I mistake not, too rashly imputed to the religious Independents now under consideration, who, with all their defects, were a much better set of men than the party now mentioned. It may be observed, secondly, that almost all the religious sects, which divided the English nation in the reign of Charles I. and more especially under the administration of Cromwell, assumed the denomination of Independents, in order to screen themselves from the reproaches of the public, and to share a part of that popular esteem which the true and genuine Independents had acquired, on account of the regularity of their lives, and the sanctity of their manners. This is confirmed, among other testimonies, by the following passage of a letter from Toland to Le Clerc. "Au commencement tous les sectaires se disoient Independans, parce que ces derniers etoient fort honorés du peuple à cause de leur pieté." See Le Clerc's Biblioth. Univers. et Histor. tom. xxiii. p. ii. p. 506. As this title was of a very extensive signification, and of great latitude, it might thus easily happen, that all the enormities of the various sects that sheltered themselves under it, and several of which were but of short duration, might unluckily be laid to the charge of the true Independents. But it must be particularly remarked, in the third place, that the usurper Cromwell preferred the Independents to all other religious communities. He looked, with an equal eye of suspicion and fear, upon the presbyterian synods and the episcopal visitations; every thing that looked like an extensive authority, whether it was of a civil or religious nature, excited uneasy apprehensions in the breast of the tyrant; but, in the limited and simple form of ecclesiastical discipline that was adopted by the Independents, he saw nothing that was calculated to alarm his fears. This circumstance was sufficient to render the Independents odious in the eyes of many, who would be naturally disposed to extend their abhorrence of Cromwell to those who were the objects of his favour and protection.

[a] The Independents were undoubtedly so called from their maintaining that all Christian congregations were so many independent religious societies, which had a right to be governed by their own laws, without being subject to any ulterior or foreign jurisdiction. Robinson, the founder of the sect, makes express use of this term in explaining his doctrine relating to ecclesiastical government; "Cœtum quemlibet particularem (says he, in his Apologia, cap. v. p. 22,) esse totam, integram, et perfectam ecclesiam ex suis partibus constantem, immediate et *independenter* (quoad alias ecclesias) sub ipso Christo." It may possibly have been from this very passage that the title of *Independent* was originally derived. The disciples of Robinson did not reject it; nor indeed is there any thing shocking in the title, when it is understood in a manner conformable to the sentiments of those to whom it is applied. It was certainly utterly unknown in England before the year 1640; at least it is not once mentioned in the ecclesiastical canons and constitutions that were drawn up, during that year, in the synods or visitations holden by the archbishops of Canterbury, York, and other prelates, in which canons all the various sects that then existed in England are particularly mentioned. See Wilkins' Concilia Magnæ Britanniæ et Hiberniæ, vol. iv. cap. v. p. 548, where are the "constitutions and canons ecclesiastical treated upon by the archbishops of Canterbury and York, and the rest of the bishops and clergy, in their several synods." An. MDCXL. It is true, that not long after this period, and more particularly from the year 1642, we find this denomination very frequently in the English annals. The English Independents were so far from being displeased with it, that they assumed it publicly in a piece they published in their own defence in 1644, under the following title; Apologetical Narration of the Independents. But when, in process of time, a great variety of sects, as has been already observed, sheltered themselves under the cover of this extensive denomination, and even seditious subjects, who aimed at nothing less than the death of their sovereign and the destruction of the government, employed it as a mask to hide their deformity, then the true and genuine Independents renounced this title, and substituted a less odious appellation for it, calling themselves *Congregational Brethren*, and their religious assemblies *Congregational Churches*.

[b] In 1616, Mr. Jacob, who had adopted the religious sentiments of Robinson, set up the first Independent or Congregational church in England.

[c] Neal's History, vol. ii. p. 107, 393; vol. viii. p. 141, 276, 303, 437, 549. See also Bohm's Englische Reformations-Historie, p. 794.

ing the administration of Cromwell, whose peculiar protection and patronage they enjoyed on more than one account, their credit rose to the greatest height, and their influence and reputation were almost universal; but, after the Restoration, their cause declined, and they fell back gradually into their primitive obscurity. The sect, indeed, still subsisted, but in such a state of dejection and weakness, as engaged them in 1691, under the government of King William, to enter into an association with the Presbyterians residing in and about London, under certain heads of agreement, that tended to the maintenance of their respective institutions.[a]

XXII. While Oliver Cromwell held the reins of government in Great-Britain, all sects, even those that dishonoured true religion in the most shocking manner by their fanaticism or their ignorance, enjoyed a full and unbounded liberty of professing publicly their respective doctrines. The Episcopalians alone were excepted from this toleration, and received the most severe and iniquitous treatment. The bishops were deprived of their dignities and revenues, and felt, in a particular manner, the heavy hand of oppression. But, though toleration was extended to all other sects and religious communities, yet the Presbyterians and Independents were treated with peculiar marks of distinction and favour. Cromwell, though attached to no one particular sect, gave to the latter extraordinary proofs of his good-will, and augmented their credit and authority, as this seemed the easiest and least exasperating method of setting bounds to the ambition of the Presbyterians, who aimed at a very high degree of ecclesiastical power.[b] It was during this period of religious anarchy, that the Fifth-Monarchy-Men arose—a set of wrong-headed and turbulent enthusiasts, who expected Christ's sudden appearance upon earth to establish a new kingdom, and, acting in consequence of this illusion, aimed at the subversion of all human government, and were for turning all things into the most deplorable confusion.[c] It was at this time also, that the Quakers, of whom we propose to give a more particular account,[d] and the hot-headed Anabaptists,[e] propagated, without restraint, their visionary doctrines. It must likewise be observed, that the Deists, headed by Sidney, Neville, Martin, and Harrington, appeared with impunity, and promoted a kind of religion, which consisted in a few plain precepts, drawn from the dictates of natural reason.[f]

XXIII. Among the various religious factions that sprang up in England during this period of confusion and anarchy, we may reckon a certain sect of Presbyterians, who were called by their adversaries *Antinomians*, or enemies of the law, and still subsist even in our times. The Antinomians are a more rigid kind of Calvinists, who pervert Calvin's doctrine of absolute decrees to the worst purposes, by drawing from it conclusions highly detrimental to the interests of true religion and virtue. Such is the judgment that the other Presbyterian communities form of this perverse and extravagant sect.[g]

[a] From this time they were called *United Brethren*. The heads of agreement that formed and cemented this union are to be found in the second volume of Whiston's Memoirs of his Life and Writings; and they consist of nine articles. The first relates to "Churches and Church Members," in which the United Ministers, Presbyterians and Independents, declare, among other things, "That each particular church hath a right to choose its own officers, and, being furnished with such as are duly qualified and ordained according to the Gospel rule, hath authority from Christ for exercising government and enjoying all the ordinances of worship within itself: that, in the administration of church-power, it belongs to the pastors and other elders of every particular church (if such there be) to rule and govern, and to the brotherhood to consent, according to the rule of the Gospel." In this both Presbyterians and Independents depart from the primitive principles of their respective institutions. Article II. relates to "the Ministry," which they grant to have been instituted by Jesus Christ, "for the gathering, guiding, edifying, and governing of his church." In this article it is farther observed, "that ministers ought to be endued with competent learning, sound judgment, and solid piety; that none are to be ordained to the work of the ministry, but such as are chosen and called thereunto by a particular church;" that, in such a weighty matter, "it is ordinarily requisite, that every such church consult and advise with the pastors of neighbouring congregations: and that, after such advice, the person thus consulted about, being chosen by the brotherhood of that particular church, be duly ordained and set apart to his office over them." Article III. relates to "Censures," and prescribes, first, the admonishing, and, if this prove ineffectual, the excommunication of offending and scandalous members, to be performed by the pastors, with the consent of the brethren. Article IV. concerning the "Communion of Churches," lays it down as a principle, that there is no subordination between particular churches; that they are all equal, and consequently independent; that the pastors, however, of these churches "ought to have frequent meetings, that, by mutual advice, support, encouragement, and brotherly intercourse, they may strengthen the hearts and hands of each other in the ways of the Lord." In Article V. which relates to "Deacons and Ruling Elders," the United Brethren acknowledge, that, "the office of a deacon is of divine appointment, and that it belongs to his office to receive, lay out, and distribute, the stock of the church to its proper uses;" and as there are different sentiments about the office of Ruling Elders, who labour not in word and doctrine, they agree that this difference makes no breach among them. In Article VI. concerning "Occasional Meetings of Ministers," &c. the brethren agree, that it is needful, in weighty and difficult cases, that the ministers of several churches meet together, "in order to be consulted and advised with about such matters;" and that particular churches "ought to have a reverential regard to their judgment so given, and not dissent therefrom without apparent grounds from the word of God." Article VII. which relates to "the Demeanour of the Brethern towards the Civil Magistrate," prescribes obedience to, and prayers for God's protection and blessing upon, their rulers. In Article VIII. which relates to a "Confession of Faith," the brethren esteem it sufficient, that a church acknowledge the Scriptures to be the word of God, the perfect and only rule of faith and practice, and "own either the doctrinal part of the articles of the church of England," or the Westminster Confession and Catechisms, drawn up by the Presbyterians, or the Confession of the Congregational Brethren (i. e. the Independents) to be agreeable to the said rule. Article IX. which concerns the "duty and deportment of the Brethren towards those who are not in communion with them," inculcates charity and moderation. It appears from these articles, that the Independents were led by a kind of necessity to adopt, in many things, the sentiments of the Presbyterians, and to depart thus far from the original principles of their sect.

[b] Soon after Cromwell's elevation, it was resolved by the parliament, at the conclusion of a debate concerning public worship and church-government, that the Presbyterian system should be the established government. The Independents had not yet agreed upon any standard of faith and discipline; and it was only a little before Cromwell's death that they held a synod, by his permission, in order to publish to the world an uniform account of their doctrine and principles.

[c] See Burnet's History of his own Time, vol. i. p. 67.

[d] See the History of the Quakers, in the present volume.

[e] We are not to imagine, by the term hot-headed, (*furiosi*,) that the Anabaptists resembled the furious fanatics of that name who formerly excited such dreadful tumults in Germany, and more especially at Munster. This was by no means the case; the English Anabaptists differed from their Protestant brethren about the subject and mode of baptism alone, confining the former to grown Christians, and the latter to immersion, or dipping. They were divided into Generals and Particulars, from their different sentiments upon the Arminian controversy. The latter, who were so called from their belief of the doctrines of particular election, redemption, &c. were strict Calvinists, who separated from the Independent congregation at Leyden in 1638. Their confession was composed with a remarkable spirit of modesty and charity. Their preachers were generally illiterate, and were eager in making proselytes of all that would submit to their immersion, without a due regard to their religious principles, or their moral characters. The writers of these times represent them as tinctured with a kind of enthusiastic fury against all that opposed them. There were, nevertheless, among them some learned and pious persons, who highly disapproved all violent and uncharitable proceedings.

[f] Neal's History, vol. iv. p. 87.

[g] See Toland's Letters to Le Clerc, in the periodical work of the latter, entitled, Bibliotheque Universelle et Historique, tom. xxiii. p. 505; and also Hornbeck's Summa Controversiarum, p. 800, 812.

Several of the Antinomians (for they are not all precisely of the same mind) look upon it as unnecessary for Christian ministers to exhort their flock to a virtuous practice, and a pious obedience to the divine law, "since they whom God has elected to salvation, by an eternal and immutable decree, will, by the irresistible impulse of divine grace, be led to the practice of piety and virtue; while those who are doomed by a divine decree to eternal punishment, will never be engaged, by any exhortations or admonitions, how affecting soever they may be, to a virtuous course; nor have they it in their power to obey the divine law, when the succours of divine grace are withholden from them." From these principles they concluded, that the ministers of the Gospel discharged sufficiently their pastoral functions, when they inculcated the necessity of faith in Christ, and proclaimed to their people the blessings of the new covenant. Another, and a still more hideous form of Antinomianism, is that which is exhibited in the opinions of other doctors of that sect,[a] who maintain, "That, as the elect cannot fall from grace or forfeit the divine favour, the wicked actions they commit, and the violations of the divine law with which they are chargeable, are not really sinful, nor are to be considered as instances of their departing from the law of God; and, consequently, they have no occasion either to confess their sins or to break them off by repentance. Thus adultery, for example, in one of the elect, though it may appear sinful in the sight of men, and be considered universally as an enormous violation of the divine law, yet is not a sin in the sight of God, because it is one of the essential and distinctive characters of the elect, that they cannot do any thing which is either displeasing to God, or prohibited by the law."[b]

XXIV. The public calamities, that flowed from these vehement and uncharitable disputes about religion, afflicted all wise and good men, and engaged several who were not less eminent for their piety than for their moderation and wisdom, to seek some method of uniting such of the contending parties as were capable of listening to the dictates of charity and reason, or at least of calming their animosities, and persuading them to mutual forbearance. These pacific doctors offered themselves as mediators between the more violent Episcopalians on the one hand, and the more rigid Presbyterians and Independents on the other; and hoped that, when their differences were accommodated, the minor factions would fall of themselves. The contests that reigned between the former turned partly on the forms of church government and public worship, and partly on certain religious tenets, more especially those that were debated between the Arminians and Calvinists. To lessen the breach that kept these two great communities at such a distance from each other, the arbitrators, already mentioned, endeavoured to draw them out of their narrow enclosures, to render their charity more extensive, and widen the paths of salvation, which bigotry and party-rage had been labouring to render inaccessible to many good Christians. This noble and truly evangelical method of proceeding procured to its authors the denomination of Latitudinarians.[c] Their views, indeed, were generous and extensive. They were zealously attached to the forms of ecclesiastical government and worship that were established in the church of England, and they recommended episcopacy with all the strength and power of their eloquence; but they did not go so far as to look upon it as of divine institution, or as absolutely and indispensably necessary to the constitution of a Christian church; and hence they maintained, that those who followed other forms of government and worship, were not, on that account, to be excluded from their communion, or to forfeit the title of brethren. As to the doctrinal part of religion, they took the system of the famous Episcopius for their model; and, like him, reduced the fundamental doctrines of Christianity (or those doctrines, the belief of which is necessary to salvation,) to a few points. By this manner of proceeding they showed, that neither the Episcopalians, who, generally speaking, embraced the sentiments of the Arminians nor the Presbyterians and Independents, who as generally adopted the doctrine of Calvin, had any reason tc oppose each other with such animosity and bitterness since the subjects of their debates were matters of an in different nature, with respect to salvation, and might be variously explained and understood, without any prejudice to their eternal interests. The chief leaders of these Latitudinarians were Hales and Chillingworth, whose names are still pronounced in England with that veneration which is due to distinguished wisdom and rational piety.[d] The respectable names of More, Cudworth, Gale, Whichcot, and Tillotson, add a high degree of lustre to this eminent list. The undertaking of these great men, was indeed bold and perilous; and it drew upon them much opposition, and many bitter reproaches. They received, as the first fruits of their charitable zeal, the odious appellations of Atheists, Deists, and Socinians, both from the Roman Catholics and the more rigid of the contending protestant parties; but, on the restoration of Charles II., they were raised to the first dignities of the church, and were deservedly holden in general esteem. It is also well known, that, even at the present time, the church of England is chiefly governed by Latitudinarians of this kind, though there be among both bishops and clergy, from time to time, ecclesiastics who breathe

☞ [a] This second Antinomian hypothesis has certainly a still more odious aspect than the first; and it is therefore surprising that our author should use, in the original, these terms; *Alii tantum statuunt, Electos, &c.*

[b] There is an account of the other tenets of the Antinomians, and of the modern disputes that were occasioned by the publication of the posthumous works of Crisp, a flaming doctor of that extravagant and pernicious sect, given by Pierre François le Courayer, in his Examen des Defauts Theologiques, tom. ii. p. 198. Baxter and Tillotson distinguished themselves by their zeal against the Antinomians; and they were also completely refuted by Dr. Williams, in his famous book, entitled, Gospel Truth Stated and Vindicated. ☞ I have been informed, since the first edition of this history was published, that the book entitled Examen des Defauts Theologiques, which our author supposes to have been written by Dr. Courayer, is the production of another pen.

[c] See Burnet's History of his own Time, vol. i. book ii.

[d] The life of the ingenious and worthy Mr. Hales was composed in English by M. Des-Maizeaux, and published at London in 1719; it was considerably augmented in the Latin translation of it, which I prefixed to the account of the synod of Dordrecht, drawn from the letters of that great man, and published at Hamburg in 1724. A life of Mr. Hales, written in French, is to be found in the first volume of the French translation of Chillingworth's Religion of Protestants, a safe Way to Salvation. The life of Chillingworth also was drawn up by Des-Maizeaux in English: and a French translation of it appeared in 1730 at the head of the excellent book now mentioned, which was also translated into that language, and published at Amsterdam in 1730. Those who are desirous of acquiring a thorough knowledge of the doctrines, government, laws, and present state of the church of England, will do well to read the history of these two men, and more especially to peruse Chillingworth's admirable book already mentioned.

the narrow and despotic spirit of Laud, and who, in the language of faction, are called High-Churchmen, or Church-Tories.[a]

XXV. No sooner was Charles II. re-established on the throne of his ancestors, than the ancient forms of ecclesiastical government and public worship were restored with him, and the bishops reinstated in their dignities and honours. The Non-conformists hoped, that *they* should be allowed to share some part of the honours and revenues of the church; but their expectations were totally disappointed, and the face of affairs changed very suddenly with respect to them; for Charles subjected to the government of bishops, not only the church of Ireland, but also that of Scotland, a nation which was peculiarly attached to the ecclesiastical discipline and polity of Geneva; and, in 1662, a public law was enacted, by which all who refused to observe the rites, and subscribe the doctrines of the church of England, were entirely excluded from its communion.[b] From this period until the reign of William III. the Non-conformists were in a precarious and changing situation, sometimes involved in calamity and trouble, at others enjoying some intervals of tranquillity and gleams of hope, according to the varying spirit of the court and ministry, but never entirely free from perplexities and fears.[c] But, in 1689, their affairs took a favourable turn, when a bill for the toleration of all protestant dissenters from the church of England, except the Socinians, passed in parliament almost without opposition, and delivered them from the penal laws to which they had been subjected by the act of uniformity, and other statutes enacted under the sway of the Stuart family.[d] Nor did the protestant dissenters in England enjoy, alone, the benefits of this act; for it extended also to the Scottish church, which was permitted thereby to follow the ecclesiastical discipline of Geneva, and was delivered from the jurisdiction of bishops, and from the forms of worship that were annexed to episcopacy. It is from this period that the non-conformists date the liberty and tranquillity they have long been blessed with, and which they still enjoy; but it is also observable, that it is to the transactions carried on during this period, in favour of religious liberty, that we must chiefly impute the multitude of religious sects and factions, that start up from time to time in that free and happy island, and involve its inhabitants in the perplexities of religious division and controversy.[e]

XXVI. In the reign of King William, and in the year 1689, the divisions among the friends of episcopacy ran high, and terminated in that famous schism in the church of England, which has never hitherto been entirely healed. Sancroft, archbishop of Canterbury, and seven of the other bishops,[f] all of whom were eminently distinguished both by their learning and their virtue, deemed it unlawful to take the oath of allegiance to the new king, from a mistaken notion that James II., though banished from his dominions, remained their rightful sovereign. As these scruples were deeply rooted, and no arguments or exhortations could engage these prelates to acknowledge the title of the prince of Orange to the crown of Great Britain, they were deprived of their ecclesiastical dignities, and their sees were filled by other men of eminent merit.[g] The deposed bishops and clergy formed a new episcopal church, which differed, in some points of doctrine, and certain circumstances of public worship, from the established church. The members of this new religious community were denominated *Non-jurors*, on account of their refusing to take the oath of allegiance, and were also called the *High-Church* party, on account of the high notions they entertained of the dignity and power of the church, and the extent they gave to its prerogatives and jurisdiction. Those, on the other hand, who disapproved this schism, who distinguished themselves by their charity and moderation toward dissenters, and were less ardent in extending the limits of ecclesiastical authority, were denominated *Low-Churchmen*.[h] The bishops who were deprived of their sees, and those who embarked in their cause, maintained openly that the church was not dependent on the jurisdiction of the king or the parliament, but was subject to the authority of God alone, and empowered to govern itself by its own laws; that consequently the sentence, pronounced against these prelates by the great council of the nation, was destitute both of justice and validity; and that it was only by the decree of an ecclesiastical council that a bishop could be deposed. These high notions of the authority and prerogatives of the church were maintained and propagated, with peculiar zeal, by the famous Henry Dodwell, who led the way in this important cause, and who, by his example and abilities, formed a considerable number of champions for its defence. Hence arose a very nice and intricate controversy, concerning the nature, privileges, and authority of the church,

[a] See Rapin's Dissertation on the Whigs and Tories. ☞ See an admirable defence of the latitudinarian divines, in a book entitled, The Principles and Practices of certain moderate Divines of the Church of England (greatly misunderstood) truly represented and defended, London, 1670. This book was written by Dr. Fowler, afterwards bishop of Gloucester. N.

☞ [b] This was the famous Act of Uniformity, in consequence of which the validity of presbyterian ordination was renounced, the ministrations of the foreign churches were disowned, the terms of conformity rendered more difficult, and raised higher than before the civil wars; and by which (contrary to the manner of proceeding in the times of Elizabeth and Cromwell, both of whom reserved for the subsistence of each ejected clergyman a fifth part of his benefice) no provision was made for those who should be deprived of their livings. See Wilkins' Concilia Magnæ Britanniæ et Hiberniæ, tom. iv. p. 573.—Burnet's History of his own Time, vol. ii. p, 190, &c.—Neal's History of the Puritans, vol. iv. p. 358.

[c] See the whole fourth volume of Neal's History.

[d] This was called the Toleration Act; and it may be seen at length in the Appendix, subjoined to the fourth volume of Neal's History of the Puritans.—☞ It is entitled, An Act for exempting their Majesties' Protestant Subjects, dissenting from the Church of England, from the Penalties of certain Laws. In this bill the Corporation and Test acts are omitted, and consequently still remain in force. The Socinians are also excepted; but provision is made for Quakers, upon their making a solemn declaration, instead of taking the oaths to the government. This act excuses protestant dissenters from the penalties of the laws therein mentioned, provided they take the oaths to the government, and subscribe the doctrinal articles of the church of England.

[e] Burnet's History of his own Time, vol. ii. p. 23.

☞ [f] The other non-juring bishops were Lloyd, bishop of Norwich; Turner, of Ely; Kenn, of Bath and Wells; Frampton, of Gloucester; Thomas, of Worcester; Lake, of Chichester, and White, of Peterborough.

☞ [g] Among these were Tillotson, Moore, Patrick, Kidder, Fowler, and Cumberland, names that will be ever pronounced with veneration by such as are capable of esteeming well employed learning and genuine piety, and that will always shine among the brightest ornaments of the church of England.

[h] The denomination of High-church is given certainly, with great propriety, to the Non-jurors, who have very proud notions of church power; but it is commonly used in a more extensive signification, and is applied to all those who, though far from being Non-jurors, or otherwise disaffected to the present happy establishment, yet form pompous and ambitious conceptions of the authority and jurisdiction of the church, and would raise it to an absolute exemption from all human control. Many such are to be found even among those who go under the general denomination of the Low-Church party.

which has not yet been brought to a satisfactory conclusion.[a]

XXVII. The Non-jurors or High-Churchmen, who boast with peculiar ostentation of their orthodoxy, and treat the Low-Church as unsound and schismatical, differ in several things from the members of the episcopal church, in its present establishment; but they are more particularly distinguished by the following principles: 1. That it is never lawful for the people, under any provocation or pretext whatever, to resist the sovereign. This is called in England passive obedience, and is a doctrine warmly opposed by many, who think it both lawful and necessary, in certain circumstances, and in cases of an urgent and momentous nature, to resist the prince for the happiness of the people. They maintain farther, 2. That the hereditary succession to the throne is of divine institution, and therefore can never be interrupted, suspended, or annulled, on any pretext: 3. That the church is subject to the jurisdiction, not of the civil magistrate, but of God alone, particularly in matters of a religious nature: 4. That, consequently, Sancroft, and the other bishops, deposed by King William III., remained, notwithstanding their deposition, true bishops, to the day of their death; and that those who were substituted in their places were the unjust possessors of other men's property: 5. That these unjust possessors of ecclesiastical dignities were rebels against the state, as well as schismatics in the church; and that all, therefore, who held communion with them, were also chargeable with rebellion and schism: 6. That this schism, which rends the church in pieces, is a most heinous sin, and that the punishment due to it must fall heavy upon all those who do not return sincerely to the true church, from which they have departed.[b]

XXVIII. It will now be proper to change the scene, and to consider a little the state of the reformed church in Holland. The Dutch Calvinists thought themselves happy after the defeat of the Arminians, and were flattering themselves with the agreeable prospect of enjoying long, in tranquillity and repose, the fruits of their victory, when new scenes of tumult arose from another quarter. Scarcely had they triumphed over the enemies of absolute predestination, when, by an ill hap, they became the prey of intestine disputes, and were divided among themselves in such a deplorable manner, that, during the whole of this century, the United Provinces were a scene of contention, animosity, and strife. It is not necessary to mention all the subjects of these religious quarrels; nor indeed would this be an easy task. We shall therefore pass over in silence the debates of certain divines, who disputed about some particular, though not very momentous, points of doctrine and discipline; such as those of the famous Voet and the learned Des-Marets; as also the disputes of Salmasius, Boxhorn, Voet, and others, concerning usury, ornaments in dress, stage-plays, and other minute points of morality; and the contests of Apollonius, Trigland, and Vedelius, concerning the power of the magistrate in matters of religion and ecclesiastical discipline, which produced such a flaming division between Frederic Spanheim and John Vander-Wayen. These, and other debates of the like nature and importance rather discover the sentiments of certain learned men, concerning some particular points of religion and morality, than exhibit a clear view of the internal state of the Belgic church. The knowledge of this must be derived from those controversies alone in which the whole church, or at least the greatest part of its doctors, have been directly concerned.

XXIX. Such were the controversies occasioned in Holland by the philosophy of Des-Cartes, and the theological novelties of Cocceius. Hence arose the two powerful and numerous factions, distinguished by the denominations of Cocceians and Voetians, which still subsist, though their debates are now less violent, and their champions somewhat more moderate than they were in former times. The Cocceian theology and the Cartesian philosophy have, indeed, no common features, nor any thing, in their respective tenets and principles, that was in the least adapted to form a connexion between them; and, in consequence, the debates they excited, and the factions they produced, had no natural relation to, or dependence on, each other. It nevertheless so happened, that the respective votaries of these very different sciences formed themselves into one sect; so far at least, that those who chose Cocceius for their guide in theology, took Des-Cartes for their master in philosophy.[c] This will appear less surprising when we consider, that the very same persons who opposed the progress of Cartesianism in Holland were the warm adversaries of the Cocceian theology; for this opposition, equally levelled at these two great men and their respective systems, laid the Cartesians and Cocceians under a kind of necessity of uniting their force, in order to defend their cause, in a more effectual manner, against the formidable attacks of their numerous adversaries. The Voetians were so called from Gisbert Voet, a learned and eminent professor of divinity in the university of Utrecht, who first sounded the alarm of this theologico-philosophical war, and led on, with zeal, the polemic legions against those who followed the standard of Des-Cartes and Cocceius.

☞ [a] Dodwell himself was deprived of his professorship of history, for refusing to take the oath of allegiance to King William and Queen Mary; and this circumstance, no doubt, augmented the zeal with which he interested himself in the defence of the bishops, who were suspended for the same reason. It was on this occasion that he published his "Cautionary Discourse of Schism, with a particular regard to the case of the bishops, who are suspended for refusing to take the new oath." This book was fully refuted by the learned Dr. Hody, in 1691, in a work entitled, "The Unreasonableness of a Separation from the new Bishops: or a Treatise out of Ecclesiastical History, showing, that although a bishop was unjustly deprived, neither he nor the church ever made a separation, if the successor was not a heretic;" translated out of an ancient Greek manuscript (among the Baroccian MSS.) in the public library at Oxford. The learned author translated this work afterwards into Latin, and prefixed to it some pieces out of ecclesiastical antiquity, relative to the same subject. Dodwell published, in 1692, an answer to it, which he called, "A Vindication of the deprived Bishops," &c., to which Dr. Hody replied, in a treatise entitled, "The Case of the Sees vacant by an unjust or uncanonical Deprivation stated, in reply to the Vindication," &c. The controversy did not end here; for it was extremely difficult to reduce Mr. Dodwell to silence. Accordingly he came forth a third time with his stiff and rigid polemics, and published, in 1695, his Defence of the Vindication of the deprived Bishops. The preface which he designed for this work, was at first suppressed, but appeared afterwards under the following title: "The Doctrine of the Church of England concerning the independency of the Clergy on the Lay-power, as to those rights of theirs which are purely spiritual, reconciled with our oath of supremacy and the lay-deprivation of the popish Bishops in the beginning of the Reformation. Several other pamphlets were published on the subject of this controversy.

[b] See Whiston's Memoirs of his Life and Writings, vol. i. p. 30.—Hickes' Memoirs of the Life of John Kettlewell.—Nouveau Diction. Histor. et Crit. at the article Collier.—Ph. Masson, Histoire Critique de la Repub. des Lettres, tom. xiii. p. 298.

[c] See Fred. Spanhemii Epistola de novissimis in Belgio Dissidiis, tom. ii. op. p. 973.

XXX. The Cartesian philosophy, at its first appearance, attracted the attention and esteem of many, and seemed more conformable to truth and nature, as well as more elegant and pleasing in its aspect, than the intricate labyrinths of Peripatetic wisdom. It was considered in this light in Holland; it however met there with a formidable adversary, in 1639, in the famous Voet above mentioned, who taught theology with the greatest reputation, and gave plain intimations of his looking upon Cartesianism as a system of impiety. Voet was a man of uncommon application and immense learning; he had made an extraordinary progress in the various branches of erudition and philosophy; but he was not endowed with a large portion of that philosophical spirit, which judges with acuteness and precision of natural science and abstract truths. While Des-Cartes resided at Utrecht, Voet found fault with many things in his philosophy; but what induced him to cast upon it the aspersion of impiety, was its being introduced by the following principles: "That the person who aspires to the character of a true philosopher must begin by doubting of all things, even of the existence of a Supreme Being—that the nature or essence of spirit, and even of God himself, consists in thought—that space has no real existence, and is no more than the creature of fancy,—and that, consequently, matter is without bounds."

Des-Cartes defended his principles, with his usual acuteness, against the professor of Utrecht; his disciples and followers thought themselves obliged, on this occasion, to assist their master; and thus war was formally declared. On the other hand, Voet was not only seconded by those Belgic divines who were the most eminent, at this time, for the extent of their learning and the soundness of their theology, such as Rivet, Des-Marets, and Maestricht, but also was followed and applauded by the greatest part of the Dutch clergy.[a] While the flame of controversy burned with sufficient ardour, it was considerably augmented by the proceedings of certain doctors, who applied the principles and tenets of Des-Cartes to the illustration of theological truth. Hence, in 1656, an alarm was raised in the Dutch churches and schools, and a strong resolution was taken in several of their ecclesiastical assemblies (commonly called *classes*,) to make head against Cartesianism, and not to permit that imperious philosophy to make such encroachments upon the domain of theology. The states of Holland not only approved this resolution, but also gave a new force and efficacy by a public edict, issued in the same year, by which both the professors of philosophy and theology were forbidden either to explain the writings of Des-Cartes to the youth under their care, or to illustrate the doctrines of the Gospel by the principles of philosophy. It was farther resolved in an assembly of the clergy, holden at Delft in the following year, that no candidate for holy orders should be received into the ministry before he made a solemn declaration, that he would neither promote the Cartesian philosophy, nor disfigure the divine simplicity of religion, by loading it with foreign ornaments. Laws of a like tenor were afterwards passed by the States-general, and by the governments of other countries.[b] But as there is in human nature a strange propensity to struggle against authority, and to pursue, with a peculiar degree of ardour, things that are forbidden, so it happened, that all these edicts proved insufficient to stop the progress of Cartesianism, which at length obtained a solid and permanent footing in the seminaries of learning, and was applied, both in the universities and churches, and sometimes indeed very preposterously, to explain the truths and precepts of Christianity. Hence it was, that the United Provinces were divided into the two great factions already mentioned, and that the whole remainder of this century was spent amidst their contentions and debates.

XXXI. John Koch of Cocceius, a native of Bremen, and professor of divinity in the university of Leyden, might have certainly passed for a great man, had his vast erudition, his exuberant fancy, his ardent piety, and his uncommon application to the study of the Scriptures, been under the direction of a sound and solid judgment. This singular man introduced into theology a multitude of new tenets and strange notions, which had never before entered into the brain of any other mortal, or at least had never been heard of before his time. In the first place, as has been already hinted, his manner of explaining Scripture was totally different from that of Calvin and his followers. Departing entirely from the admirable simplicity that reigns in the commentaries of that great man, he represented the whole history of the Old Testament as a mirror, that held forth an accurate view of the transactions and events which were to happen in the church under the dispensation of the New Testament, and to the end of the world. He even went so far as to maintain, that the miracles, actions, and sufferings of Christ and of his apostles, during the course of their ministry, were types and images of future events. He affirmed, that the far greater part of the ancient prophecies foretold Christ's ministry and mediation, and the rise, progress, and revolutions of the church, not only under the figures of persons and transactions, but in a literal manner, and by the very sense of the words, used in these predictions; and he completed the extravagance of this chimerical system, by turning, with wonderful art and dexterity, into holy riddles and typical predictions, even those passages of the Old Testament which seemed intended for no other purpose than to celebrate the praises of the Deity, convey some religious truth, or inculcate some rule of practice. In order to give an air of solidity and plausibility to these eccentric notions, he first laid it down as a fundamental rule of interpretation, "That the words and phrases of Scripture are to be understood in every sense of which they are susceptible; or, in other words, that they signify, in effect, every thing that they can signify;" a rule which, when followed by a man who had more imagination than judgment, could not fail to produce very extraordinary comments on the sacred writings. After having laid down this singular rule, he divided the whole history of the church into seven periods, conformable to the seven trumpets and seals mentioned in the Revelations.

XXXII. One of the great designs formed by Gocceius, was that of separating theology from philosophy, and of confining the Christian doctors, in their explications of

[a] See Baillet's Vie de M. Des-Cartes, tom. ii. chap. v. and Daniel's Voyage du Monde de M. Des-Cartes.

[b] Fred. Spanheim, de novissimis in Belgio Dissidiis, tom. ii. op. p. 959.—The reader may also consult the historians of this century, such as Arnold, Weismann, Jäger, Carolus, and also Walchius' Histor. Controvers. Germanic, tom. iii.

the former, to the words and phrases of the Scriptures. Hence it was, that, finding, in the language of the sacred writers, the Gospel dispensation represented under the image of a covenant made between God and man, he looked upon the use of this image as admirably adapted to exhibit a complete and well connected system of religious truth. But while he was labouring this point, and endeavouring to accommodate the circumstances and characters of human contracts to the dispensations of divine wisdom, which they represent in such an inaccurate and imperfect manner, he fell imprudently into some erroneous notions. Such was his opinion concerning the covenant made between God and the Jewish nation by the ministry and the mediation of Moses, which he affirmed to be "of the same nature with the new covenant obtained by the mediation of Jesus Christ." In consequence of this general principle, he maintained, "That the Ten Commandments were promulgated by Moses not as a rule of obedience, but as a representation of the covenant of grace; that when the Jews had provoked the Deity, by their various transgressions, particularly by the worship of the golden calf, the severe and servile yoke of the ceremonial law was added to the decalogue, as a punishment inflicted on them by the Supreme Being in his righteous displeasure; that this yoke, which was painful in itself, became doubly so on account of its typical signification, since it admonished the Israelites, from day to day, of the imperfection and uncertainty of their state, filled them with anxiety, and was a standing and perpetual proof that they had merited the displeasure of God, and could not expect, before the coming of the Messiah, the entire remission of their transgressions and iniquities; that, indeed, good men, even under the Mosaic dispensation, were immediately after death made partakers of everlasting happiness and glory; but that they were, nevertheless, during the whole course of their lives, far removed from that firm hope and assurance of salvation, with which the faithful are gratified under the dispensation of the Gospel, and that their anxiety flowed naturally from this consideration, that their sins, though they remained unpunished, were not pardoned, because Christ had not then offered himself up a sacrifice to the Father to make an entire atonement for them." These are the principal lines that distinguish the Cocceian from other systems of theology; it is attended, indeed, with other peculiarities; but we shall pass them over in silence, as of little moment, and unworthy of notice. These notions were warmly opposed by the persons who had declared war against the Cartesian philosophy; and the contest was carried on for many years with various success. But in the issue, the doctrines of Cocceius, like those of Des-Cartes, maintained their ground; and neither the dexterity nor the vehemence of his adversaries could exclude his disciples from the public seminaries of learning, or hinder them from propagating, with surprising success and rapidity, the tenets of their master in Germany and Switzerland.[a]

XXXIII. The other controversies that divided the Batavian church during this century, arose from the immoderate propensity that certain doctors discovered toward an alliance between the Cartesian philosophy and their theological system. This will appear, with the utmost evidence, from the debates excited by Roell and Becker, which surpassed all the others, both by the importance of their subjects and by the noise they made in the world. About the year 1686, certain Cartesian doctors of divinity, headed by the ingenious Herman Alexander Roell, professor of theology in the university of Franeker, seemed to attribute to the dictates of reason a more extensive authority in religious matters, than they had hitherto possessed. The controversy occasioned by this innovation was reducible to the two following questions: "I. Whether the divine origin and authority of Scripture can be demonstrated by reason alone, or whether an inward testimony of the Holy Spirit in the hearts of Christians be necessary in order to the firm belief of this fundamental point? 2. Whether the sacred writings propose to us, as an object of faith, any thing that is repugnant to the dictates of right reason?" These questions were answered, the former in the affirmative, and the latter in the negative, not only by Roell, but also by Vander-Wayen, Wessel, Duker, Ruard ab Andala, and other doctors, who were opposed on this occasion by Ulric Nuber, an eminent lawyer, Gerard de Vries, and others of inferior note.[b] The flame excited by this controversy spread itself far and wide through the United Provinces; and its progress seemed to be increasing from day to day, when the states of Friseland prudently interposed to restore the peace of the church, by imposing silence on the contending parties. Those whose curiosity may engage them to examine with attention and accuracy the points debated in this controversy, will find, that a very considerable part of it was merely a dispute about words, and that the real difference of sentiment that existed between these learned disputants might have been easily accommodated, by proper explications on both sides.

XXXIV. Not long after this controversy had been hushed, Roell alarmed the orthodoxy of his colleagues, and more particularly of the learned Vitringa, by some other new tenets, that rendered the soundness of his religious principles extremely doubtful, not only in their opinion, but likewise in the judgment of many Dutch divines;[c] for he maintained, "That the account we have of the generation of the Son, in the sacred writings, is not to be understood in a literal sense, or as a real generation of a natural kind;" he also affirmed, "That the afflictions and death of the righteous are as truly the penal effects of original sin, as the afflictions and death of the wicked and impenitent;" and he entertained notions concerning the divine decrees, original sin, the satisfaction of Christ, and some points of less moment, which differed in reality, or by the manner of expressing them seemed to differ greatly, from the doctrines received and established in the Dutch church.[d] The magistrates of Friseland used all the precautions that prudence could suggest, to

[a] See Baillet's Vie de M. Des-Cartes, tom. ii. p. 33.—Daniel's Voyage du Monde de Des-Cartes.—Val. Alberti Διπλοῦν καππά, Cartesianismus et Cocceianismus descripti et refutati.

[b] See the Biblioth. Univers. et Historique of Le Clerc, tom. vi.

[c] For an account of Roell, see the Bibliotheca Bremens, Theologico-Philolog. tom. ii. p. vi. p. 707; and Casp. Burmanni Trajectum Eruditum, p. 306.

[d] Those who are desirous of the most accurate account of the errors of Roell, will find them enumerated in a public piece composed by the faculty of theology at Leyden, in order to confirm the sentence of condemnation that had been pronounced against them by the Dutch synods. This piece is entitled, Judicium Ecclesiasticum, quo Opiniones quædam Cl. H. A. Roellii synodice damnatæ sunt, laudatum a Professoribus Theologiæ in Academiâ Lugduno-Batavâ.

prevent these controversies from being propagated in their province; and they enacted several laws for this purpose, all tending toward peace and silence. This conduct, however, was not imitated by the other provinces, where Roell and his disciples were condemned, both in private and in public, as heretics and corruptors of divine truth.[a] Nor did the death of this eminent man extinguish the animosity and resentment of his adversaries; for his disciples were still treated with severity; and, notwithstanding the solemn protestations they have given of the soundness and purity of their religious sentiments, they labour under the imputation of many concealed errors.

XXXV. The controversy set on foot by the ingenious Balthasar Becker, minister at Amsterdam, must not be omitted. This learned ecclesiastic took occasion, from the Cartesian definition of spirit, of the truth and precision of which he was intimately persuaded, to deny boldly all the accounts we have in Scripture of the seduction, influence, and operations of the devil and his infernal emissaries, as also all that has been said in favour of the existence of ghosts, spectres, and magicians. The long and elaborate work which he published in 1691, upon this interesting subject, is still extant. In this singular production, which bears the title of the World Bewitched, he modifies and perverts, with the greatest ingenuity, but also with equal temerity and presumption, the accounts given by the sacred writers of the power of Satan and wicked angels, and of persons possessed by evil spirits; he affirms, moreover, that the unhappy and malignant being, who is called in Scripture Satan, or the Devil, is chained down with his infernal ministers in hell; so that he can never come forth from this eternal prison to terrify mortals, or to seduce the righteous from the paths of virtue. According to the Cartesian definition above mentioned, the essence of spirit consists in thought; and, from this definition, Becker drew his doctrine, since none of that influence, or of those operations which are attributed to evil spirits, can be effected by mere thinking.[b] Rather, therefore, than call in question the accuracy or authority of Des-Cartes, Becker thought proper to force the narrations and doctrines of Scripture into a conformity with the principles and definitions of this philosopher. This error excited great tumults and divisions, not only in all the United Provinces, but also in some parts of Germany, where several doctors of the Lutheran church were alarmed at its progress, and arose to oppose it.[c] Its inventor and promoter, though refuted victoriously by a multitude of adversaries, and publicly deposed from his pastoral charge, died in 1718, in the full persuasion of the truth of those opinions which had drawn upon him so much opposition, and professed, with his last breath, his sincere adherence to every thing he had written on that subject; nor can it be said, that this his doctrine died with him, since it is abundantly known, that it has still many votaries and patrons, who either hold it in secret, or profess it publicly.

XXXVI. The curious reader can be no stranger to the multitude of sects, some Christian, some half-Christian, some totally delirious, that have started up at different times both in England and Holland. It is difficult, indeed, for those who live in other countries, to give accurate accounts of these separatists, as the books that contain their doctrines and views are seldom dispersed among foreign nations. We have, however, been lately favoured with some relations, that give a more just idea of the Dutch sects, called Verschorists and Hattemists, than we had before entertained; and it will not therefore be improper to give here some account of these remarkable communities. The former derives its denomination from Jacob Verschoor, a native of Flushing, who in 1680, out of a perverse and heterogeneous mixture of the tenets of Cocceius and Spinosa, produced a new form of religion, equally remarkable for its extravagance and impiety. His disciples and followers were called Hebrews, on account of the zeal and assiduity with which they all, without distinction of age or sex, applied themselves to the study of the Hebrew language.

The Hattemists were so called from Pontian Van Hattem, a minister in the province of Zealand, who was also addicted to the sentiments of Spinosa, and was on that account degraded from his pastoral office. The Verschorists and Hattemists resemble each other in their religious systems, though there must also be some points in which they differ, since it is well known, that Van Hattem could never persuade the former to unite their sect with his, and thus to form one communion. Neither of the two would wish the public to conclude that they have abandoned the profession of the Reformed religion; they affect, on the contrary, an apparent attachment to it; and Hattem, in particular, published a treatise upon the Catechism of Heidelberg. If I rightly understand the imperfect relations that have been given of the sentiments and principles of these two communities, both their founders began by perverting the doctrine of the Reformed church

[a] This affirmation is somewhat exaggerated; at least we must not conclude from it, that Roell was either deposed or persecuted; for he exercised the functions of his professorship for several years after this at Franeker, and was afterwards called to the chair of divinity at Utrecht, upon the most honourable and advantageous terms. The states of Friseland published an edict, enjoining silence, and forbidding all professors, pastors, &c. in their province, to teach the particular opinions of Roell; and this pacific divine sacrificed the propagation of his opinions to the love of peace and concord. His notion concerning the Trinity did not essentially differ from the doctrine generally received upon that mysterious and unintelligible subject; and his design seemed to be no more than to prevent Christians from humanising the relation between the Father and Son. But this was wounding his brethren, the rigorous systematic divines, in a tender point; for, if Anthropomorphism, or the custom of attributing to the Deity the kind of procedure in acting and judging that is usual among men (who resemble him only as imperfection resembles perfection,) should be banished from theology, orthodoxy would be deprived of some of its most precious phrases, and our confessions of faith and systems of doctrine would be reduced within much narrower bounds.

[b] Our historian relates here somewhat obscurely the reasoning which Becker founded upon the Cartesian definition of mind or spirit. The substance of his argument is as follows: "The essence of mind is thought, and the essence of matter extension. Now since there is no sort of conformity or connexion between thought and extension, mind cannot act upon matter, unless these two substances be united, as soul and body are in man: therefore no separate spirits, either good or evil, can act upon mankind. Such acting is miraculous, and miracles can be performed by God alone. It follows of consequence that the scriptural accounts of the actions and operations of good and evil spirits must be understood in an allegorical sense." This is Becker's argument; and it does, in truth, little honour to his acuteness and sagacity. By proving too much, it proves nothing at all; for, if the want of a connexion or conformity between thought and extension renders mind incapable of acting upon matter, it is hard to see how their union should remove this incapacity, since the want of conformity and of connexion remains notwithstanding this union. Besides, according to this reasoning, the Supreme Being cannot act upon material beings. In vain does Becker maintain the affirmative, by having recourse to a miracle: for this would imply, that the whole course of nature is a series of miracles, that is to say, that there are no miracles at all.

[c] See Lilienthalii Selectæ Historiæ Literar. p. i. observat. ii. p. 17.—

concerning absolute decrees, so as to deduce from it the impious system of a fatal and uncontrollable necessity. Having laid down this principle to account for the origin of all events, they went a step farther into the domain of atheism, and denied "the difference between moral good and evil, and the corruption of human nature." Hence they concluded, "That mankind were under no sort of obligation to correct their manners, to improve their minds, or to endeavour after a regular obedience to the divine laws; that the whole of religion consisted, not in acting, but in suffering; and that all the precepts of Jesus Christ are reducible to this single one, that we should bear with cheerfulness and patience the events that happen to us through the divine will, and make it our constant and only study to maintain a permanent tranquillity of mind."

This, if we mistake not, was the common doctrine of the two sects under consideration. There were, however, certain opinions or fancies, which were peculiar to Hattem and his followers, who affirmed, "That Christ had not satisfied the divine justice, nor made an expiation for the sins of men by his death and sufferings, but had only signified to us, by his mediation, that there was nothing in us that could offend the Deity." Hattem maintained, "that this was Christ's manner of justifying his servants, and presenting them blameless before the tribunal of God." These opinions seem perverse and pestilential in the highest degree; and they evidently tend to extinguish all virtuous sentiments, and to dissolve all moral obligation. It does not however appear, that either of these innovators directly recommended immorality and vice, or thought that men might safely follow, without any restraint, the impulse of their irregular appetites and passions. It is at least certain, that the following maxim is placed among their tenets, that God does not punish men *for* their sins, but *by* their sins; and this maxim seems to signify, that, if a man does not restrain his irregular appetites, he must suffer the painful fruits of his licentiousness, both in a present and future life, not in consequence of any judicial sentence pronounced by the will, or executed by the immediate hand of God, but according to some fixed law or constitution of nature.[a] The two sects still subsist, though they bear no longer the names of their founders.

XXXVII. The churches of Switzerland, so early as the year 1669, were alarmed at the progress which the opinions of Amyrault, De la Place, and Capel, were making in different countries; and they were apprehensive that the doctrine they had received from Calvin, and which had been so solemnly confirmed by the Synod of Dordrecht, might be altered and corrupted by these supposed improvements in theology. This apprehension was so much the less chimerical, as at that very time there were, among the clergy of Geneva, certain doctors eminent for their learning and eloquence, who not only adopted these new opinions, but were also desirous, notwithstanding the opposition and remonstrances of their colleagues, of propagating them among the people.[b] To set bounds to the zeal of these innovators, and to stop the progress of the new doctrines, the learned John Henry Heidegger, professor of divinity at Zurich, was employed in 1675, by an assembly composed of the most eminent Helvetic divines, to draw up a form of doctrine, in direct opposition to the tenets and principles of the celebrated French writers mentioned above. The magistrates were engaged, without much difficulty, to give to this production the stamp of their authority, and to add to it the other confessions of faith received in the Helvetic church, under the peculiar denomination of the *Form of Concord*. This step, which seemed to be taken with pacific views, proved an abundant source of division and discord. Many declared, thot they could not conscientiously subscribe this new form; and thus unhappy tumults and contests arose in several places. Hence it happened, that the canton of Basil and the republic of Geneva, perceiving the inconveniences that proceeded from this new article of church communion, and being strongly solicited, in 1686, by Frederic William, elector of Brandenburg, to ease the burthened consciences of their clergy, abrogated this form.[c] It is nevertheless certain, that in the other cantons it maintained its authority for some time after this period; but, in our time, the discords it has excited in many places, and more particularly in the university of Lausanne, have contributed to deprive it of all its authority, and to plunge it into utter oblivion.[d]

CHAPTER III.

The History of the Arminian Church.

I. THERE sprang forth from the bosom of the reformed church, during this century, two new sects, whose birth and progress were, for a long time, painful and perplexing to the parent that bore them. These sects were the Arminians and Quakers, whose origin was owing to very different principles, since the former derived its existence from an excessive propensity to improve the faculty of reason, and to follow its dictates and discoveries: while the latter sprang up, like a rank weed, from the neglect and contempt of human reason. The Arminians derive their name and their origin from James Arminius, or Harmensen, who was first pastor at Amsterdam, afterwards professor of divinity at Leyden, and who attracted the esteem and applause of his very enemies, by his acknowledged candour, penetration, and piety.[e] They received also the denomination of *Remonstrants*, from

Miscellan. Lipsiens, tom. i. p. 361, where may be found an explication of a satirical medal, struck to expose the sentiments of Becker. See also Nouveau Diction. Hist. et Critique, tom. i. p. 193.

[a] See Theod. Hasæi Dissert. in Museo Bremensi Theol. Philolog. vol. ii. p. 144.—Bibliotheque Belgique, tom. ii. p. 203.

[b] See Leti Istoria Genevina, part iv. book v. p. 448, 488, 497, &c.

[c] ☞ It must not be imagined, from the expressions of our historian, that this *Consensus*, or Form of Agreement, was abrogated at Basil by a positive edict. The case stood thus: Mr. Peter Werenfels, who was at the head of the ecclesiastical consistory of that city, paid such regard to the letter of the elector, as to avoid requiring a subscription to this form from the candidates for the ministry: and his conduct, in this respect, was imitated by his successors. The remonstrances of the elector do not seem to have had the same effect upon those who governed the church of Geneva; for the form maintained its credit and authority there until the year 1706, when, without being abrogated by any positive act, it fell into disuse. In several other parts of Switzerland, it was still imposed as a rule of faith, as appears from the letters addressed by George I., king of Great Britain, and by the king of Prussia, in 1723, to the Swiss cantons, in order to procure the abrogation of this form, which was considered as an obstacle to the union of the Reformed and Lutheran churches. See the Memoires pour servir à l'Histoire des Troubles arrivées en Suisse à l'occasion du Consensus, published at Amsterdam in 1726.

[d] See the work last quoted, and also Christ. Matth. Pfaffii. Schediasma de Formula Consens. Helvet.

[e] The most ample account we have of this eminent man is given by Caspar Brandt, in his Historia Vitæ Jac. Arminii, published at Leyden, in 1724, and the year after by me at Brunswick, with an additional preface and some annotations. See also Nouveau Dictionaire Histor. et

an humble petition, entitled their Remonstrance, which they addressed, in 1610, to the states of Holland and West-Friseland; and, as the patrons of Calvinism presented an address in opposition to this, which they called their Counter-Remonstrance, the latter received the name of *Counter-Remonstrants*.

II. Arminius, though he had imbibed in his tender years the doctrines of Geneva, and had even received his theological education in the university of that city, yet rejected, when he arrived at the age of manhood, the sentiments, concerning predestination and the divine decrees, that were adopted by the greatest part of the reformed churches, and embraced the principles and communion of those, whose religious system extended the love of the Supreme Being, and the merits of Jesus Christ, to all mankind.[a] As time and deep meditation had only served to confirm him in these principles, he thought himself obliged, by the dictates both of candour and conscience, to profess them publicly, when he had obtained the chair of divinity in the university of Leyden, and to oppose the doctrine and sentiments of Calvin on these heads, which had been followed by the greatest part of the Dutch clergy. Two considerations encouraged him, in a particular manner, to venture upon this open declaration of his sentiments; for he was persuaded, on one hand, that there were many persons, beside himself, and, among these, some of the first rank and dignity, who were highly disgusted at the doctrine of absolute decrees; and, on the other, he knew that the Dutch divines and doctors were neither obliged by their confession of faith, nor by any other public law, to adopt and propagate the principles of Calvin. Thus animated and encouraged, he taught his sentiments publicly, with great freedom and equal success, and persuaded many of the truth of his doctrine: but, as Calvinism was at this time in a flourishing state in Holland, this freedom procured him a multitude of enemies, and drew upon him the severest marks of disapprobation and resentment from those who adhered to the theological system of Geneva, and more especially from Francis Gomar, his colleague. Thus commenced that long, tedious, and intricate controversy, which afterwards made such a noise in Europe. Arminius died in 1609, when it was just beginning to involve his country in contention and discord.[b]

III. After the death of Arminius, the contest seemed to be carried on, during some years, with equal success; so that it was not easy to foresee which side would gain the ascendency. The demands of the Arminians were moderate; they required no more than a bare toleration of their religious sentiments;[c] and some of the first men in the republic, such as Olden-Barneveldt, Grotius, Hoogerbeets, and several others, looked upon this demand as reasonable and just. It was the opinion of these great men, that, as the points in debate had not been determined by the Belgic confession of faith, every individual had an unquestionable right to judge for himself, more especially in a free state, which had thrown off the yoke of spiritual despotism and civil tyranny. In consequence of this persuasion, they used their utmost efforts to accommodate matters, and left no methods unemployed to engage the Calvinists to treat with Christian moderation and forbearance their dissenting brethren. These efforts were at first attended with some prospect of success. Maurice, prince of Orange, and the princess dowager, his mother, countenanced these pacific measures, though the former became afterwards one of the warmest adversaries of the Arminians. Hence a conference was holden in 1611, at the Hague, between the contending parties; another took place at Delft in 1613; and with the same view, a pacific edict was issued in 1614 by the states of Holland to exhort them to charity and mutual forbearance; not to mention a number of expedients applied in vain to prevent the schism that threatened the church.[d] But these measures confirmed, instead of removing, the apprehensions of the Calvinists; from day to day they were still more firmly persuaded, that the Arminians aimed at nothing less than the ruin of all religion; and hence they censured their magistrates with great warmth and freedom, for interposing their authority to promote peace and union with such adversaries;[e] and those, who are well informed and impartial, must candidly acknowledge, that the Arminians were far from being sufficiently cautious in avoiding connexions with persons of loose principles, and that, by frequenting the company of those, whose sentiments were entirely different from the received doctrines of the reformed church, they furnished their enemies with a pretext for suspecting their own principles, and representing their theological system in the worst colours.

IV. It is worthy of observation, that this unhappy con-

Critique, tom. i. p. 471. They who would form a just and accurate notion of his temper, genius, and doctrine, will do well to peruse, with particular attention, his Disputationes publicæ et privatæ. There are in his manner of reasoning, and also in his phraseology, some little remains of the scholastic jargon of that age; yet we find in his writings, upon the whole, much of that simplicity and perspicuity which his followers have always looked upon, and still consider, as among the principal qualities of a Christian minister. For an account of the Arminian confessions of faith, and the historical writers who have treated of this sect, see J. Christ. Kocher's Biblioth. Theol. Symbolicæ, p. 481.

[a] Bertius in his Funeral Oration on Arminius, Brandt in his history of the life of that divine, and almost all the ecclesiastical historians of this period, mention the occasion of this change in his sentiments. It happened in 1591, as appears from the remarkable letter of Arminius to Grynæus, dated in that year, in which the former proposes to the latter some of his theological doubts. This letter is published in the Biblioth. Brem. Theol. Philolog. tom. iii. p. 384.

[b] The history of this controversy, and of the public discords and tumults it occasioned, is more circumstantially related by Brandt, in the second and third volumes of his History of the Reformation, than by any other writer. This excellent history is written in Dutch; but there is an abridgment of it in French, which has been translated into English. Add to this, Uytenbogard's Ecclesiastical History, written also in Dutch; Limborchi Historia Vitæ Episcopii; and the Epistolæ Clarorum Virorum, published by Limborch. Those who desire a more concise view of this contest, will find it in Limborch's Relatio Historica de Origine et Progressu Controversiarum in Fœderato Belgio de Prædestinatione et capitibus annexis, which is subjoined to the later editions of his Theologia Christiana, or Body of Divinity. It is true, all these are Arminians; and, as impartiality requires our hearing both sides, the reader may consult Trigland's Ecclesiastical History, composed likewise in Dutch, and a prodigious number of polemical writings published against the Arminians.

[c] ☞ This toleration was offered to them in the conference holden at the Hague in 1611, provided they would renounce the errors of Socinianism. See Trigland's History, and also Henry Brandt's Collatio Scriptorum habita Hagæ-Comitum.

[d] The writers who have given accounts of these transactions are well known: we shall only mention the first and second volumes of the Histoire de Louis XIII. by Le Vassor, who treats largely and accurately of these religious commotions, and of the civil transactions that were connected with them.

[e] The conduct of the states of Holland, who employed not only the language of persuasion, but also the voice of authority, in order to calm these commotions, and restore peace to the church, was defended, with his usual learning and eloquence, by Grotius, in two treatises. One, which contains the general principles on which this defence is founded, is entitled, "De Jure summarum Potestatum circa Sacra;" the other, in

troversy, which assumed another form, and was rendered more comprehensive by new subjects of contention, after the synod of Dordrecht, was at this time confined to the doctrines relating to predestination and grace. The sentiments of the Arminians concerning these intricate points, were comprehended in five articles. They held,

1. "That God, from all eternity, determined to bestow salvation on those who, as he foresaw, would persevere to the end in their faith in Christ Jesus, and to inflict everlasting punishments on those who should continue in their unbelief, and resist, to the end of life, his divine succours:

2. "That Jesus Christ, by his death and sufferings, made an atonement for the sins of mankind in general, and of every individual in particular: that, however, none but those who believe in him can be partakers of that divine benefit.

3. "That true faith cannot proceed from the exercise of our natural faculties and powers, or from the force and operation of free-will, since man, in consequence of his natural corruption, is incapable either of thinking or doing any good thing; and that therefore it is necessary to his conversion and salvation, that he be *regenerated* and renewed by the operation of the Holy Ghost, which is the gift of God, through Jesus Christ.

4. "That this divine grace, or energy of the Holy Ghost, which heals the disorders of a corrupt nature, begins, advances, and brings to perfection, every thing that can be called good in man; and that, consequently, all good works, without exception, are to be attributed to God alone, and to the operation of his grace; that, nevertheless, this grace does not *force* the man to act against his inclination, but may be resisted and rendered ineffectual by the perverse will of the impenitent sinner.

5. "That they who are united to Christ by faith are thereby furnished with abundant strength, and with succours sufficient to enable them to triumph over the seductions of Satan, and the allurements of sin and temptation; but that the question, Whether such *may* fall from their faith, and forfeit finally this state of grace, has not been yet resolved with sufficient perspicuity, and must, therefore, be yet more carefully examined by an attentive study of what the Scriptures have declared in relation to this important point."

It is to be observed, that this last article was afterwards changed by the Arminians, who, in process of time, declared their sentiments with less caution, and positively affirmed, that the saints might fall from a state of grace.[a]

If we are to judge of men's sentiments by their words and declarations, the tenets of the Arminians, at the period now under consideration, bear a manifest resemblance to the Lutheran system. But the Calvinists did not judge in this manner; on the contrary, they explained the words and declarations of the Arminians according to the notions they had formed of the hidden sentiments of those sectaries; and, instead of judging of their opinions by their expressions, they judged of their expressions by their opinions. They maintained, that the Arminians designed, under these specious and artful declarations, to insinuate the poison of Socinianism and Pelagianism into unwary and uninstructed minds. The secret thoughts of men are only known to Him, who is the searcher of hearts; and it is his privilege alone to pronounce judgment upon those intentions and designs which are concealed from public view. But if we were allowed to interpret the five articles now mentioned in a sense conformable to what the leading doctors among the Arminians have taught in later times concerning these points, it would be difficult to show, that the suspicions of the Calvinists were entirely groundless; for it is certain, whatever the Arminians may allege to the contrary, that the sentiments of their most eminent theological writers, after the synod of Dordrecht, concerning divine grace, and the doctrines that are connected with it, are much more accordant to the opinions of the Pelagians and Semi-Pelagians, than to those of the Lutheran church.[b]

V. The mild and favourable treatment which the Arminians received from the magistrates of Holland, and from several persons of merit and distinction, encouraged them to hope, that their affairs would take a prosperous turn, or at least that their cause was not desperate, when an unexpected storm arose against them, and blasted their expectations. This change was produced by causes entirely foreign to religion; and its origin must be sought in those connexions which can scarcely be admitted as possible by the philosopher, but are perpetually presented to the view of the historian. A secret misunderstanding had for some time subsisted between the stadtholder Maurice, prince of Orange, and some of the principal magistrates and ministers of the new republic, such as Olden-Barneveldt, Grotius, and Hoogerbeets; and this misunderstanding had at length broken out into an open enmity and discord. The views of this great prince are differently represented by different historians. Some allege, that he had formed the design of getting himself declared count of Holland, a dignity which William I., the glorious founder of Belgic liberty, is also said to have had in view.[c] Others affirm,

which these principles are peculiarly applied in justifying the conduct of the states, was published, in 1613, under the following title: "Ordinum Hollandiæ ac West-Frisiæ Pietas a multorum Calumniis vindicata."

[a] The history of these five articles, and more particularly of their reception and progress in England, has been written by Dr. Heylin, whose book was translated into Dutch by the learned and eloquent Brandt, and published at Rotterdam in 1687.

[b] ☞ This is a curious remark. It would seem as if the Lutherans were not Semi-Pelagians; as if they considered man as absolutely passive in the work of his conversion and sanctification; but such an opinion surely has never been the general doctrine of their church, however rigorously Luther may have expressed himself on that head, in some unguarded moments: more especially it may be affirmed, that in later times the Lutherans are, to a man, Semi-Pelagians; and let it not be thought that this is imputed to them as a reproach.

[c] That Maurice aimed at the dignity of count of Holland we learn from Aubery's Memoires pour servir à l'Histoire d' Hollande et des autres Provinces Unies, sect. ii. If we are to believe Aubery (informed by his father, who was, at that time, ambassador of France at the Hague,) Olden-Barneveldt disapproved this design, prevented its execution, and lost his life by his bold opposition to the views of the prince. This account is looked upon as erroneous by Le Vassor, who takes much pains to refute it, and indeed with success, in his Histoire de Louis XIII., t. ii. p. ii. Le Clerc, in his Biblioth. Choisie, and in his History of the United Provinces, endeavours to confirm what is related by Aubery; and also affirms, that the project formed by Maurice had been entertained before by his father. The determination of this debated point is not necessary to our present purpose. It is sufficient to observe what is acknowledged on all sides, that Olden-Barneveldt and his associates suspected prince Maurice of a design of encroaching upon the liberties of the republic, and arrogating to himself the supreme dominion. Hence arose the zeal of Barneveldt to weaken his influence, and to set bounds to his authority; hence the indignation and resentment of Maurice; and hence the downfall of the Arminian sect, which enjoyed the patronage and adhered to the interests of Olden-Barneveldt and Grotius.

that he only aspired to a greater degree of authority and influence than seemed consistent with the liberties of the republic; it is at least certain, that some of the principal persons in the government suspected him of aiming at supreme dominion. The leading men above mentioned opposed these designs; and these leading men were the patrons of the Arminians. The Arminians adhered to these their defenders, without whose aid they could have no prospect of security or protection. Their adversaries the Gomarists, on the contrary, seconded the views and espoused the interests of the prince, and inflamed his resentment, which had been already kindled by various suggestions, to the disadvantage of the Arminians, and of those who protected them. Thus, after mutual suspicions and discontents, the flame broke out with violence; and Maurice aimed at the ruin of those who ruled the republic without showing a proper regard to his counsels, and also of the Arminians, who espoused their cause. The men who sat at the helm of government, were cast into prison. Olden-Barneveldt, a man of gravity and wisdom, whose hairs were grown grey in the service of his country, lost his life on a public scaffold; while Grotius and Hoogerbeets were condemned to perpetual imprisonment;[a] under what pretext, or in consequence of what accusations or crimes, is unknown to us.[b] As the Arminians were not charged with any violation of the laws, but merely with departing from the established religion, their cause was not of such a nature as rendered it cognisable by a civil tribunal. That, however, this cause might be regularly decided, it was judged proper to bring it before an ecclesiastical assembly, or national synod. This method of proceeding was agreeable to the sentiments and principles of the Calvinists, who are of opinion, that all spiritual concerns and religious controversies ought to be judged and decided by an ecclesiastical assembly or council.[c]

VI. Accordingly a synod was convoked at Dordrecht, in 1618, by the counsels and influence of prince Maurice,[d] at which were present ecclesiastical deputies from the United Provinces, as also from the churches of England, Hesse, Bremen, Switzerland, and the Palatinate. The leading men among the Arminians appeared, before this famous assembly, to defend their cause; and they had, at their head, Simon Episcopius, who was, at that time, professor of divinity at Leyden, had formerly been the disciple of Arminius, and admired, even by his enemies, on account of the depth of his judgment, the extent of his learning, and the force of his eloquence. This eminent man addressed a discourse, full of moderation, gravity, and elocution, to the assembled divines; but this was no sooner finished, than difficulties arose, which prevented the conference the Arminians had demanded, in order to show the grounds, in reason and Scripture, on which their opinions were founded. The Arminian deputies proposed to begin the defence of their cause by refuting the opinions of the Calvinists. This proposal was rejected by the synod, which looked upon the Arminians as a set of men that lay under the charge of heresy, and therefore thought it incumbent upon them to declare and prove their own opinions, before they could be allowed to combat the sentiments of others. The design of the Arminians, in the proposal they made, was probably to get the people on their side, by such an unfavourable representation of the Calvinistical system, and of the harsh consequences that seem deducible from it, as might excite, in the minds of those who were present, a disgust to its patrons and abettors; and it is more than probable, that one of the principal reasons, that engaged the members of the synod to reject this proposal, was a consideration of the genius and talents of Episcopius, and an apprehension of the effects of his eloquence upon the multitude. When all the methods employed to persuade the Arminians to submit to the

[a] The truth of this general account of these unhappy divisions will undoubtedly be acknowledged by all parties, particularly at this period, when these tumults and commotions have subsided, and the spirit of party is less blind, partial, and violent; and the candid and ingenuous Calvinists who acknowledge this, will not thereby do the smallest prejudice to their cause. If they should even grant (what I neither pretend to affirm nor deny) that their ancestors, carried away by the impetuous spirit of the times, defended their religious opinions in a manner that was far from being consistent with the dictates of moderation and prudence, no rational conclusion can be drawn from this, either against them or the goodness of their cause; for it is well known, both by observation and experience, that unjustifiable things have often been done by men, whose characters and intentions, in general, were good and upright, and that a good cause has frequently been maintained by methods that would not bear a rigorous examination. What I have said with brevity on this subject is confirmed and amplified by Le Clerc, in his Histoire des Provinces Unies, and in the Biblioth. Choisie, tom. ii. p. 134; and also by Grotius, in his Apologeticus eorum, qui Hollandiæ et West-Frisiæ, et vicinis quibusdam Nationibus, præfuerunt ante Mutationem quæ evenit Anno 1618. The life of Olden-Barneveldt, written in Dutch, was published in 1648. The history of his trial, and of the judgment pronounced on the famous triumvirate, mentioned above, was drawn by Gerard Brandt from authentic records, and published under the following title: Historie van de Rechts-plegінge gehouden in den jaaren 1618 en 1619, omtrent de drie gevangene Heeren Johan van Olden-Barneveldt, Rombout Hoogerbeets, en Hugo de Groot; a third edition of this book, augmented with annotations, appeared in 1723. The History of the Life and Actions of Grotius, composed in Dutch by Caspar Brandt and Adrian van Cattenburg, and drawn mostly from original papers, throws a considerable degree of light on the history of these transactions. This famous work was published in 1727, under the following title: Historie van het leven des Heeren Huig de Groot, beschrewen tot den Anfang van zyn Gesandschap wegens de Koninginne en Kroone van Zweden aanit Hof van Vrankryck, door Caspard Brandt, en vervolgt tot zyn doodt door Adrian van Catterburg Those who desire to form a true and accurate notion of the character and conduct of Grotius, and to see him as it were near hand, must have recourse to this excellent work, since almost all the other accounts of this great man are insipid, lifeless, and exhibit little else than a poor shadow, instead of a real and animated substance. The life of Grotius, composed by Burigni in French, deserves perhaps to be included in this general censure; it is at least a very indifferent and superficial performance. ☞ There appeared in Holland a warm vindication of the memory of this great man, in a work published in 1727, and entitled, Grotii Manes ab iniquis Obtrectationibus vindicati; accedit Scriptorum ejus, tum editorum tum in editorum, Conspectus Triplex. See the following note.

[b] ☞ Dr. Mosheim, however impartial, seems to have consulted more the authors of one side than of the other, probably because they are more numerous, and more generally known. When he published this history, the world had not been favoured with the Letters, Memoirs, and Negotiations of Sir Dudley Carleton; which lord Royston (afterwards earl of Hardwicke) drew forth from his inestimable treasure of historical manuscripts, and presented to the public, or rather at first to a select number of persons, to whom he distributed a small number of copies of these Negotiations, printed at his own expence. They were soon translated both into Dutch and French; and though it cannot be affirmed that the spirit of party is no where discoverable in them, yet they contain anecdotes with respect both to Olden-Barneveldt and Grotius, which the Arminians, and the other patrons of these two great men, have been studious to conceal. These anecdotes, though they may not be sufficient to justify the severities exercised against these eminent men, would, however, have prevented Dr. Mosheim from saying that he knew not under what pretext they were arrested.

[c] ☞ The Calvinists are not particular in this; and indeed it is natural that debates, purely theological, should be discussed in an assembly of divines.

[d] ☞ Our author always forgets to mention the order, issued by the states-general, for the convocation of this famous synod; and, by his manner of expressing himself, and particularly by the phrase (Mauritio *auctore*,) would seem to insinuate, that it was by the prince that this assembly was called together. The legitimacy of the manner of convoking this synod was questioned by Olden-Barneveldt, who maintain-

manner of proceeding, proposed by the synod, proved ineffectual, they were excluded from that assembly, and returned home, complaining bitterly of the rigour and partiality with which they had been treated. Their cause was nevertheless tried in their absence; and, in consequence of a strict examination of their writings, they were pronounced guilty of pestilential errors, and condemned as corruptors of the true religion. This sentence was followed by its natural effects, which were the excommunication of the Arminians, the suppression of their religious assemblies, and the deprivation of their ministers. In this unhappy contest, the candid and impartial observer will easily perceive that faults were committed on both sides. Which of the contending parties may justly be thought most worthy of censure, is a point, whose discussion is foreign to our present purpose.[a]

VII. We shall not here appreciate either the merit or demerit of the divines who were assembled in this famous synod; but we cannot help observing that their sanctity, wisdom, and virtue, have been exalted beyond all measure by the Calvinists, while their partiality, violence, and their other defects, have been exaggerated with some degree of malignity by the Arminians.[b] There is no doubt that, among the members of this assembly, who sat in judgment upon the Arminians, there were several persons equally distinguished by their learning, piety, and integrity, who acted with upright intentions, and had not the least notion, that the steps they were taking, or encouraging, were inconsistent with equity and wisdom. On the other hand it clearly appears, that the Arminians had reason to complain of several circumstances that strike us in the history of this remarkable period. It is evident in the first place, that the ruin of their community was a point not only premeditated, but determined even before the meeting of the national synod;[c] and that this synod was not so much assembled to examine their doctrine, in order to see whether it was worthy of toleration and indulgence, as to publish and execute, with a certain solemnity, with an air of justice, and with the suffrages and consent of foreign divines, whose authority was respectable, a sentence already drawn up and agreed upon by those who had the principal direction of these affairs. It is farther to be observed, that the accusers and adversaries of the Arminians were their judges, and that Bogerman, who presided in this synod, was distinguished by his peculiar hatred of that sect; that neither the Dutch nor foreign divines had the liberty of giving their suffrages according to their own private sentiments, but were obliged to deliver the opinions of the princes and magistrates, of whose orders they were the depositories;[d] that the influence of the lay deputies, who appeared in the synod with commissions from the states-general and the prince of Orange, was still superior to that of the ecclesiastical members, who sat as judges; and, lastly, that the solemn promise, made to the Arminians, when they were summoned before the synod, that they should be allowed to enjoy the liberty of explaining and defending their opinions as far as they thought proper or necessary to their justification, was manifestly violated.[e]

VIII. The Arminians, in consequence of the decision of the synod, were considered as enemies of their country and of its established religion; and they were accordingly treated with great severity. They were deprived of all their posts and employments, whether ecclesiastical or civil; and, which they looked upon as a yet more intolerable instance of the rigour of their adversaries, their ministers were silenced, and their congregations were suppressed. They refused obedience to the order, by which their pastors were prohibited from performing, in public, their ministerial functions; and thus they drew upon themselves anew the resentment of their superiors who punished them by fines, imprisonment, exile, and other marks of ignominy. To avoid these vexations, many of them retired to Antwerp, others fled into France; while a considerable number, accepting the invitation sent to them by Frederic, duke of Holstein, formed a colony, which settled in the dominions of that prince, and built for themselves a handsome town called Fredericstadt, in the duchy of Sleswick, where their descendants still live unmolested, in the open profession and free exercise of their religion. The heads of this colony were persons of distinction, who had been obliged to leave their native country on account of these troubles, particularly Adrian Vander-Wael, who was the first governor of the new city.[f] Among the persecuted ecclesiastics, who followed this colony, were, the famous Vorstius, (who, by his religious sentiments, which differed little from the Socinian system, had rendered the Arminians particularly odious,) Grevinckhovius (a man of a resolute spirit, who had been pastor at Rotterdam,) Goulart, Grevius, Walther, Narsius, and others.[g]

ed that the states-general had no sort of authority in matters of religion, not even the power of assembling a synod; affirming that this was an act of sovereignty, that belonged to each province separately and respectively. See Carleton's Letters.

[a] The writers who have given accounts of the synod of Dordrecht, are mentioned by Jo. Albert Fabricius, in his Biblioth. Græc. vol. xi. p. 723. The most ample account of this famous assembly has been given by Brandt, in the second and third volumes of his History of the Reformation in the United Provinces; but, as this author is an Arminian, it will not be improper to compare his relation with a work of the learned Leydekker, in which the piety and justice of the proceedings of this synod are vindicated against the censures of Brandt. This work, which is composed in Dutch, was published in 1707 under the following title: Eere van de nationale Synode van Dordrecht, voorgestaan en bevestigd tegen de beschuldingen, van G. Brandt. After comparing diligently these two productions, I can see no enormous error in Brandt; for, in truth, these two writers do not so much differ about facts, as they do in the reasoning they deduce from them, and in their accounts of the causes whence they proceeded. The reader will do well to consult the Letters of the learned and worthy Mr. John Hale of Eton, who was an impartial spectator of the proceedings of the synod, and who relates with candour and simplicity what he saw and heard.

[b] All that appeared unfair to the Arminians in the proceedings of this synod has been collected in a Dutch book, entitled, Nulliteyten, Miskandelingen, ende onbyllike, Proceduren des nationalen Synodi gehouden binnen Dordrecht, &c. 1619.

[c] This assertion is of too weighty a nature to be advanced without sufficient proof. Our author quotes no authority for it.

[d] ☞ Here our author has fallen into a palpable mistake. The Dutch divines had no commission but from their respective consistories, or subordinate ecclesiastical assemblies; nor are they ever depositories of the orders of their magistrates, who have lay-deputies to represent them both in provincial and national synods. As to the English and other foreign doctors who appeared in the synod, the case perhaps may have been somewhat different.

[e] See Le Vassor, Histoire du Regne de Louis XIII. tom. iii. livr. xii. p. 365.—and Mosheim's preface to the Latin translation of the account of the synod of Dordrecht, written by the *ever-memorable* John Hale.

[f] The history of this colony is accurately related in the famous letters published by Philip Limborch and Christian Hartsoeker, entitled, Epistolæ præstantium et eruditorum virorum ecclesiasticæ et theologicæ, of which the last edition was published at Amsterdam in 1704. See also Molleri Introductio in Histor. Chersonesi Cimbricæ, p. ii. p. 108. and Pontoppidani Annales Ecclesiæ Danicæ Diplomatici, tom. iii. p. 714.

[g] For an ample account of Vorstius, see Molleri Cimbria Literata, tom. ii. where we find a particular account of the other ecclesiastics above mentioned.

IX. After the death of prince Maurice, which happened in 1625, the Arminian exiles experienced the mildness and clemency of his brother and successor Frederic Henry, under whose administration they were recalled from banishment, and restored to their former reputation and tranquillity. Those who had taken refuge in the kingdom of France, and in the Spanish Netherlands, were the first that embraced this occasion of returning to their native country, where they erected churches in several places, and more particularly in the cities of Amsterdam and Rotterdam, under the mild shade of religious toleration. That they might also have a public seminary for the instruction of their youth, and the propagation of their theological principles, they founded a college at Amsterdam, in which two professors were appointed to instruct the candidates for the ministry, in the various branches of literature and science, sacred and profane. Simon Episcopius was the first professor of theology among the Arminians; and, since his time, the seminary now mentioned has been, in general, furnished with professors eminent for their learning and genius, such as Courcelles, Poelenburg, Limborch, Le Clerc, Cattenburg,[a] and Wetstein.

X. We have already seen that the original difference, between the Arminians and the Calvinists, was entirely confined to the five points mentioned above, relative to the doctrines of predestination and grace; and it was the doctrine of the former concerning these points alone that occasioned their condemnation in the synod of Dordrecht. It is farther to be observed, that these points, as explained at that time by the Arminians, seemed to differ very little from the Lutheran system. But after the dissolution of the synod, and especially after the return of the Arminian exiles into their native country, the theological system of this community underwent a remarkable change, and assumed an aspect that distinguished it entirely from that of all other Christian churches; for then they gave a new explication of these five articles, that made them almost coincide with the doctrine of those who deny the necessity of divine succours in the work of conversion, and in the paths of virtue. They even went farther; and, bringing the greatest part of the doctrines of Christianity before the tribunal of reason, they modified them considerably, and reduced them to an excessive degree of simplicity. Arminius, the parent and founder of the community, was undoubtedly the inventor of this new form of doctrine, and taught it to his disciples;[b] but it was first digested into a regular system, and embellished with the charms of a masculine eloquence, by Episcopius, whose learning and genius have given him a place among the Arminian doctors, next to their founder.[c]

XI. The great and ultimate end which the Arminians seem to have in view is, that Christians, though divided in their opinions, may be united in fraternal charity and love, and thus be formed into one family or community, notwithstanding the diversity of their theological sentiments. In order to execute their benevolent purpose, they maintain, that Christ demands from his servants more *virtue* than *faith;* that he has confined, to a few articles, that belief which is essential to salvation; that, on the other hand, the rules of practice he has prescribed are extremely large in their extent; and that charity and virtue ought to be the principal study of true Christians. Their definition of a true Christian is somewhat latitudinarian in point of belief. According to their account, every person is a genuine subject of the kingdom of Christ, "1. who receives the Scriptures, and more especially the New Testament, as the rule of his faith, however he may think proper to interpret and explain these sacred oracles; 2. who abstains from idolatry, polytheism, and all their concomitant absurdities; 3. who leads a decent, honest, and virtuous life, directed and regulated by the laws of God; and, 4. who never discovers a spirit of persecution, discord, or ill-will, toward those who differ from him in their religious sentiments, or in their manner of interpreting Scripture." Thus the wide bosom of the Arminian church is open to Christians in general, however they may differ in some of their theological opinions. The papists alone are excluded from this extensive communion, because they deem it lawful [d] to persecute those who will not submit to the yoke of the Roman pontiff.[e] It is not our design here either to justify or condemn these

[a] There is an accurate account of these and the other Arminian writers given by Adrian van Cattenburg, in his Bibliotheca Scriptorum Remonstrantium, printed at Amsterdam in 1728.

[b] It is a common opinion, that the ancient Arminians, who flourished before the synod of Dordrecht, were much more sound in their opinions, and strict in their morals, than those who have lived since that period; that Arminius himself only rejected the Calvinistical doctrine of absolute decrees, and what he took to be its immediate consequences, adopting in all other points the doctrines received in the reformed churches: but that his disciples, and more especially Episcopius, had boldly transgressed the bounds which had been wisely prescribed by their master, and had gone over to the Pelagians, and even to the Socinians. Such, I say, is the opinion commonly entertained concerning this matter. But it appears, on the contrary, evident to me, that Arminius himself had laid the plan of that theological system, which was, in after-times, embraced by his followers, and that he had instilled the main principles of it into the minds of his disciples; and that these latter, and particularly Episcopius, did really no more than bring this plan to a greater degree of perfection, and propagate, with more courage and perspicuity, the doctrines it contained. I have the testimony of Arminius to support this notion, beside many others that might be alleged in its behalf: for, in the last will made by this eminent man, a little before his death, he plainly and positively declares, that the great object he had in view, in in all his theological and ministerial labours, was to unite in one community, cemented by the bonds of fraternal charity, all sects and denominations of Christians, the papists excepted. His words, as they are recorded in the funeral oration, which was composed on occasion of his death by Bertius, are as follow: "Ea proposui et docui . . . quæ ad propagationem amplificationemque veritatis religionis Christianæ, veri Dei cultus, communis pietatis, et sanctæ inter homines conversationis, denique ad convenientem Christiano nomini tranquillitatem et pacem juxta verbum Dei possent conferre, excludens ex iis papatum, cum quo nulla unitas fidei, nullum pietatis aut Christianæ pacis vinculum servari potest." These words, in their amount, coincide perfectly with the modern system of Arminianism, which extends the limits of the Christian church, and relaxes the bonds of fraternal communion in such a manner, that Christians of all denominations, whatever their sentiments and opinions may be (papists excepted,) may be formed into one religious body, and live together in brotherly love and concord.

[c] The life of this eminent man was composed in Latin by the learned and judicious Limborch, and is singularly worthy of an attentive perusal. It was published at Amsterdam in 1701.

[d] ☞ It is not only on account of their persecuting spirit, but also on account of their idolatrous worship, that the Arminians exclude the Papists from their communion. See the following note.

[e] For a full and accurate representation of this matter, it will be sufficient for the reader to have recourse to that treatise which is published in the first volume of the works of Episcopius (p. 508.) under the following title: Verus Theologus Remonstrans, sive veræ Remonstrantium Theologiæ de errantibus dilucida Declaratio. This treatise is written with precision and perspicuity. Le Clerc, in the dedication prefixed to his Latin translation of Dr. Hammond's Paraphrase and Commentary on the New Testament, gives a brief account of the Arminian principles and terms of communion in the following words, addressed to learned men of that sect: "You declare," says he, "that they *only* are excluded from your communion, who are chargeable with idolatry, who do not receive the Scriptures as the rule of faith, who trample upon the precepts of Christ by their licentious manners and actions, and who perse-

latitudinarian terms of communion; but it may be said, that, if other Christian churches should adopt them, diversity of sentiment would be no longer an obstacle to mutual love and concord.

XII. From all this it appears, that the Arminian community was a kind of medley, composed of persons of different principles, and that, properly speaking, it could have no fixed and stable form or system of doctrine. The Arminians, however, foreseeing that this circumstance might be objected to them as a matter of reproach, and unwilling to pass for a society connected by no common principles or bond of union, have adopted, as their Confession of Faith, a kind of theological system, drawn up by Episcopius, and expressed, for the most part, in the words and phrases of Scripture.[a] But as none of their pastors are obliged, either by oath, declaration, or tacit compact, to adhere strictly to this confession, and as, on the contrary, by the fundamental constitution of this community, every one is authorized to interpret its expressions (which are in effect susceptible of various significations) in a manner conformable to their peculiar sentiments; it evidently follows, that we cannot thence deduce an accurate and consistent view of Arminianism, or know, with certainty, what doctrines are adopted or rejected by this sect. Hence it happens, that the Arminian doctors differ widely among themselves concerning some of the most important doctrines of Christianity;[b] and they can scarcely be said to agree universally, or to be entirely uniform, in their sentiments of any one point, if we except the doctrines of predestination and grace. They all, indeed, unanimously adhere to the doctrine that excluded their ancestors from the communion of the reformed churches, importing 'that the love of God extends itself equally to all mankind; that no mortal is rendered finally unhappy by an eternal and invincible decree; and that the misery of those who perish comes from themselves;' but they explain this doctrine in a very different manner from that in which it was formerly understood. Be that as it may, this is the fundamental doctrine of the Arminians, and whoever opposes it, becomes thereby an adversary to the whole community; whereas those whose objections are levelled at particular tenets which are found in the writings of the Arminian divines, cannot be said, with any degree of propriety, to attack or censure the Arminian church, whose theological system, a few articles excepted, is vague and uncertain,[c] and is not characterised by any fixed set of doctrines and principles. Such only attack certain doctors of that communion, who are divided among themselves, and do not agree, even in their explications of the doctrine relating to the extent of the divine love and mercy, though this be the fundamental point that occasioned their separation from the reformed churches.

XIII. The Arminian church makes at present but an inconsiderable figure, when compared with the reformed; and, if credit may be given to public report, it declines from day to day. The Arminians have only in the United Provinces thirty-four congregations more or less numerous, which are furnished with forty-four pastors; beside these, their church at Fredericstadt, in the duchy of Sleswick, still subsists. It cannot, however, be said, that the credit and influence of their religious principles have declined with the external lustre of their community, since it is well known that their sentiments were early adopted in several countries, and were secretly received by many who had not the courage to profess them openly. Every one is acquainted with the change that has taken place in the established church of England, whose clergy, generally speaking, since the time of archbishop Laud, have embraced the Arminian doctrine concerning predestination and grace, and, since the restoration of Charles II., have discovered a strong propensity to several other tenets of the Arminian church. Beside this, whoever has any acquaintance with the world, must know, that, in many of the courts of protestant princes, and, in general, among those persons who pretend to be wiser than the multitude, the following fundamental principle of Arminianism is adopted: "that those doctrines, whose belief is necessary to salvation, are very few in number; and that every one is to be left at full liberty, with respect to his private sentiments of God and religion, provided his life and actions be conformable to the rules of piety and virtue." Even the United Provinces, which saw within their bosom the defeat of Arminianism, are at this time sensible of a considerable change in that respect; for, while the patrons of Calvinism in that republic acknowledge, that the community, which makes an external profession of Arminianism, declines gradually both in its numbers and influence, they, at the same time, complain, that its doctrines and spirit gain ground from day to day; that they have even insinuated themselves more or less into the bosom of the established church, and infected the theological system of many of those very pastors who are appointed to maintain the doctrine and authority of the synod of Dordrecht. The progress of Arminianism, in other countries, is abundantly known; and its votaries in France, Geneva, and many parts of Switzerland, are certainly very numerous.[d]

cute those who differ from them in matters of religion."* Many writers affirm, that the Arminians acknowledge, as their brethren, all those who receive that form of doctrine which is known under the denomination of the Apostle's Creed. But that these writers are in an error, appears sufficiently from what has been already said on this subject, and is confirmed by the express testimony of Le Clerc, who (in his Biblioth. Ancienne et Mod. tom. xxv. p. 110,) declares, that it is not true that the Arminians admit to their communion all those who receive the Apostles' Creed; his words are, "Ils se trompent; ils (the Arminians) offrent la communion à tous ceux qui recoivent l'ecriture sainte comme la seule règle de la foi et des mœurs, et qui ne sont ni idolatres ni persecuteurs."

[a] This Confession of Faith is extant in Latin, Dutch, and German. The Latin edition of it is to be found in the works of Episcopius, tom. ii. p. ii. p. 69; where may be found also a Defence of this Confession against the objections of the professors of divinity at Leyden.

[b] They who will be at the pains of comparing the theological writings of Episcopius, Courcelles, Limborch, Le Clerc, and Cattenburg, will see clearly the diversity of sentiment that reigns among the Arminian doctors.

[c] ☞ What renders the Arminian Confession of Faith an uncertain representation of the sentiments of the community, is, the liberty in which every pastor is indulged of departing from it, when he finds any of its doctrines contradictory to his private opinions. See the Introduction to the Arminian Confession of Faith, in the third volume of the French abridgment of Brandt's History.

[d] ☞ It may not, however, be improper to observe here, that the progress of Arminianism has been greatly retarded, and that its cause daily declines in Germany and several parts of Switzerland, in consequence of the ascendency which the Leibnitian and Wolfian philosophy has gained in these countries, and particularly among the clergy and men of learning. Leibnitz and Wolff, by attacking that liberty of *indifference*, which is supposed to imply the power of acting, not only *without* but *against* motives, struck at the very foundation of the Arminian system. But this was not all: for, by considering the multiplicity of worlds that

* The original words of Le Clerc are, "Profiteri soletis .... eos duntaxat a vobis excludi, qui idololatriâ sunt contaminati, qui minime habent Scripturam pro fidei normâ, qui impuris moribus sancta Christi præcepta conculcant, aut qui denique alios religionis causâ vexant."

The external forms of divine worship and ecclesiastical government, in the Arminian church, are almost the same with those which are in use among the Presbyterians. As, however, the leading men among the Arminians are peculiarly ambitious of maintaining their correspondence and fraternal intercourse with the church of England, and leave no circumstance unimproved that may tend to confirm this union; so they discover, upon all occasions, their approbation of the episcopal form of ecclesiastical government, and profess to regard it as most ancient, as truly sacred, and as superior to all other institutions of church-polity.[a]

CHAPTER IV.

The History of the Sect called Quakers.

I. THE sect of Quakers received this denomination, in the year 1650, from Gervas Bennet, a justice of peace in Derbyshire,[b] partly on account of the convulsive agitations and shakings of the body with which their discourses to the people were usually attended, and partly on account of the exhortation addressed to this magistrate by Fox and his companions, who, when they were called before him, desired him, with a loud voice and a vehement emotion of body, 'to tremble at the word of the Lord.' However sarcastical this appellation may be, when considered in its origin, the members of this sect are willing to adopt it, provided it be rightly understood; they prefer, nevertheless, to be called, in allusion to that doctrine which is the fundamental principle of their association, 'Children or Confessors of Light.' In their conversation and intercourse with each other, they use no other term of appellation than that of *Friend*.[c]

This sect had its rise in England, in those unhappy times of confusion, anarchy, and civil discord, when every political or religious fanatic, who had formed a new plan of government, or invented a new system of theology, came forth with his novelties to public view, and propagated them with impunity among a fickle and unthinking multitude. Its parent or founder was George Fox,[d] a shoemaker of a dark and melancholy complexion, and of a visionary and enthusiastic turn of mind. About the year 1647, which was the twenty-fourth year of his age, he began to stroll through several counties in England, giving himself out for a person divinely inspired, and exhorting the people to attend to the voice of the divine word, that lies hidden in the hearts of all men. After the decapitation of Charles I., when all laws, both civil and ecclesiastical, seemed to be entirely suspended, if not extinct, Fox exerted his fanatical powers with new vigour, and formed more ambitious and extensive views. Having acquired a considerable number of disciples of both sexes, who were strongly infected with his wild enthusiasm, he excited great tumults in several parts of England, and, in 1650, went so far as to disturb the devotion of those who were assembled in the churches for the purposes of public worship, declaring that all such assemblies were useless and unchristian. For these extravagances, both he and his companions were sometimes thrown into prison, and chastised, as disturbers of the peace, by the civil magistrate.[e]

compose the universe, as one system or whole, whose greatest possible perfection is the ultimate end of creative goodness, and the sovereign purpose of governing wisdom, they removed from the doctrine of predestination those arbitrary procedures and narrow views, with which the Calvinists are supposed to have loaded it, and gave it a new, a more pleasing, and a more philosophical aspect. As the Leibnitians laid down this great end, as the supreme object of God's universal dominion, and the scope to which *all* his dispensations are directed, so they concluded, that, if this *end* was proposed, it *must* be accomplished. Hence the doctrine of necessity seemed proper to fulfil the purposes of a predestination founded in wisdom and goodness; a necessity, physical and mechanical in the motions of material and inanimate things, but moral and spiritual in the voluntary determinations of intelligent beings, in consequence of prepollent motives, which produce their effects with certainty, though these effects be contingent, and by no means the offspring of an absolute and essentially immutable fatality. These principles are evidently applicable to the main doctrines of Calvinism; by them predestination is confirmed, though modified with respect to its reasons and its ends; by them irresistible grace (irresistible in a moral sense) is maintained upon the hypothesis of prepollent motives and a moral necessity. The perseverance of the saints is also explicable upon the same system, by a series of moral causes producing a series of moral effects. In consequence of all this, several divines of the German church have applied the Leibnitian and Wolfian philosophy to the illustration of the doctrines of Christianity; and the learned Canzius has written a book expressly to show the eminent use that may be made of that philosophy in throwing light upon the chief articles of our faith. See his Philosophiæ Leibnitianæ et Wolfianæ Usus in Theologiâ per præcipua Fidei capita, auctore Israele Theoph. Canzio. See also Wittenbach's Tentamen Theologiæ Dogmaticæ Methodo Scientificâ pertractatæ; but, above all, consult the famous work of Leibnitz, entitled, "Essais de Theodicée, sur la Bonté de Dieu, la Liberté de l'Homme, et l'Origine du Mal." It is remarkable enough, that the Leibnitian system has been embraced by very few, scarcely by any of the English Calvinists. Can this be owing to a want of inclination toward philosophical discussions? This cannot be said. The scheme of necessity, and of partial evil's tending to universal good, has indeed been fostered in some parts of Great Britain, and even has turned some zealous Arminians into moderate and philosophical Calvinists. But the zealous Calvinists have, for the most part, adhered firmly to their theology, and blended no philosophical principles with their system: and it is certain, that the most eminent philosophers have been found, in general, among the Arminians. If both Calvinists and Arminians claim a King, it is certain that the latter alone can boast of a Newton, a Locke, a Clarke, and a Boyle.

[a] Hence, to omit many other circumstances that show unquestionably the truth of this observation, the Arminians have been at great pains to represent Grotius, their hero and their oracle, as a particular admirer of the constitution and government of the church of England, which he preferred to all other forms of ecclesiastical polity. See what Le Clerc has published on this subject at the end of the edition of Grotius' book, de Veritate Religionis Christianæ, which he gave at the Hague in 1724, p. 376.

[b] See George Sewell's History of the Quakers, p. 23.—Neal's History of the Puritans, vol. iv. p. 32.

[c] Sewell, p. 624.

[d] ☞ The anonymous writer of a letter to Dr. Formey seems much offended at that gentleman on account of his calling George Fox a man of a turbulent spirit, &c. He tells us, on the contrary, that, from all the information worthy of credit which he was able to procure, Fox was "a man of so meek, contented, easy, steady, and tender a disposition, that it was a pleasure to be in his company; that he exercised no authority but over evil, and that every where, and in all, but with love, compassion, and long-suffering." This account he takes from Penn; and it is very probable that he has looked no farther, unless it be to the curious portrait which Thomas Ellwood, another Quaker, has given of Fox,—a portrait in which there is such an affected jingle of words as shows the author to have been more attentive to the arrangement of his sentences, than to a true exhibition of the character of his original: for we are told by Ellwood that this same George Fox was deep in divine knowledge, powerful in preaching, fervent in prayer, quick in discerning, sound in judgment (*risum teneatis, amici?*)—manly in personage, grave in gesture, courteous in conversation, weighty in communication, &c. After having thus painted George after the *fancy* of his two brethren (for fancy is the quaker's fountain of light and truth,) the letter-writer observes, that Dr. Formey has taken his account of George's turbulence and fanaticism from Mosheim's Ecclesiastical History. As Mosheim is dead, and cannot defend himself, may I be permitted to request this anonymous letter-writer, who appears to be a candid and rational man, to cast an eye upon Sewell's History of the Quakers, and to follow this *meek*, *courteous* and *modest* George, running like a wild man through several counties, refusing to pay due homage to his sovereign, interrupting the ministers in the public celebration of divine service at Nottingham, Mansfield, and Bosworth? It is remarkable, that the very learned and worthy Dr. Henry More, who was not himself without a strong tincture of enthusiasm, and who looked upon Penn as a pious Christian, treated nevertheless George Fox as a melancholy fanatic, and as one possessed with the Devil. See his Myst. of Godliness, B. x. ch. xiii. and also Schol. in Dialogue v. sect. 5.

[e] Beside the ordinary writers of the ecclesiastical history of this century, the curious reader will do well to consult Croesii Historia Quaker-

II. The first association of Quakers consisted chiefly of visionary fanatics, and of persons who really seemed to be disordered in their brains; and hence they committed many enormities, which the modern Quakers endeavour to alleviate and diminish, but which they neither pretend to justify nor to approve; for the greatest part of them were riotous and tumultuous in the highest degree, and even their female disciples, forgetting the delicacy and decency peculiar to their sex, bore their part in these disorders. They ran, like Bacchanals, through the towns and villages, declaiming against episcopacy, presbyterianism, and every fixed form of religion; railed at public and stated worship; affronted and mocked the clergy, even in the very exercise of their ministerial functions;[a] trampled upon the laws and the authority of the magistrates, under the pretext of being actuated by a divine impulse; and made use of their pretended inspiration to excite vehement commotions both in state and church. Hence it is not at all surprising, that the secular arm was at length raised against these pernicious fanatics, and that many of them were severely chastised for their extravagance and folly.[b] Cromwell himself, who was, in general, an enemy to no sect, however enthusiastical it might be, entertained uneasy apprehensions from the frantic violence of the Quakers, and therefore, in his first thoughts, formed a resolution to suppress their rising community. But when he perceived that they treated with contempt both his promises and threats, and were, in effect, too powerful or too headstrong to yield to either, he prudently abstained from the use of force, and contented himself with employing wise measures and precautions to prevent their fomenting sedition among the people, or undermining the foundations of his new sovereignty.[c]

III. In process of time, the fumes of this excessive fanaticism began to evaporate, and the ardent impetuosity of the rising sect seemed gradually to subside; nor did the *divine light*, of which the Quakers boast, produce such tumults in church and state, as at the first declaration of their celestial pretensions. In the reign of Charles II. both their religious doctrine and discipline assumed a more regular and permanent form, by the care and industry of Fox, assisted, in this very necessary undertaking, by Robert Barclay, George Keith, and Samuel Fisher, men of learning and abilities, who became, notwithstanding, members of this strange community. Fox stood in urgent need of such able assistants; for his gross ignorance had rendered his religion, hitherto, a confused medley of incoherent tenets and visions. The new triumvirate, therefore, used their utmost endeavours to digest these under certain heads, and to reduce them to a sort of theological system.[d] But such was the change of times, that the wiser and more moderate Quakers of England suffered more vexations, and were involved in greater calamities, than had fallen to the lot of their frantic and turbulent ancestors. These vexations, indeed, were not so much the consequence of their religious principles, as of their singular customs and manners in civil life; for they would never give to magistrates those titles of honour and pre-eminence which are designed to mark the respect due to their authority; they also refused obstinately to take the

---

iana, tribus libris comprehensa. A physician named Kohlhansius, who was born a Lutheran, but afterwards became a Quaker, published critical remarks upon this history, under the title of Dilucidationes; and it must be acknowledged, that there are many inaccuracies in the work of Croesius; it is, however, much less faulty than another history of this sect, which was published at Cologne in 1692, under the following title: Histoire abregée de la Naissance et du Progres du Kouakerisme, avec celle de ses Dogmes; for the anonymous author of the latter history, instead of relating well-attested facts, has compiled, without either discernment or choice, such an extravagant medley of truth and falsehood, as is rather adapted to excite laughter than to administer instruction. See the second book of Croesius' Historia Quakeriana, p. 322, and 376, as also Le Clerc, Biblioth. Universelle et Historique, tom. xxii. p. 53.—The most ample and authentic account of this sect is that which was composed by George Sewell from a great variety of genuine records, and partly from the papers of Fox, its founder, and published under the following title: "The History of the Christian people called Quakers." This work is remarkable for the industry and accuracy which the author has discovered in compiling it; but, as Sewell was himself a Quaker, he is sometimes chargeable with concealing, diminishing, or representing under artful colours, many things, which, if impartially related, *must* have appeared dishonourable, and *might* have been detrimental, to his community. It must however be granted, that, notwithstanding these defects, his history is abundantly sufficient to enable an impartial and intelligent reader to form a just and satisfactory idea of this visionary sect. Voltaire has also entertained the public with four Letters, concerning the religion, manners, and history of the Quakers, in his Melanges de Literature, d'Histoire et de Philosophie, which are written with his usual wit and elegance, but are rather adapted to amuse than instruct. The conversation between him and Andrew Pitt, an eminent Quaker in London (which is related in these letters,) may be true in general; but, to render the account of it still more pleasing, the ingenious writer has embellished it with effusions of wit and fancy, and even added some particulars, that are rather drawn from imagination than memory. It is from the books already mentioned that the French Dissertation on the Religion of the Quakers (which is inserted in the third volume of the splendid work, entitled, Ceremonies et Coutumes Religieuses de tous les Peuples,) is chiefly compiled, though with less attention and accuracy than might have been expected. A Lutheran writer, named Friederic Ernest Meis, has given an account of he English Quakers in a German work, entitled, Entwurff der Kirchen rdnung und Gebrauche der Quacker in Engelana, 1715.

[a] ☞ A female, contrary to the modesty of her sex, appeared in Whitehall chapel *stark naked*, in the midst of public worship, when Cromwell was there present. Another entered the parliament-house, with a trencher in her hand, which she broke in pieces, saying, "Thus shall he be broken in pieces." Thomas Adams, having complained to the protector of the imprisonment of some of his friends, and not finding redress, took off his cap and tore it in pieces, saying, "So shall thy government be torn from thee and thy house." Several, pretending an extraordinary message from heaven, went about the streets, denouncing the judgments of God against the protector and his council; and one approached the door of the parliament-house with a drawn sword, and wounded several persons, saying, that "he was inspired by the Holy Spirit to kill every man who sat in that house." The most extravagant Quaker who appeared at this time, was James Naylor, formerly an officer, a man of parts, and so much admired by these fanatics, that they blasphemously styled him, "the everlasting son of righteousness, the prince of peace, the only begotten son of God, the fairest among ten thousand." See Neal's History of the Puritans, and the Life and Trial of Naylor. The anonymous author of the Letter to Dr. Formey, seems to have lost sight of the state of Quakerism in the time of Fox, when he denies that the charge of turbulence and fanaticism can be proved against him or his friends, and gives the gentle denomination of *imprudence* to the extravagances exhibited by the Quakers under Charles I. and the commonwealth. The single story of Naylor, who was the convert and pupil of Fox, and the letters, full of blasphemous absurdity, written to this "Rose of Sharon," this "new Jesus," by Hannah Stranger, Richard Fairman, and others, show the horrid vein of fanaticism that ran through this visionary sect. See these letters in the Life and Trial of Naylor, who, though cruelly scourged, was, however, whipped into his senses, or at least, brought by his sufferings into a calmer state of mind. See also Satan Inthroned. If Quakerism be now in England on a more rational footing, we may congratulate its members upon the happy change, but at the same time condole with them on the approaching annihilation of their sect; for, if *reason* gets in among them, the *spirit* (I mean *their* spirit) will soon be quenched, and fancy being no more the only criterion of truth, the fundamental principle of their existence will be destroyed. In such a catastrophe, the abettors of ancient Quakerism will find some resource among the Methodists.

[b] Neal's History, vol. iv.—Sewell.

[c] The earl of Clarendon tells us, in his History of the Rebellion, that the Quakers always persevered in their bitter enmity against Cromwell. See Sewell's History, book i.

[d] For an account of the life and writings of Barclay, see the General Dictionary. Sewell, in his History, gives an ample account of Keith. There is also particular mention made of Fisher, in the Unschuldige Nachrichten, An. 1750, p. 338.

oath of allegiance to their sovereign,[a] and to pay tithes to the clergy; hence they were looked upon as rebellious subjects, and, on that account, were frequently punished with great severity.[b] In the reign of James II. and more particularly about the year 1685, they began to see more prosperous days, and to enjoy the sweets of toleration and liberty, which they owed, not to the clemency of the government, but to the friendship of that monarch for the famous William Penn,[c] who had been employed by him in matters of the utmost moment, and had rendered him signal and important services.[d] What James had done, from motives of a personal or political nature, in favour of the Quakers, King William III. confirmed and continued, from a zeal for maintaining the rights of conscience, and advancing the cause of religious liberty. From these motives, he procured a full and ample toleration for dissenters of almost all denominations; and the Quakers, in consequence of this grant, enjoyed at length, upon a constitutional footing, tranquillity and freedom.[e]

IV. Fatigued with the vexations and persecution which they suffered in their native country during the reign of Charles II., the Quakers looked about for some distant settlements, where they might shelter themselves from the storm; and with this view they began to disseminate their religious principles in various countries. Attempts of this nature were made in Germany, Prussia, France, Italy, Greece, Holland, and Holstein, but with little success. The Dutch, however, were, after much importunity, persuaded to allow a certain number of these enthusiasts to settle in Holland, where their descendants still continue to reside. Multitudes of them had already gone over to America, and formed settlements there, not long after the rise of their sect; and it afterwards happened, by a singular concourse of events, that this new world became the chief seat of their prosperity and freedom. William Penn, son of the famous vice-admiral of that name, who embraced Quakerism in 1668, received, in 1680, from Charles and from the English parliament, the grant of an ample and fertile but uncultivated province in America, as a reward for the eminent services of his father. This illustrious Quaker, who was far from being destitute of parts, and whose activity and penetration were accompanied with an uncommon degree of eloquence,[f] carried over with him into his new dominions a considerable colony of his *Friends* and Brethren; and he founded in those distant regions a republic, whose form, laws, and institutions, resembled no other known system of government, whose pacific principles and commercial spirit have long blessed it with tranquillity and opulence, and which still continues in a prosperous and flourishing state.[g] The Quakers predominate in this colony, both by their influence and their numbers; but all those who acknowledge the existence and providence of one Supreme Being, and show their respect to that Being, either by external worship, or at least by the regularity of their lives and actions, are admitted to the rights and privileges of citizens in this happy republic. The large province that constitutes its territory was called Pennsylvania, from the name of its proprietor; and its capital city was named Philadelphia, from the spirit of union and fraternal love that reigned at first, and is still supposed to prevail, among its inhabitants.

V. Even during the life of their founder, the Quakers, notwithstanding their extraordinary pretensions to fraternal charity and union, were frequently divided into parties, and involved in contests and debates. These debates, indeed, which were carried on in the years 1656, 1661, and 1683, with peculiar warmth, were not occasioned by any doctrines of a religious nature, but by a diversity of opinions about matters of discipline, about certain customs and manners, and other affairs of little moment; and they were generally terminated in a short time, and without much difficulty.[h] But, after the death of Fox, which happened in 1691, some Friends, and more especially George Keith, who was indisputably the most learned member of their community, excited, by their doctrines and innovations, discords of a more serious and momentous kind than those which had before divided the Brethren. This fountain of contention was opened in Pennsylvania, where Keith was charged with erroneous opinions respecting several points of theology, and more particularly concerning the human nature of Christ, which he supposed to be two-fold, one part being spiritual and celestial, the other corporeal and terrestrial.[i] This and other inventions of Keith would perhaps have passed without censure, among a people who reduce the whole of religion to fancy and a kind of spiritual instinct, had not this learned man animadverted, with a certain degree of severity, upon some of the fantastic notions of the American brethren, and opposed, in a more particular

[a] ☞ This refusal to take the oath of allegiance did not proceed from any disaffection to the government, but from a persuasion that all oaths were unlawful, and that swearing, even upon the most solemn occasions, was forbidden in the New Testament. They also sincerely believed, that they were as much obliged to obedience by an affirmation, which they were willing to make, as by an oath.

[b] See a circumstantial account of their sufferings under Charles II. in Neal's fourth volume, p. 313, 353, 396, 432, 510, 552, 569.—Burnet's History of his own Time, vol. i. p. 271.—Sewell's Hist.

[c] See Sewell's History.

[d] ☞ The indulgence of James toward the Quakers and other dissenters from the established church, was, in fact, founded on a zeal for popery, and designed to favour the Roman Catholics. More particularly the order which he sent to the lord-mayor of London, on the 7th of November, 1687, to dispense with an oath from the Quakers, was evidently designed to open a door to the catholics to bear offices in the state without a legal qualification. At the same time it is probable enough, that a personal attachment to the famous William Penn may have contributed to render this monarch more indulgent to this sect than he would otherwise have been. The reasons of this attachment are differently represented. Some suppose it to have been owing to the services of his father in the fleet commanded against the Dutch in 1665, by James, when duke of York. Others attribute this attachment to his personal services. From the high degree of favour he enjoyed at court, they concluded that he was a concealed papist, and assisted the king in the execution of his designs. That the imputation of popery was groundless, appears from his correspondence with Dr. Tillotson, which is published in the life of Penn, prefixed to the first volume of the works of the latter. It is nevertheless certain, that he was very intimate with Father Petre, the hot-headed Jesuit, whose bigotry framed the king's projects, and whose imprudence rendered them abortive. It is also certain, that, in 1686, he went over to Holland, in order to persuade the prince of Orange to support the measures of king James.

[e] Œuvres de M. de Voltaire, tom. iv. p. 182.

[f] ☞ Bishop Burnet, who knew Penn personally, says, that "he was a talking, vain man, who had such a high opinion of his own eloquence, that he thought nothing could stand before it;" and that "he had a tedious *luscious* way, that was not apt to overcome a man's reason, though it might tire his patience."

[g] The laws and charters of the colony of Pennsylvania may be seen in Rapin's History, Penn's Works, and in other collections of public records; they are also inserted in the Bibliotheque Britannique, tom. xv. p. 310; tom. xvi. p. 127.—Penn acquired a great reputation, both by his writings and the active figure he made in life. See the accounts given of him by Sewell and Burnet.

[h] See Sewell's History.

[i] ☞ Ceremonies et Coutumes de tous les Peuples du Monde, tom. iv. p. 141.—Croesii Historia Quakeriana, lib. iii. p. 446.

manner, their method of converting the whole history of Christ's life and sufferings into a mere allegory, or symbolical representation of the duties of Christianity. The European Quakers dare not so far presume upon the indulgence of the civil and ecclesiastical powers, as to deny openly the *reality* of the history of the life, mediation, and sufferings of Christ; but in America, where they have nothing to fear, they are said to express themselves without ambiguity, on this subject, and to maintain publicly, that Christ never existed but in the hearts of the *faithful*. This point was debated between Keith and his adversaries, in several general assemblies of the sect holden in England, and was at length brought before the parliament. The contest was terminated, in 1695, by the excommunication of Keith and his adherents, which so exasperated this famous Quaker,[a] that he returned, some years after this, into the bosom of the English church, and died in its communion.[b] His friends and followers long continued to hold their assemblies, and to exercise their religion in a state of separation from the rest of the sect; but now, if we may believe public fame, they are reconciled with their brethren.[c]

VI. The religion of this sect has an air of novelty that strikes at first sight; but, when viewed closely, it will appear to be nothing more than a certain modification of that famous Mystic Theology, which arose so early as the second century, was fostered and embellished by the luxuriant fancy of Origen, and, passing through various hands, assumed different aspects until it was adopted by the Quakers, who set off the motley form with their own inventions. Fox, indeed, is not chargeable with these inventions; his ignorant and inelegant simplicity places him beyond the reach of suspicion in this matter; but it is, at the same time, undoubtedly certain, that all his notions concerning the internal word, the divine light within, and its operations and effects, were either borrowed from the writings of the Mystics, which were, at that time, in the hands of many, or at least collected from the conversation and expressions of some persons of the Mystic order. The tenets, however, which this blunt and illiterate man expressed in a rude, confused, and ambiguous manner, were dressed up and presented under a different form by the masterly hands of Barclay, Keith, Fisher, and Penn, who digested them with such sagacity and art, that they assumed the aspect of a regular system. The Quakers may therefore be deemed with reason the principal branch of the Mystics, as they not only embraced the precepts of their hidden wisdom, but even saw its whole tendency, and adopted, without hesitation, all its consequences.[d]

VII. The fundamental doctrine of Quakerism, from which all the other tenets of the sect are derived, is that famous and ancient opinion of the mystic school, "that there lies concealed in the minds of all men a certain portion of divine reason, a spark of the same wisdom that exists in the Supreme Being. Therefore, those who are desirous of arriving at true felicity and eternal salvation, must, (according to their system) by self-converse, contemplation, and perpetual efforts to subdue their sensual affections, endeavour to draw forth, kindle, and inflame that divine, hidden spark, which is overpowered by the darkness of the flesh, and suffocated, as it were, by that mass of matter with which it is surrounded. They who observe this rule, will feel (say the Quakers) a divine glow of warmth and light, and hear a celestial and divine voice proceeding from the inward recesses of their souls; and by this light and this voice, they will be led to all truth, and be perfectly assured of their union with the Supreme Being."

☞ [a] Bishop Burnet, who was certainly better acquainted with the history of Keith (with whom he had been educated) than Dr. Mosheim, attributes his return to the church of England to a much worthier motive than irritation and resentment. He tells us that Keith, after the American quakers had appeared to him as little better than deists, opposed them so warmly, that they sent him back to England. Here he opened a new meeting, and by printed summons called together the whole party to convince them of these errors. "He continued those meetings, (says the bishop,) being still, in outward appearance, a Quaker, for some years; till having prevailed as far as he saw any appearance of success, he laid aside their exterior, and was reconciled to the church."

[b] See Burnet's History, and also that of Sewell; but it is proper to observe, that the latter was either unacquainted with the true nature and state of this controversy, which, as he was an illiterate man, may easily be supposed to have been the case, or he has given designedly a false and ambiguous representation of the matter. See the life of Kuster, in the Europa Erudita of Rahtlef (a work written in German,) where this controversy is placed in its true light. Kuster was a man of probity, who lived at that time in America, and was an eye-witness of these divisions.

[c] See Rogers' Christian Quaker; as also the Quakers a divided People, and Unschuld. Nachricht. 1744, p. 496.

[d] Most people are of opinion that we are to learn the true doctrine and sentiments of the Quakers from the Catechism of Robert Barclay, and more especially from his Apology for the true Christian Divinity, &c. which was published in 1676, and was translated into several foreign languages; nor do I deny, that the members of this sect are very desirous that we should judge of their religious sentiments by the doctrine that is exhibited in these books: but, if those who are disposed to judge by this rule, go so far as to maintain, that these books contain all the religious tenets that were formerly advanced, or are at present adopted by the people called Quakers, they may be refuted without difficulty, from a great variety of books and records of unquestionable authenticity. It is necessary to enter into the true spirit of Barclay's writings. This ingenious man appeared as a patron and defender of Quakerism, and not as a professed teacher or expositor of its various doctrines; and he interpreted and modified the opinions of this sect after the manner of a champion or advocate, who undertakes the defence of an odious cause. How then does he go to work? In the first place, he observes an entire silence in relation to those fundamental principles of Christianity, concerning which it is of great consequence to know the real opinions of the Quakers; and thus he exhibits a system of theology that is evidently lame and imperfect; for it is the peculiar business of a prudent apologist to pass over in silence points that are scarcely susceptible of a plausible defence, and to enlarge upon those only which the powers of genius and eloquence may be able to embellish and exhibit in an advantageous point of view. It is observable, in the second place, that Barclay touches, in a slight, superficial, and hasty manner, some tenets, the explanation of which had already exposed the Quakers to severe censures; and in this he discovers plainly the weakness of his cause. Lastly (to omit many other observations that might be made here), this writer employs the greatest dexterity and art in softening and modifying those invidious doctrines which he cannot conceal, and presumes not to disavow; for which purpose he carefully avoids all those phrases and terms which are used by the Quakers, and are peculiar to their sect, and expresses their tenets in ordinary language, in terms of a vague and indefinite nature, and in a style that casts a sort of mask over their natural aspect. At this rate the most enormous errors may be maintained with impunity; for there is no doctrine, however absurd, to which a plausible air may not be given by following the insidious method of Barclay; and it is well known that even the doctrine of Spinosa was, with a like artifice, dressed out and disguised by some of his disciples. The other writers of this sect have declared their sentiments with more freedom, perspicuity, and candour, particularly the famous William Penn and George Whitehead, whose writings deserve an attentive perusal, preferably to all the other productions of that community. There is, among other writings of these eminent Quakers, one in whose composition they were both concerned, and which was published in 1674, under the following title: The Christian Quaker and his divine Testimony vindicated by Scripture, Reason, and Authority, against the injurious Attempts that have been lately made by several Adversaries. The first part of this book was written by Penn, and the second by Whitehead. There is also, in Sewell's History, a confession of faith that was published by the Quakers in 1693, during their controversy with Keith; but this confession is composed with great caution, and is full of ambiguity.

This hidden treasure, which is possessed, though not improved, by all the human race, bears different denominations in the language of this fanatical sect. They frequently call it *divine light*, sometimes *a ray of the eternal wisdom*, at others, the *heavenly Sophia*, whom they suppose married to a mortal, and whose wedding garments some of their writers describe with the most gaudy and pompous eloquence. But the most usual epithets given to this spiritual treasure are those of the *internal word*, and of Christ *within;* for as, on the one hand, they adopt that doctrine of Origen, and the ancient Mystics, which represents Christ as the eternal reason or wisdom of God, and, on the other, maintain, that all men are endowed naturally with a certain portion of the divine wisdom, they are thus directly led to affirm, that Christ, or the word of God, dwells and speaks in the hearts of all men.[a]

VIII. All the singularities and wonderful fancies which are to be found in the religious system of the Quakers, are the immediate consequences of the fundamental principle now mentioned; for, since Christ resides in the inward frame of every mortal, it follows, "first, that the whole of religion consists in calling off the mind from external objects, in weakening the influence and ascendancy of the outward senses, and in every one's entering deeply into the inmost recesses of his heart, and listening attentively to the divine instructions and commands that the internal word, or Christ within, delivers there; secondly, that the external word, i. e. the Scripture, neither points out the way of salvation, nor leads men to it, since it only consists of letters and words, which, being void of life, have not a sufficient degree of efficacy and power to illuminate the human mind, and unite it to God. The only advantage that, in their opinion, results from a perusal of the Scripture, is, that it excites the mind to listen to the dictates of the internal word, and to go to the school of Christ, who teaches within them; or (to express the same thing in other words,) they look upon the Bible as a mute master, who, by signs and figures, points out and discovers that living master, that effective guide, who dwells in the mind. Thirdly, they who are without this written word, such as the Jews, Mohammedans, and savage nations, are not, on that account, either removed from the path, or destitute of the doctrine of salvation, though they indeed want this inferior and subordinate help to its attainment; for, if they only attend to this inward teacher, who always *speaks* when the *man is silent*, they will learn abundantly, from him, all that is necessary to be known and practised in order to their final happiness. In consequence, fourthly, the kingdom of Christ is of a vast extent, and comprehends the whole race of mankind; for all have Christ within them, and therefore, even those who are deprived of the means of knowledge, and live in the grossest ignorance of the Christian religion, are capable of obtaining, through him, wisdom here, and happiness hereafter. Hence also they conclude, that those who lead virtuous lives, and resist the impulse of their lusts and passions, whether they be Jews, Moslems, or Polytheists, shall be united to God in this life, by means of the Christ that lies hidden within them, and shall enjoy the fruits of this union in the life to come. To these tenets they add, in the fifth place, that a heavy, dark body, composed of corrupt matter, hinders men from discerning, with ease, this hidden Christ, and from hearing his divine and internal voice. Therefore they look upon it as a matter of the highest importance, to watch against the pernicious consequences of this union between the soul and body, that the latter may not blunt the powers of the former, disturb its tranquillity, or, by the ministry of the outward senses, fill it with the images of vain, sensible, and external objects." The consideration now mentioned engages them, lastly, "to look upon it as utterly incredible, that God should ever again shut up, in the same material habitation, the souls that are set free by death from their bodily prison; and therefore they affirm, that the Gospel-account of the resurrection of the body must either be interpreted in a figurative sense, or be understood as pointing out the creation of a new and celestial body.[b]

IX. It evidently appears from all this, that the existence of the man of Christ Jesus, and the circumstantial accounts we have in Scripture of his divine origin, his life, and actions, his satisfaction, merits and sufferings, make no essential part of the theological system of the Quakers, which is built upon a different foundation, and derives the whole plan and method of salvation from the Christ *within*. Hence several members of that sect, as we learn from writers of unquestionable authority, went such an extravagant length as to maintain, that the accounts we have of Jesus Christ, in the evangelical history, do not relate to the Son of God, who took upon him the nature of man, but to that Christ within, whose operations are recorded by the sacred historians in figurative and allegorical language. This opinion, if we may confide in the testimonies of unexceptionable witnesses, is so far from having lost its credit among them, that it is still openly professed by the American Quakers. Those of Europe, whether from the force of conviction or the suggestions of prudence, differ entirely from their brethren in this respect. They hold, "That the divine wisdom, or reason, resided in the son of the Virgin Mary, and conveyed its instructions to mankind by his ministry;" and they profess to believe, "that this divine man really did and suffered what is recorded concerning him by the sacred writers." It is nevertheless certain, that they express themselves in a very ambiguous manner on many points that relate to the history of the divine Saviour; and, in a more particular manner, their notions respecting the fruits of his sufferings, and the efficacy of his death, are so vague and obscure, that it is very difficult to know what is their real opinion about the degree of this efficacy, and the nature of these fruits. It is also worthy of observation, that the European Quakers, though they acknowledge the reality of the life, actions, and sufferings of Christ, yet do not entirely reject the allegorical interpretation of our Saviour's history mentioned above; for they consider the events that happened to Christ, in the course of his ministry upon earth, as the signs and emblems of those scenes through

[a] It is nevertheless to be observed, that the modern Quakers, as appears from the writings of Martyn and others, are, in general, ignorant of the system of their ancestors, and perpetually confound the innate divine light above-mentioned, with the operations of the Holy Ghost in the minds of the faithful.

[b] The Quakers adopt all these tenets; they are at least obliged to adopt them, unless they renounce the fundamental principles of their system. We have omitted the mention of those points about which they dispute among themselves, that we may not appear to take pleasure in representing them under odious colours.

which the mental Christ must pass, in order to render us partakers of eternal salvation. Hence they talk in high and pompous strains (like their models the Mystics) of the birth, life, sufferings, death, and resurrection of Christ 'in the hearts of the faithful.'

X. The religious discipline, worship, and practice of the Quakers, flow from the same source from which, as we have already observed, their doctrine and tenets were immediately derived. They meet for the purposes of religion on the same days which are set apart for the celebration of public worship in all other Christian churches; but they neither observe festivals, nor use external rites and ceremonies, nor suffer religion, which they place entirely in the mental worship of the hidden Christ, to be shackled and cramped by positive institutions. All the members of their community, whether male or female, have an equal right to teach and exhort in their public meetings; for who, say they, will presume to exclude, from the liberty of speaking to the Brethren, those persons in whom Christ dwells, and by whom he speaks? They reject the use of prayers, hymns, and the various outward forms of devotion by which, in other Christian churches, public worship is distinguished; and this, indeed, is an instance of their consistency with themselves, as it is the immediate consequence of their religious system; for, in their judgment, it is not the person who expresses his desires in a set form of words, that can be said to pray truly, but he, on the contrary, who, by a deep recollection, withdraws his mind from every outward object, reduces it to a state of absolute tranquillity, silences every inward motion and affection, and plunges it, as it were, into the abyss of Deity. They neither observe the institution of baptism, nor do they renew the remembrance of Christ's death, and of the benefits that result from it, by the celebration of the eucharist. They look upon these two institutions as merely Judaical, and allege, that our Saviour observed them for no other end than to show for once, in a visible manner, the mystical purification of the soul, under the figure of baptism, and the spiritual nourishment of the inward man, under that of the eucharist.

XI. The moral doctrine of this sect, which is remarkable for its excessive austerity, is chiefly comprehended in the two following precepts. One is of this import: "That the faithful are either to avoid entirely every thing that tends to gratify the external senses and passions, every thing that can be ranked under the denomination of sensual or bodily pleasure; or, if such rigorous abstinence be impossible in this present state, and contrary to the evident laws of nature, such pleasure is to be so modified and restrained by reason and meditation, as to prevent it from debasing and corrupting the mind; for, as the whole attention of the mind must be given to the voice and orders of the internal guide, so, for this purpose, all possible care must be taken to remove it from the contagion of the body, and from all intimate and habitual commerce with corporeal objects." By another leading precept of morality among the Quakers, all imitation of those external manners, that go by the name of civility and politeness, as also several matters of form, usual in the conduct of life, and in the connexions of human society, are strictly prohibited as unlawful. Hence they are easily distinguished from all other Christian sects, by their outward deportment and their manner of life. They never salute any person whom they meet in their way, nor employ in their conversation the usual manner of address, or the appellations that civility and custom have rendered a matter of decency, at least, if not of duty; they never express their respect for magistrates, or persons in authority, either by bodily gestures, titles of honour, or in general by any of the marks of homage that are paid to them by persons of all other denominations. They carry their pacific sentiments to such an extravagant length as to renounce the right of self-defence, and let pass with impunity, and even without resistance, the attacks that are made on their possessions, their reputation, and even on their lives. They refuse to confirm their testimonies by an oath, to appear in behalf of their property before a civil tribunal, or to accuse those who have injured them. To these negative parts of their external conduct, they add peculiar circumstances of a positive kind, that discover the same austere, stiff, proud, and formal spirit; for they distinguish themselves, in a striking manner, from the rest of their fellow-citizens, by the gravity of their aspects, the rustic simplicity of their apparel, the affected tones of their voices, the stiffness of their conversation, and the frugality of their tables. It is, however, affirmed by persons of credit, who are eye-witnesses of what passes among the members of this sect, that the modern, and more especially the English Quakers, whom trade has furnished with the means of luxury, have departed from this rigid and austere manner of life, and gradually become more reconciled to the outward pleasures and enjoyments of the world. These more sociable Quakers are also said to modify and explain the theology of their ancestors, in such a manner as to render it more rational than it was in its primitive state. At the same time it is certain, that many of the members of this sect have either a false notion, or no notion at all, of that theology.

XII. The principles of this community seem to exclude the very idea of order, discipline, and ecclesiastical government. Its leading members, however, began to perceive in process of time, that without laws and rulers it could not subsist, but must inevitably fall into confusion and ruin. They accordingly erected a council of elders, who discuss and determine matters of a doubtful or difficult nature, and use all possible care and diligence in inspecting the conduct of the Brethren, and in preventing whatever they look upon as prejudicial to the interests of the community. The names of those who enter into the state of matrimony are given in to those leading members, who also keep an exact register of the births and deaths that happen in their society. They exercise, moreover, a certain degree of authority over those who speak in their meetings, since it is well known, that in some places these speakers show their discourses to the ruling elders before they deliver them, in order that they may judge whether they are fit to be repeated in public; for, since the abuse that was made of the unbounded liberty that every individual had to instruct and exhort the congregation, and to speak and harangue when the pretended spirit moved them, new regulations have been observed; and this liberty has been considerably modified, in several places, to avoid the mockery, contempt, and censure, to which the community was constantly exposed, by the absurd, incoherent, and insipid discourses of many of its members.

There are also in some of the more considerable congregations, and more especially in those which are formed at London, certain persons whose duty it is to be always prepared to speak to the people, if none of the congregation should seem to be inwardly moved or disposed to rise and harangue. The appointment of these professed speakers was designed to remedy an inconvenience that frequently happened in the Quaker-meetings, the whole assembly being dismissed without either instruction or exhortation, because no persons found themselves *moved* to speak. It is indeed to be observed, that this public discourse is not looked upon by the Quakers as an essential part of their religion and worship; for the Brethren and Sisters do not meet that they may hear the words of an external teacher, but that they may listen with recollection to the voice of the divine instructor, which every one carries with him in his own breast, or, to use their own phrase, that they may 'commune with themselves.' Nevertheless, as these mute assemblies excite the laughter of their adversaries, and expose them to the reproach of enthusiasm and folly, they have, on that account, appointed fixed speakers to whom they give a small salary, that the whole time of their meeting may not be passed in silence.[a]

The Quakers have, annually, a general assembly, which meets at London in the week before Whitsuntide,* and is composed of deputies from all their particular congregations. They still complain, notwithstanding the toleration they enjoy, of certain severities and hardships; but these are entirely owing to their obstinate refusal to pay those tithes, which, by the laws of the land, are designed for the support of the established church.

VINDICATION OF THE QUAKERS.

[The following *Vindication* was added to the Philadelphia edition of Mosheim's Ecclesiastical History, published in 1799:]

AN American edition of Mosheim's Ecclesiastical History being nearly completed, in which is contained a very false account of the principles, doctrine and discipline of our religious society, a very erroneous character of George Fox, and divers other misrepresentations and untrue charges; and although full answers and refutations of these calumnies have been heretofore published, yet as this book may fall into the hands of persons unacquainted with the true state of facts, we think it a point of justice due to the cause of truth and to our religious society, and for the information of candid and unprejudiced minds, briefly to give what from authentic histories and our own knowledge we have ascertained is a just narration.

Men who consider themselves accountable for their words and actions, and think it highly criminal to deceive others by either disguising or falsification, who are well informed and acquainted with the facts and subjects they relate or write upon, are entitled to greater credit than professed and avowed opposers, who from mistaken motives publish distortions and misconstructions. From the misrepresentations and wrong accounts given by our adversaries, we have no doubt Mosheim has taken most of his narrative.

The true character of George Fox has been drawn by men of the first respectability and the fullest information; men who were conversant with him from his youth to his close: and a cloud of witnesses and authentic testimonies can be produced to prove that he was a pious, sober, solid and exemplary man, and no fanatic, eminently qualified for the work he was raised up to promote. As we wish to be brief, we shall omit recurring to other documents, and only cite a few sentences from a preface to George Fox's Journal written by Willian Penn, as follows:

"He was a man that God endowed with a clear and wonderful depth, a discerner of others' spirits, and very much a master of his own.

"He was of an innocent life, no busy body nor self-seeker, neither touchy nor critical. So meek, contented, modest, steady, tender, it was a pleasure to be in his company.

"As he was unwearied, so he was undaunted in his services for God. For in all things he acquitted himself like a man, a new and heavenly-minded man, a divine and a naturalist, and all of God Almighty's making. I have been surprised at his questions and answers in natural things, that whilst he was ignorant of useless and sophistical science, he had in him the foundation of useful and commendable knowledge, and cherished it every where.

"Thus he lived and sojourned among us, and as he lived so he died, feeling in his last moments the same eternal power that had raised and preserved him."

Instead of the first association of Quakers "being mostly composed of visionary fanatics, and of persons that really seemed to be disordered in their brains," William Penn, in his aforesaid preface, gives the names of a number of eminent men who became members of this society, and who were instrumental with many others in spreading and propagating the doctrines which they had espoused, and also of establishing a discipline and church government which must be allowed to be a compact and well regulated system of good order.

The charge of their "running like bacchanals through the towns and villages, declaiming against Episcopacy, Presbyterianism, and every fixed form of religion, &c. trampling upon the laws, and making use of their pretended inspirations to excite the most vehement commotions both in church and state," and divers other scandalous aspersions, we deny.

That tumults were raised by their opposers, is very true, and also that they refused complying with laws which they conceived as violating the rights of conscience; but that in any one instance they offered violence to the person of any man, or departed from their peaceable testimony, is false. That they bore beatings, imprisonment and death, with patience, meekness, and perseverance,

☞ [a] The truth of this account of fixed speakers appointed to discourse and exhort (when the spirit does not move any of the other brethren), and rewarded for their pains, is denied by the writer of the letter to Dr. Formey. We leave the decision of the matter to those who have an opportunity of examining the supposed fact. The translator, instead of leaving this point unsettled, ought to have inquired into the circumstance; but, as he was unwilling to take that trouble, the *editor* is induced to supply the deficiency, by stating that for Dr. Mosheim's assertion there is no authority. Many persons are in the habit of preaching, exhorting, or advising, at the different meetings; but they are not selected or appointed by the congregation, and do not act as stipendiary ministers. The *Friends* know that the labourer is worthy of his hire, and follow that rule in ordinary cases; but the idea of remuneration for religious instruction is neither entertained by the preacher himself, nor by the *Brethren* and *Sisters* who listen to his extemporaneous effusions.

* It is now fixed for the third Sunday in May.

praying for their enemies, is a fact indisputable and of great notoriety; so that in time, when the clouds of prejudice were dissipated and their innocence fully manifested, way was made in the minds of rulers for their toleration; and this may with truth be said, that such of them as keep true to their principles, are as good members of civil society as any other people, and have never been found in any plots or combinations against the governments which in the course of providence have been set over them.

The conduct of James Naylor, in his dark and bewildered state, we freely condemn; but his punishment was rigorous in the extreme. That two or three weak persons were deluded and paid a sort of divine honour to him, is confessed; but that this was in any degree countenanced by our religious society is positively denied, but on the contrary was fully reprobated by them. Although James Naylor had lamentably missed his way, yet we have reason to believe he was through divine mercy restored to a sound mind. He published a condemnation of his misconduct, and we reverently hope he died in peace with God and love to all men.

As to the absurd story of "one of these people going to the parliament house with a drawn sword and wounding several, and saying he was inspired by the Holy Spirit to kill every man that sat in that house," it is a very fiction, and we deny that any acknowledged member among us ever was guilty of such conduct.

We have also made diligent search and cannot find any account of a female going naked as mentioned in the same note, and believe it is untrue.

That George Keith was a man of learning and a member of our society, and wrote several pieces in support of our tenets, is true; but that he gave way to a contentious spirit, and endeavoured to lay waste what he himself had assisted to build up, and was, after much patient labour and forbearance, disowned by friends, we acknowledge. and that an opposition was made to the establishment of meetings for discipline, by some through ignorance, who afterwards saw their error and condemned it, and by others from mistaken motives; but that our fundamental opinions have been the same from the first promulgation of them, we confidently assert.

We believe the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament to be of divine original, and give full credit to the historical facts, as well as the doctrines therein delivered; and never had any doubt of the truth of the actual birth, life, sufferings, death, resurrection and ascension of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, as related by the evangelists, without any mental or other reserve, or the least diminution by allegorical explanation: and there is not, nor ever has been, any essential difference in faith or practice between Friends in Europe and America; but a correspondence is regularly maintained, and love, harmony, and unity have been preserved down to this day; and we hope and believe, under divine favour, nothing will be able to scatter or divide us.

We do not wish to meddle with those, called mystics, or to adopt many of their expressions. We presume there were sincerely religious people among them; but we think religion is a simple thing, the work of the Spirit of God in the hearts of men: and as to our tenets and history we refer to Fox, Barclay, Penn, Sewell, Gough, &c. and declare, that we never had, nor now have, any other doctrines to publish, and that there are no religious opinions or practices among us which have not been made known to the world.

When any person by submitting to the influence and operation of the Spirit of God, becomes thereby qualified, and is called to the work of the ministry, after having made full proof thereof to the satisfaction of the congregation, he or she is accepted and recommended as such; but as to any person being appointed with a stipend, small or great, or preparing a sermon to be delivered in our meetings to be previously examined, or without such examination, there never was any such practice among us. Our ministers, elders, overseers, and other friends appointed to religious services, receive no pecuniary pay, but spend their time and their own money freely on such occasions, at home and abroad; yet proper attention is given to those in low or poor circumstances of every description, besides contributing our full proportion to the support of the general poor. Equally untrue is the insinuation that we are ashamed of our silent meetings, having experienced them to be both profitable and refreshing, as by waiting on the Lord we renew our strength in him.

Having referred to divers books for further information respecting us, and a more minute refutation of the other false charges, we shall content ourselves at present with this general answer.

Signed by direction and on behalf of a meeting representing the religious society called Quakers in Pennsylvania, New-Jersey, &c. held in Philadelphia the 22d of 11th Month, 1799.

JOHN DRINKER, *Clerk.*

CHAPTER V.

Concerning the Mennonites, or Anabaptists.

1. AFTER various scenes of trial and perplexity, the Mennonites at length found, during this century, that tranquillity which they had long sought in vain. They arrived, indeed, at this state of repose by very slow steps; for though, in the preceding age, they were admitted to the rights and privileges of citizens in the United Provinces, yet it was a long time before their solicitations and pleas of innocence could engage the English, the Swiss, and Germans, to receive them in their bosom, and to abrogate the laws that had been enacted against them. The civil magistrates, in these countries, had still before their eyes the enormities committed by the ancient Anabaptists; and, besides, they could not persuade themselves, that a set of men, who looked upon all oaths as sinful, and declared that magistracy and penal laws have no place in the kingdom of Christ, had the qualities and sentiments that are necessary to constitute a good citizen. Hence we find, even in this century, several examples of great severities employed against the Anabaptists, and some instances of even capital punishments being inflicted on them.[a] But now, that the demonstrations of their innocence and probity are clear and unquestionable, they

[a] The severities exercised in Switzerland against the Mennonites are recorded by Ottius, in his Annal. Anabapt. p. 337, and more particularly those which they suffered in the year 1693, by Hottinger, in his German work, entitled Schweizerische Kirchen-Historie, vol. i. p. 1101,

enjoy the sweets of security and repose, not only in the United Provinces, but also in England, Germany, and Prussia, where they procure by their honest industry, and particularly by their application to trade and commerce, an ample subsistence for themselves and their families.

II. The wiser members of this community easily perceived, that their external tranquillity would not be staple or permanent, unless their intestine discords were removed, and their ancient disputes about trifling and unimportant matters charitably terminated. They accordingly used their most zealous endeavours to diffuse the sweets of charity and concord throughout their sect; nor were their labours altogether unsuccessful. In 1630, a considerable part of the Anabaptists of Flanders, Germany, and Friseland, concluded their debates in a conference at Amsterdam, and entered into the bonds of fraternal communion; each, notwithstanding, reserving a liberty of retaining certain opinions. This association was renewed, and confirmed by new resolutions in 1649, by the Anabaptists of Flanders and Germany, among whom great divisions had reigned.[a] All these formed a bond of union with those branches of the sect that were most distinguished by their moderation; and they mitigated and corrected, in various respects, the rigorous laws of Menno and his successors.

III. At this day, therefore, the whole community may be divided into two large sects. One comprehends the more *refined* Anabaptists, remarkable for their austerity, who are also called Flemings or Flandrians; and those who form the other sect are styled the *Gross* Anabaptists, who are of a milder complexion, and an easier and more moderate character, and go commonly under the denomination of Waterlandians. We have already given a particular account of the origin and etymology of these denominations. Each sect is subdivided into a variety of branches, more especially the refined and austere Anabaptists; who have not only produced two separate societies, distinguished by the names of Groningenists,[b] and Dantzickers, or Prussians,[c] but also a considerable number of more obscure factions, which differ in doctrine, discipline, and manners, and agree in nothing but the name of Anabaptists, and in some ancient opinions that have been unanimously embraced by all the members of that sect. All the refined Anabaptists are the rigid followers of Simon Menno, and firmly maintain, though not all with the same degree of severity and rigour, the sentiments of their chief on the following points—the human nature of Christ—the obligation that binds us to wash the feet of strangers in consequence of our Saviour's command—the necessity of excommunicating and of avoiding, as one would do the plague, not only avowed sinners, but also those who depart, even in some light instances, from the simplicity of their ancestors, and are tainted with any appearance of evil—the contempt that is due to human learning, and other matters of less moment.[d] It is however to be observed, that, in our times, some of the congregations of this refined sect have been gradually departing from their austere system, and are proceeding, though with a slow pace, toward the opinions and discipline of the moderate Anabaptists.

IV. All these Anabaptists adopt a form of ecclesiastical government and discipline, that is administered by three distinct orders of persons. The first order is that of the Bishops or Presbyters, who always preside in the consistory, and are alone invested with the power of administering the sacraments of baptism and the Lord's supper. The second is that of the Teachers, who are set apart for the purposes of public instruction, and the celebration of divine worship. The third comprehends the Deacons, who are chosen out of both sexes. These three orders compose the consistory, or council, by which the church is governed. All matters of importance are proposed, examined, and decided, in the meetings of the Brethren. By their suffrages the ministers are elected to their holy office, and are all, the deacons excepted, installed by public prayers, attended with imposition of hands.

V. Among the inferior sects of the rigid Anabaptists, the most considerable is that which passes under the denomination of Ukewallists, and is so called after its founder Uke Walles, a native of Friseland. This rustic, rigid, and ignorant sectary, not only exhorted his followers to maintain the primitive and austere doctrine of Menno, without suffering it to be softened or altered in the smallest degree, but also, in the year 1637, began to propagate, jointly with another innovator, named John Leus, a singular opinion concerning the salvation of Judas, and the rest of Christ's murderers. To give an air of plausibility to the favourable opinion he entertained concerning the eternal state of this arch-apostate, he invented the following odd hypothesis: "That the period which extended from the birth of Christ to the descent of the Holy Ghost, and was, as it were, the distinctive term that separated the Jewish from the Christian dispensation, was a time of deep ignorance and darkness, during which the Jews were void of light, and entirely destitute of divine succour; and that, in consequence, the sins and enormities that were committed during this interval were in a great measure excusable, and could not merit the severest displays of the divine justice." This idle fiction met with no indulgence, either from the Mennonites on the one hand, or from the magistrates of Groningen on the other; for the former excluded its inventor from their communion, and the latter banished him from their city. He fixed his residence in the adjacent province of East-Friseland, and there drew after him a considerable number of disciples, whose descendants still subsist in Friseland, and also in Lithuania and Prussia, and have their own religious assemblies, separate from those of the other Mennonites. As they have little intercourse with any but those of their own communion, it is not an easy matter to know, with certainty, whether they persevere in the singular opinion that proved so detrimental to the interest of their leader. It is at least certain, that they follow scrupulously the steps of their original founder, Menno, and exhibit a lively image of the primitive manners and

nor even in the present* century have they been treated more mildly in the canton of Bern, as appears from Schyn's Historia Mennonitar. cap. x. p. 289, in which we find the letters of the states-general of the United Provinces, interceding with that canton in their behalf. A severe persecution was set on foot against them in the Palatinate in 1694, which was suspended by the intercession of William III. king of Great Britain. See Schyn's Hist. p. 265. Bishop Burnet mentions some instances of Anabaptists suffering death in England during the seventeenth century, in the first volume of his History of his own Time.

[a] Herm. Schyn, Plenior Deductio Historiæ Mennonit. p. 41, 42.

[b] So called, because they met at certain stated times in Groningen.

[c] They derive this denomination from their adopting the manners and discipline of the Prussians.

[d] See a German work, entitled, Nachrichten von dem gegenwartigen Zustande der Mennoniten, by Rues, 1743.

* The eighteenth.

constitution of the Mennonites. They re-baptize all those who leave other Christian churches to embrace their communion. Their apparel is mean beyond expression, and they avoid every thing that has the most distant appearance of elegance or ornament. They suffer their beards to grow to an enormous length; their hair, uncombed, lies in a disorderly manner on their shoulders; their countenances are marked with the strongest lines of dejection and melancholy; and their habitations and household furniture are such as are only fitted to answer the demands of mere necessity. Such moreover is the severity of their discipline, that any member of their community, who departs in the smallest instance from this austere rule, is immediately excluded from the society, and avoided by all the Brethren as a public pest. Their inspectors or bishops, whom they distinguish from the ministers, whose office is to preach and instruct, are chosen by an assembly composed of all the congregations of the sect. The ceremony of washing the feet of strangers, who come within the reach of their hospitality, is looked upon by them as a right of divine institution. We shall not enlarge upon the other circumstances of their ritual, but only observe, that they prevent all attempts to alter or modify their religious discipline, by preserving their people from every thing that bears the remotest aspect of learning and science; from whatever, in a word, might have a tendency to enlighten their devout ignorance.

VI. The more gross or moderate and less scrupulous Anabaptists are composed of certain inhabitants of Waterland, Flanders, Friseland, and Germany, who entered into an association, as has been already observed, and commonly pass under the denomination of Waterlandians. The members of this community have abandoned the severe discipline and singular opinions of Menno, whom, nevertheless, they generally respect as their primitive parent and founder, and have advanced a step nearer than the other Anabaptists to the religious doctrines and customs of other Christian churches. They are, however, divided into two distinct sects, which bear the respective denominations of Friselanders and Waterlandians, and are both without bishops, employing no other ecclesiastical ministers than presbyters and deacons. Each congregation of this sect is independent of all foreign jurisdiction, having its own ecclesiastical council or consistory, which is composed of presbyters and deacons. The supreme spiritual power is, nevertheless, in the hands of the people, without whose consent nothing of importance can be carried into execution. Their presbyters are, generally speaking, men of learning, and apply themselves with success to the study of physic and philosophy: and a public professor is supported, at present, by the sect at Amsterdam, for the instruction of their youth in the various branches of philosophy and sacred erudition.

VII. One of these Waterlandian sects divided itself, in 1664, into two factions, which were respectively called Galenists and Apostoolians, from the names of their two leaders. The founder of the former sect was Galen Abraham Haan, a doctor of physic, and pastor of a Mennonite congregation at Amsterdam, who received the applause even of his enemies, on account of his uncommon penetration and eloquence. This eminent Anabaptist in imitation of the Arminians, considered the Christian religion as a system that laid much less stress upon faith than upon practice; and he was inclined to receive, into the communion of the Mennonites, all who acknowledged the divine origin of the books of the Old and New Testament, and led holy and virtuous lives. Such, in his judgment, were true Christians, and had an undoubted right to all the rights and privileges that belonged to that character. These comprehensive terms of communion were peculiarly favourable to his own theological sentiments, since his notions concerning Christ's divinity, and the salvation of mankind by his death and merits, were very different from those of the Mennonites, and coincided in a great measure with the Socinian system.

Several persons opposed the sentiments of this latitudinarian, and more especially Samuel Apostool, an eminent pastor among the Mennonites at Amsterdam, who not only defended, with the utmost zeal, the doctrines generally received among the Mennonites, in relation to the divinity of Christ and the fruits of his death, but also maintained the ancient hypothesis of a visible and glorious church of Christ upon earth, that was peculiar to this sect.[a] Thus a controversy was excited which produced the division now mentioned; a division which the zealous efforts of several of the wisest and most respectable members of this community have hitherto proved insufficient to heal. The Galenists are not less disposed than the Arminians to admit, as members of their community, all who call themselves Christians; and they are the only sect of the Anabaptists who reject the denomination of Mennonites. The Apostoolians, on the contrary, admit to their communion those only who profess to believe all the points of doctrine which are contained in their public confession of faith.[b]

CHAPTER VI.

Concerning the Socinians and Arians.

I. ABOUT the commencement of this century, the sect of the Socinians seemed to be well established, and their affairs were even in a flourishing condition. In Transylvania and Lucko, they enjoyed the liberty of holding, without molestation, their religious assemblies, and professing publicly their theological opinions. The advantages that attended their situation in Poland were still more considerable; for they had at Racow a public seminary, which was furnished with professors eminently distinguished by their erudition and genius, together with a press for the publication of their writings; they had also a considerable number of congregations in that district, and were supported by the patronage of several persons of the highest distinction. Elate with this scene of prosperity, they began to form more extensive views, and aimed at enlarging the borders of their community, and procuring it patrons and protectors in other countries. Authentic records are extant, from which it appears, that they sent emissaries with this view, about the commencement of the century, into Holland, England, Germany, and Prussia, who endeavoured to make proselytes to Socini-

[a] For a more particular account of these two Mennonites, see Schyn's Deductio plenior Histor. Mennonit. cap. xv. page 318, and xviii. page 237.

[b] Casp. Commelini Descriptio Urbis Amstelodami, tom. i. p. 500.—Stoupa's Religion des Hollandois, p. 20.—Benthem's Hollandischer Schul and Kirchen Staat, p. 1. ch. xix. p. 830.

anism in these countries, among men of learning and men in power; for it is remarkable, that the Socinians, in propagating their religious principles, have always followed a quite different method from that which has been observed by other sects. It has been the general practice of sectaries and innovators to endeavour to render themselves popular, and to begin by gaining the multitude to their side; but the disciples of Socinus, who are perpetually exalting the dignity, prerogatives, and authority of reason, have this peculiarity in their manner of proceeding, that they are at very little pains to court the favour of the people, or to make proselytes to their cause among those who are not distinguished from the multitude by their rank or their abilities; it is only among the learned and the great that they seek disciples and patrons with zealous assiduity.

II. The effect of the missions now mentioned, though they were conducted and executed by persons of whom the greatest part were eminent, both on account of their rank and abilities, was nevertheless far from answering the views and expectations of the community. In most places the success of the cause was doubtful, at best inconsiderable; in some, however, the missionaries were favourably received, and seemed to employ their labours with effect. They had no where a more flattering prospect of success than in the university of Altorf, where their sentiments and their cause were promoted with dexterity by Ernest Sohner, an acute and learned cultivator of the peripatetic system, who was also professor of physic and natural philosophy. This subtle philosopher, who had joined the Socinians during his residence in Holland, instilled their principles into the minds of his scholars with much greater facility, by his having acquired the highest reputation, both for learning and piety. The death, indeed, of this eminent man, which happened in 1612, deprived the rising society of its chief ornament and support; nor could the remaining friends of Socinianism carry on the cause of their community with such art and dexterity, as to escape the vigilant and severe eye of the other professors. Their secret designs were accordingly brought to light in 1616; and the contagion of Socinianism, which was gathering strength from day to day, and growing imperceptibly into a reigning system, was suddenly dissipated and extinguished by the vigilant severity of the magistrates of Nuremberg. The foreign students, who had been infected with these doctrines, saved themselves by flight; while those natives, who were chargeable with the same reproach, accepted the remedies that were presented to them by the healing hand of orthodoxy, and returned quietly to their former theological system.[a]

III. The establishment of the Socinians in Poland, though it seemed to rest upon solid foundations, was nevertheless of a short duration.[b] Its chief supports were withdrawn, in 1638, by a public decree of the diet. It happened in this year that some of the students of Racow vented, in an irregular and tumultuous manner, their religious resentment against a crucifix, at which they threw stones, till they beat it down out of its place. This act of violence excited such a high degree of indignation, in the catholics, that they vowed revenge, and severely fulfilled this vow; for it was through their importunate solicitations that the terrible law was enacted at Warsaw, by which it was resolved, that the college of Racow should be demolished, its professors banished with ignominy, the printing-house of the Socinians destroyed, and their churches shut. All this was executed without the smallest alleviation or the least delay, notwithstanding the efforts made by the powerful patrons of the Socinians to ward off the blow.[c] But a catastrophe, still more terrible, awaited them; and the persecution now mentioned was the forerunner of that dreadful revolution, which, about twenty years afterwards, brought on the entire ruin of this community in Poland: for, by a public and solemn act of the diet holden at Warsaw, in 1658, all the Socinians were banished for ever from the territory of that republic, and capital punishment was denounced against all who should either profess their opinions, or harbour their persons. The unhappy exiles were, at first, allowed the space of three years to settle their affairs, and to dispose of their possessions; but this term was afterwards abridged by the cruelty of their enemies, and reduced to two years. In 1661, the terrible edict was renewed; and all the Socinians that yet remained in Poland were barbarously driven out of that country, some with the loss of their property, others with the loss of their lives, as neither sickness, nor any domestic consideration, could suspend the execution of that rigorous sentence.[d]

IV. A part of these exiles, who sought refuge among their brethren in Transylvania, sunk under the burthen of their calamities, and perished amidst the hardships to which they were exposed. A considerable number of these unhappy emigrants were dispersed through the adjacent provinces of Silesia, Brandenburg, and Prussia; and their posterity still subsist in those countries. Several of the more eminent members of the sect, in consequence of the protection granted to them by the duke of Brieg, resided for some time at Crossen in Silesia.[e] Others went in search of a convenient settlement for themselves and their brethren, into Holland, England, Holstein, and Denmark. Of all the Socinian exiles, none discovered such zeal and industry for the interests and establishment of the sect as Stanislaus Lubieniecius, a Polish knight, distinguished by his learning, and singularly esteemed by persons of the highest rank, and even by several sovereign princes, on account of his eloquence, politeness, and prudence. This illustrious patron of Socinianism succeeded so far in his designs, as to gain the favour of Frederic III. king of Denmark, of Christian Albert duke of Holstein, and Charles Louis elector Palatine; and thus he had almost obtained a secure retreat and settlement for the Socinians, about the year 1662, at Altena, Fredericstadt, and Manheim; but his measures

[a] The learned Gustavus George Zeltner, formerly professor of divinity in the university of Altorf, composed an ample and learned account of this theological revolution, drawn principally from manuscript records; which Gebauer published at Leipsic, in 1729, under the following title, "Historia Crypto-Socinianismi Altorfinæ quondam Academiæ infesti, arcana."

[b] We have a circumstantial account of the flourishing state of the Racovian seminary, while it was under the direction of the learned Martin Ruarus, in the Cimbria Literata of Moller, tom. i. p. 572, where we learn that Ruarus was a native of Holstein, who became a proselyte to the Socinian system.

[c] Epistola de Wissowatii Vitâ in Sandii Bib. Anti-Trinitar, p. 233.—Gust. Georg. Zeltneri His. Crypto-Socinianismi Altorfini, vol. i. p. 299.

[d] Stanislai Lubieniecii Hist. Reformat. Polonicæ, lib. iii. c. xvii. xviii. p. 279.—Equitis Poloni Vindiciæ pro Unitariorum in Poloniâ Religionis Libertate, apud Sandium, p. 267.

[e] Lubieniecii Hist. cap. xviii. p. 285, where there is a letter written by the Socinians of Crossen.

were disconcerted, and all his hopes entirely frustrated, by the opposition and remonstrances of the clergy established in those countries; he was opposed in Denmark by Suaning bishop of Sealand, in Holstein by Reinboth, and in the Palatinate by John Louis Fabricius.[a] Several other attempts were made, in different countries, in favour of Socinianism; but their success was still less considerable; nor could any of the European nations be persuaded to grant a public settlement to a sect, whose members denied the divinity of Christ.

V. The remains, therefore, of this unfortunate community are, at this day, dispersed through different countries, particularly in the kingdoms of England and Prussia, the electorate of Brandenburg, and the United Provinces, where they lie more or less concealed, and hold their religious assemblies in a clandestine manner. They are, indeed, said to exercise their religion publicly in England,[b] not in consequence of a legal toleration, but through the indulgent connivance of the civil magistrate.[c] Some of them have embraced the communion of the Arminians; others have joined with those Anabaptists who form a sect distinguished by the name of Galenists; and in this there is nothing at all surprising, since neither the Arminians nor Anabaptists require, from those who enter into their communion, an explicit or circumstantial declaration of their religious sentiments. It is also said, that a considerable number of this dispersed community became members of the religious society called Collegiants.[d] Amidst such frequent changes and vicissitudes, it was not possible that the Socinians could maintain a uniform system of doctrine, or preserve unaltered and entire the religious tenets handed down to them by their ancestors. On the contrary, their peculiar and distinctive opinions are variously explained and understood both by the learned and illiterate members of their community, though they all agree in rejecting the doctrine of the Trinity, and tha also of the divinity and satisfaction of Jesus Christ.[e]

VI. After the Socinians, as there is a great affinity be tween the two sects, it is proper to mention the Arians, who had several celebrated writers in this century, such as Sandius and Biddle.[f] Of those who also passed under the general denomination of Anti-Trinitarians and Unitarians, there are many that may be placed in the class of the Socinians and Arians; for the term *Unitarian* is very comprehensive, and is applicable to a great variety of persons, who agree in this common principle, that there is no real distinction in the divine nature. The denomination of Arian is also given in general to those who consider Jesus Christ as inferior and subordinate to the Father. But, as this subordination may be understood and explained in various ways, it is evident that the term *Arian*, as it is used in modern language, is susceptible of different significations; and that, in consequence, the persons to whom it is applied cannot be all considered in the same point of light with the ancient Arians, or supposed to agree perfectly with each other in their religious tenets.

CHAPTER VII.

Concerning some Sects of Inferior Note.

I. It will not be improper to take notice here of a few sects of inferior consequence and note, which we could not conveniently mention in the history of the more extensive and important communities that we have been surveying, and which, nevertheless, we cannot omit, for several reasons. While the disputes and tumults, produced in Holland in 1619 by the Arminian system, were at the greatest height, a religious society arose, whose members hold at Rhinsberg, near Leyden, a solemn assembly in every half-year, and are generally known by the denomination of *Collegiants*.[g]

[a] See Sandii Biblioth. p. 165.—Historia Vitæ Lubieniecii, prefixed to his History.—Molleri Introductio in Histor. Chersones. Cimbricæ, p. ii. p. 105, and his Cimbria Literata, tom. ii. p. 487.—Jo. Henr. Heideggeri Vita Joh. Lud. Fabricii, subjoined to the works of the latter.

☞ [b] The Socinians in England have never made any figure as a community, but have rather been dispersed among the great variety of sects that have arisen in a country where liberty displays its most glorious fruits, and at the same time exhibits its most striking inconveniences. Besides, few ecclesiastics, or writers of any note, have adopted the theological system now under consideration, in all its branches. The Socinian doctrine relating to the design and efficacy of the death of Christ had indeed many abettors in England during the seventeenth century; and it may be presumed, that its votaries are rather increased than diminished in the present; but those divines who have abandoned the Athanasian hypothesis concerning the Trinity of Persons in the Godhead, have more generally gone into the Arian and Semi-Arian notions of that inexplicable subject, than into those of the Socinians, who deny that Jesus Christ existed before his appearance in the human nature. The famous John Biddle, after having maintained, both in public and in private, during the reign of Charles and the protectorship of Cromwell, the Unitarian system, erected an Independent congregation in London, the only British church we have heard of, in which all the peculiar doctrines of Socianism were inculcated; for, if we may give credit to the account of Sir Peter Pett, this congregation held the following notions: "That the fathers under the old covenant had only temporal promises; that saving faith consisted in universal obedience performed to the commands of God and Christ; that Christ rose again only by the power of the Father, and not by his own; that justifying faith is not the pure gift of God, but may be acquired by men's natural abilities; that faith cannot believe any thing contrary to, or above reason; that there is no original sin; that Christ has not the same body now in glory, in which he suffered and rose again; that the saints shall not have the same bodies in heaven which they had on earth; that Christ was not Lord or King before his resurrection, or Priest before his ascension; that the saints shall not, before the day of judgment, enjoy the bliss of heaven; that God does not certainly know future contingencies; that there is not any authority of fathers or general councils in determining matters of faith; that Christ, before his death, had not any dominion over the angels; and that Christ, by dying, made not satisfaction for us." See the preface to Sir Peter Pett's Happy future State of England, printed in 1688.

[c] The Socinians, who reside at present in the district of Mark, used to meet, some years ago, at stated times, at Koningswald, a village in the neighbourhood of Frankfort, on the Oder. See the Recueil de Literature, de Philosophie et d'Histoire (published at Amsterdam, in 1731*,) p. 44. They published in 1716, at Berlin, their confession of faith, in the German language, which is to be found, with a refutation thereto annexed, in a book entitled, Den Theologischen Heb. Opfern, part x. p. 852.

☞ [d] This community, of which an account is given in the following chapter, called their religious meetings *Colleges*, that is, congregations or assemblies; and hence they were denominated *Collegiants*.

[e] Many examples might be alleged in proof of this. It will be sufficient to mention that of the learned Crellius, who, though he was professor of theology among the Socinians, yet differed in his opinions about many points of doctrine, from the sentiments of Socinus and the Racovian Catechism, and would not be called a Socinian, but an Artemonite.† See the Journal Literaire, tom. xvii. part i. and the account I have given of this celebrated man in my Syntagm. Dissertationum ad sanctiores Disciplinas pertinentium, p. 352.—Unschuld. Nachrict. 1750, p. 942.—Nouveau Diction. Historique et Critique, tom. ii. p. 88.

☞ This last citation is erroneous; there is no account of Crellius in the place here referred to.

[f] For an account of Sandius, father and son, see Arnold and other writers. The life of Biddle is to be found in the Nouveau Diction. Historique et Critique, tom. i. p. ii. p. 288. ☞ Dr. Mosheim places Biddle improperly among the Arians; it is manifest that he belongs to the Socinian sect, since, in the third article of his Confession of Faith, he professes to believe that Christ has no other than a human nature. See the Socinian Tracts, entitled, The Faith of one God, &c. published at London in 1691. See also above, note [a c].

[g] See note [a], in the preceding chapter.

☞ * The author of this collection was one Jordan, who was pastor of a church in the neighbourhood of Berlin.

☞ † After Artemon, who lived in the reign of the Emperor Severus, and denied the pre-existence and divinity of Jesus Christ.

This community was founded by three brothers, of the name of Vander-Kodde, who passed their days in the obscurity of a rural life, and are said to have been men of eminent piety, well acquainted with sacred literature, and great enemies to religious controversy. They had for their associate Anthony Cornelius, a man also of a mean condition, and who had no qualities that could give any degree of weight or credit to their cause. The descendants and followers of these men acquired the name of *Collegiants*, because they called their religious assemblies *Colleges*. All are admitted to the communion of this sect who acknowledge the divinity of the Scriptures, and endeavour to live suitably to the precepts and doctrines contained in those writings, whatever their peculiar sentiments may be concerning the nature of the Deity and the truths of Christianity. Their numbers are very considerable in the provinces of Holland, Utrecht, East and West-Friseland. They meet twice in every week, namely, on Sundays and Wednesdays, for the purpose of divine worship; and, after singing a psalm or hymn, and addressing themselves to the Deity by prayer, they explain a certain portion of the New Testament. The female members of the community are not allowed to speak in public; but all others, without any exception founded on rank, condition, or incapacity, have a right to communicate the result of their meditations to the assembly, and to submit their sentiments to the judgment of the brethren. All likewise have an unquestionable right to examine and oppose what has been advanced by any of the brethren, provided that their opposition be attended with a spirit of Christian charity and moderation. There is a printed list of the passages of Scripture, that are to be examined and illustrated at each of their religious meetings; so that any one who is ambitious of appearing among the speakers, may study the subject beforehand, and thus come fully prepared to descant upon it in public. The Brethren, as has been already observed, have a general assembly twice a year at Rhinsberg, where they have ample and convenient houses for the education of orphans and the reception of strangers; and there they remain together during the space of four days, which are employed in hearing discourses that tend to edification, and exhortations which are principally designed to inculcate brotherly love and sanctity of manners. The sacrament of the Lord's supper is also administered during this assembly; and those adult persons who desire to be baptized, receive the sacrament of baptism, according to the ancient and primitive manner of celebrating that institution, that is, by immersion. Those Collegiants, who reside in the province of Friseland, have at present an annual meeting at Leewarden, where they administer the sacraments, as the distance at which they live from Rhinsberg renders it inconvenient for them to repair thither twice a year. We shall conclude our account of these sectaries by observing, that their community is of a most ample and extensive kind; that it comprehends persons of all ranks, orders, and sects, who profess themselves Christians, though their sentiments concerning the person and doctrine of the divine Founder of Christianity be extremely different; that it is kept together, and its union maintained, not by the authority of rulers and doctors, the force of ecclesiastical laws, the restraining power of creeds and confessions, or the influence of positive rites and institutions, but merely by a zeal for the advancement of practical religion, and a desire of drawing instruction from the study of the Scriptures.[a]

II. In such a community, or rather amidst such a multitude as this, in which opinion is free, and every one is permitted to judge for himself in religious matters, dissensions and controversies can scarcely have place. However, a debate attended with some warmth, arose in 1672, between the merchants John and Paul Bredenburg, on one side, and Abraham Lemmerman and Francis Cuiper on the other. John Bredenburg had erected a particular society, or college, in which he gave a course of lectures upon the religion of nature and reason; but this undertaking was highly disapproved by Lemmerman and Cuiper, who were for excluding reason altogether from religious inquiries and pursuits. During the heat of this controversy, Bredenburg discovered a manifest propensity toward the sentiments of Spinosa; he even defended them publicly, and yet, at the same time, professed a firm attachment to the Christian religion.[b] Other debates of less consequence arose in this community; and the effect was a division of the Collegiants into two parties, which held their assemblies separately at Rhinsberg. This division happened in 1686; but it was healed about the commencement of the following century, by the death of those who had principally occasioned it; and then the Collegiants returned to their former union and concord.[c]

[a] See the Dissertation sur les Usages de ceux qu'on appelle en Hollande Collegiens et Rhinobourgeois, in the Ceremonies Religieuses de tous les Peuples du Monde, tom. iv. p. 323.; as also a Dutch book, containing an account of the Collegiants, and published by themselves in 1736, under the following title: "De Oorspronck, Natuur, Handelwyze en Oogmerk der zo genaamde Rynburgsche Vergadering."

[b] The names of John Bredenburg, and Francis Cuiper, are well known among the followers and adversaries of Spinosa; but the character and profession of these two disputants are less generally known. Bredenburg, or (as he is otherwise called) Breitenburg, was a Collegiant, and a merchant of Rotterdam, who propagated in a public manner the doctrine of Spinosa, and pretended to demonstrate mathematically its conformity to the dictates of reason. The same man not only professed Christianity, but moreover explained, recommended, and maintained the Christian religion in the meetings of the Collegiants, and asserted, on all occasions, its divine original. To reconcile these striking contradictions, he declared, on one hand, that reason and Christianity were in direct opposition to each other; but maintained, on the other, that we were obliged to believe, even against the evidence of the strongest mathematical demonstrations, the religious doctrines comprehended in the Scriptures; (this, indeed, was adding absurdity to absurdity.) He affirmed, that truth was two-fold, theological and philosophical: and that those propositions, which were false in theology, were true in philosophy. There is a brief but accurate account of the character and sentiments of Bredenburg, in the learned work of the Jew Isaac Orobio, entitled, "Certamen Philosophicum propugnatæ Veritatis, divinæ et naturalis, adversus Jo. Bredenburgii Principia, ex quibus, quod Religio Rationi repugnat, demonstrare nititur." This work, which contains Bredenburg's pretended demonstrations of the philosophy of Spinosa, was first published at Amsterdam in 1703, and afterwards at Brussels, in 1731. His antagonist, Francis Cuiper, acquired a considerable reputation by his Arcana Atheismi detecta, i. e. the secrets of Atheism detected. He was a bookseller at Amsterdam; and it was he that published, among other things, the Bibliotheca Fratrum Polonorum seu Unitariorum. Those who have a tolerable acquaintance with the literary history of this century, know that Cuiper, on account of the very book which he wrote against Bredenburg, was suspected of Spinosism, though he was a Collegiant, and a zealous defender of the Christian faith, as also of the perfect conformity that subsists between right reason and true religion. ☞ Dr. Mosheim said a little before, in the text, that Lemmerman and Cuiper were for excluding reason altogether from religion; how then can he consistently say here of the latter, that he was a defender of the conformity between reason and religion?

[c] Beside the authors who have been already mentioned, those who understand the German language may consult the curious work of Simon Frederic Rues, entitled, "Nachrichten vom Zustande der Mennoniten," p. 267.

III. The Labadists were so called from their founder John Labadie, a native of France, a man of no mean genius, and remarkable for a natural and masculine eloquence. This man was born in the Romish communion, entered into the order of the Jesuits, and, being dismissed by them,[a] became a member of the reformed church, and exercised with reputation the ministerial functions in France, Switzerland, and Holland. He at length erected a new community, which resided successively at Middleburg in Zealand, and at Amsterdam. In 1670, it was transplanted to Hervorden in Westphalia, at the particular desire of the princess Elizabeth, daughter of the elector Palatine, and abbess of Hervorden.[b] It was soon driven from that part of Germany, notwithstanding the protection of this illustrious princess; and, in 1672, settled at Altena, where its founder died two years after his arrival. After the death of Labadie, his followers removed the wandering community to Wiewert, in the district of North-Holland, where it found a peaceful retreat, and soon fell into oblivion; so that few, if any, traces of it are now to be found.

Among the persons that became members of this sect, there were some, whose learning and abilities gave it a certain degree of credit and reputation, particularly Anna Maria Schurman, of Utrecht, whose extensive erudition rendered her so famous in the republic of letters. The members of this community, if we may judge of them by their own account, did not differ from the reformed church so much in their tenets and doctrines, as in their manners and rules of discipline;[c] for their founder exhibited in his own conduct a most austere model of sanctity and obedience, which his disciples and followers were obliged to imitate; and they were taught to look for the communion of saints, not only in the invisible church, but also in a visible one, which, according to their views of things, ought to be composed of none but such persons as were distinguished by their sanctity and virtue, and by a pious progress toward perfection. There are still extant several treatises composed by Labadie, which sufficiently discover the temper and spirit of the man, and bear evident marks of a lively and glowing imagination, not tempered by the influence of a sober and accurate judgment; and, as persons of this character are sometimes carried, by the impetuosity of passion and the seduction of fancy, both into erroneous notions and licentious pursuits, we are not perhaps to reject, in consequence of an excessive charity or liberality of sentiment, the testimonies of those who have found many things worthy of censure, both in the life and doctrine of this turbulent enthusiast.[d]

IV. Among the fanatical contemporaries of Labadie was the famous Antoinette Bourignon de la Porte, a native of Flanders, who pretended to be divinely inspired, and set apart, by a particular interposition of Heaven, to revive the true spirit of Christianity, that had been extinguished by theological animosities and debates. This female enthusiast, whose religious feelings were accompanied with an unparalleled vivacity and ardour, and whose fancy was exuberant beyond all expression, joined to these qualities a volubility of tongue, less wonderful indeed, yet much adapted to seduce the unwary. Furnished with these useful talents, she began to propagate her theological system, and her enthusiastical notions made a great noise in Flanders, Holland, and some parts of Germany, where she had resided some years. Nor was it only the ignorant multitude that swallowed down with facility her visionary doctrines, since it is well known that several learned and ingenious men were persuaded of their truth, and caught the contagion of her fanaticism. After experiencing various turns of fortune, and suffering much vexation and ridicule on account of her religious fancies, she ended her days at Franeker, in Friseland, in 1680. Her writings were voluminous; but it would be a fruitless attempt to endeavour to draw from them an accurate and consistent scheme of religion; for the pretended divine light, that guides people of this class, does not proceed in

☞ [a] From this expression of our author, some may be led to imagine that Labadie was expelled by the Jesuits from their society; and many have, in effect, entertained this notion. But this is a palpable mistake; and whoever will be at the pains of consulting the letter of the abbé Goujet to father Niceron (published in the Memoires des Hommes illustres, tom. xx. p. 142.) will find that Labadie had long solicited his discharge from that society, and, after many refusals, obtained it at length in an honourable manner, by a public act signed at Bordeaux, by one of the provincials, on the 17th of April, 1639. For a full account of this restless, turbulent, and visionary man, who, by his plans of reformation, conducted by a zeal destitute of prudence, produced much tumult and disorder, both in the Romish and reformed churches, see his Life, composed with learning, impartiality, and judgment, by M. Chauffepeid, and inserted in that author's Supplement to Bayle.

☞ [b] This illustrious princess seems to have had as strong a taste for fanaticism as her grandfather king James I. of England had for scholastic theology. She carried on a correspondence with Penn, the famous Quaker, and other members of that extravagant sect. She is, nevertheless, celebrated by certain writers, on account of her application to the study of philosophy and poetry. That a poetical fancy may have rendered her susceptible of fanatical impressions, is not impossible; but how these impressions could be reconciled with a philosophical spirit, is more difficult to imagine.

☞ [c] Labadie always declared, that he embraced the doctrines of the reformed church. Nevertheless, when he was called to perform the ministerial functions to a French church at Middelburgh in Zealand, he refused to subscribe its confession of faith. Besides, if we examine his writings, we shall find that he entertained very odd and singular opinions on various subjects. He maintained, among other things, "that God may and does, on certain occasions, deceive men; that the Scriptures are not sufficient to lead men to salvation, without certain particular illuminations and revelations from the Holy Ghost; that, in reading them, we ought to give less attention to the literal sense of the words, than to the inward suggestions of the spirit, and that the efficacy of the word depends upon the preacher;—that the faithful ought to have all things in common; that there is no subordination or distinction of rank in the true church of Christ;—that Christ is to reign a thousand years upon earth; that the contemplative life is a state of grace and union with God, and the very height of perfection; that the Christian, whose mind is contented and calm, sees all things in God, enjoys the Deity, and is perfectly indifferent about every thing that passes in the world; and that the Christian arrives at that happy state by the exercise of a perfect self-denial, by mortifying the flesh and all sensual affections, and by mental prayer." Beside these, he had formed singular ideas of the Old and New Testaments, considered as covenants, as also concerning the Sabbath, and the true nature of a Christian church.

It is remarkable, that almost all the sectaries of an enthusiastical turn were desirous of entering into communion with Labadie. The Brownists offered him their church at Middelburg, when he was suspended by the French synod from his pastoral functions. The Quakers sent their two leading members, Robert Barclay and George Keith, to Amsterdam, while he resided there, to examine his doctrine; and, after several conferences with him, these commissioners offered to receive him into their communion, which he refused, probably from a principle of ambition, and the desire of remaining head of a sect. It is even said, that the famous William Penn made a second attempt to gain over the Labadists; and that he went for that purpose to Wiewert, where they resided after the death of their founder, but without success. We do not pretend to answer for the truth of these assertions, but shall only observe, that they are related by Möller, in his Cimbria Literata, on the authority of a manuscript journal, of which several extracts have been given by Joach. Fred. Feller, in his Trimest. ix Monumentorum ineditorum, sect. iii. A. 1717. p. 498—500.

[d] Möller's Cimbria Literata, tom. iii. p. 35, and his Isagoge ad Histor. Chersones. Cimbricæ, p. 2, cap. v. p. 121.—Arnold's Hist. Eccles. v. i. p. ii. lib. xvii. cap. xxi. p. 1186.—Weissman's Hist. Eccles. sæc. xvii. p. 927.—For an account of the two famous companions of Labadie, namely, Du Lignon and Yvon, see Cimbria Literata, tom. ii. p. 472, 1020.

a methodical way of reasoning and argument; it discovers itself by flashes, which shed nothing but thick darkness in the minds of those who investigate truth with the understanding, and do not trust to the reports of fancy, that is so often governed by sense and passion. An attentive reader will, however, learn something by perusing the writings of this fanatical virgin: he will be persuaded, that her intellect must have been in a disordered state; that her *divine effusions* were principally borrowed from the productions of the Mystics; and that by the intemperance of her imagination, she gave an additional air of extravagance and absurdity to the tenets which she derived from those pompous enthusiasts. If we attend to the main and predominant principle that appears in the incoherent productions of Bourignon, we shall find it to be the following: "That the Christian religion neither consists in knowledge nor in practice, but in a certain internal feeling, and divine impulse, arising immediately from communion with the Deity."[a] Among the more considerable patrons of this fanatical doctrine, we may reckon Christian Bartholomew de Cordt, a Jansenist, and priest of the oratory at Mechlin, who died at Nordstrand, in the duchy of Sleswick;[b] and Peter Poiret, a man of a bold and penetrating genius, who was a great master of the Cartesian philosophy.[c] The latter was shown in a striking manner by his own example, that knowledge and ignorance, reason and superstition, are often divided by thin partitions; and that they sometimes not only dwell together in the same person, but also, by an unnatural and unaccountable union, afford mutual assistance, and thus engender monstrous productions.

V. The same spirit, the same views, and the same kind of religion that distinguished Bourignon, were observable in an English, and also a female fanatic, named Jane Leadley, who, toward the conclusion of this century, seduced by her visions, predictions, and doctrines, a considerable number of disciples, among whom were some persons of learning; and thus gave rise to what was called the Philadelphian Society. This woman was of opinion that all dissensions among Christians would cease, and the kingdom of the Redeemer become, even here below, a glorious scene of charity, concord, and felicity, if those who bear the name of Jesus, without regarding the forms of doctrine or discipline which distinguish particular communions, would all join in committing their souls to the internal guide, to be instructed, governed, and formed by his divine impulse and suggestions. She even went farther, and declared, in the name of the Lord, that this desirable event would happen, and that she had a divine commission to proclaim the approach of this glorious communion of saints, who were to be collected in one visible universal church, or kingdom, before the dissolution of this earthly globe. This prediction she delivered with a peculiar degree of confidence, from a notion that her Philadelphian society was the true kingdom of Christ, in which alone the divine spirit resided and reigned. We shall not mention the other dreams of this enthusiast, among which the famous doctrine of the final restoration of all intelligent beings to perfection and happiness held an eminent place. Leadley was less fortunate than Bourignon in this respect, that she had not such an eloquent and ingenious patron as Poiret to plead her cause, and to give an air of philosophy to her wild reveries; for Pordage and Bromley, who were the chief of her associates, had nothing to recommend them but their mystic piety and contemplative turn of mind. Pordage, indeed, was so far destitute of the powers of elocution and reasoning, that he even surpassed Jacob Behmen, whom he admired, in obscurity and nonsense; and, instead of imparting instruction to his readers, did no more than excite in them a stupid kind of awe by a high-sounding jingle of pompous words.[d]

[a] See, for an ample account of Bourignon, Möller's Cimbria Literata, and his Isagoge.—Bayle's Dict. at the article Bourignon.—Arnold, vol. ii. ☞ See also Poiret's Epist. de Auctoribus Mysticis, sect. xiv. p. 565. This treatise is inserted at the end of his book, de Euriditione solidâ et superficiariâ.

[b] Mölleri Cimbria Literata, tom. ii. p. 149.

[c] Poiret dressed out in an artful manner and reduced to a kind of system, the wild and incoherent fancies of Bourignon, in his large work, entitled, L'Œconomie Divine, ou Systeme Universel, which was published, both in French and Latin, at Amsterdam, in 1686. For an account of this mystic philosopher, whose name and voluminous writings made such a noise, see Bibliotheca Brem. Theolog. Philol. tom. iii. p. 75.

[d] Jo. Wolf. Jaegeri Historia Sacra et Civilis, sæc. xvii. decenn. x. p. 90.—Petri Poireti Bibliotheca Mysticor. p. 161, 174, 283, 286.

A SHORT VIEW OR GENERAL SKETCH OF THE ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY

OF THE

EIGHTEENTH CENTURY.

I. The History of the Christian Church during this period, instead of a few pages, would alone require a volume; such are the number and importance of the materials that it exhibits to an attentive inquirer. It is therefore to be hoped that, in due time, some able and impartial writer will employ his labours on this interesting subject. At the same time, to render the present work as complete as possible, and to give a certain clue to direct those who teach or who study ecclesiastical history, through a multitude of facts that have not yet been collected, or digested into a regular order, we shall draw a general sketch that will exhibit the principal outlines of the state of religion since the commencement of the eighteenth century. That this sketch may not swell to too great an extent, we shall omit the mention of the authors who have furnished materials for this period of church history. Those who are acquainted with modern literature must know, that there are innumerable productions extant, whence such a variety of lines and colours might be taken, as would render this group and general draught a finished piece.

II. The doctrines of Christianity have been propagated in Asia, Africa, and America, with equal zeal, both by the Protestant and Popish missionaries. But we cannot say the same thing of the true spirit of the Gospel, or of the religious discipline and institutions which it recommends to the observance of Christians; for it is an undeniable fact, that many of those whom the Romish missionaries have persuaded to renounce their false gods, are Christians only as far as an external profession and certain religious ceremonies go; and that, instead of departing from the superstitions of their ancestors, they observe them still, though under a different form. We have, indeed, pompous accounts of the mighty success with which the Jesuitical ministry has been attended among the barbarous and unenlighted nations; and the French Jesuits, in particular, are said to have converted innumerable multitudes in the course of their missions. This perhaps cannot be altogether denied, if we are to call those converts to Christianity who have received some faint and superficial notions of the doctrines of the Gospel; for it is well known, that several congregations of *such* Christians have been formed by the Jesuits in the East-Indies, and more especially in the Carnatic, the kingdoms of Madura and Marava, some territories on the coast of Malabar, in the kingdom of Tonquin, the Chinese empire, and also in certain provinces of America. These conversions have, in outward appearance, been carried on with particular success, since Antony Veri has had the direction of the foreign missions, and has taken such especial care, that neither hands should fail for this spiritual harvest, nor any expenses be spared that might be necessary to the execution of such an arduous and important undertaking. But these pretended conversions, instead of effacing the infamy under which the Jesuits labour in consequence of the iniquitous conduct of their missionaries in former ages, have only served to augment it, and to show their designs and practices in a still more odious point of view; for they are known to be much more zealous in satisfying the demands of their avarice and ambition, than in promoting the cause of Christ, and are said to corrupt and modify, by a variety of inventions, the pure doctrine of the Gospel, in order to render it more generally palatable, and to increase the number of their ambiguous converts.

III. A famous question arose in this century, relating to the conduct of the Jesuits in China, and their manner of promoting the cause of the Gospel, by permitting the new converts to observe the religious rites and customs of their ancestors. This question was decided to the disadvantage of the missionaries, in 1704, by Clement XI., who, by a solemn edict, forbade the Chinese Christians to practise the religious rites of their ancestors, and more especially those which are celebrated by the Chinese in honour of their deceased parents, and of their great lawgiver Confucius. This severe edict was, nevertheless, considerably mitigated in 1715, in order to appease, no doubt, the resentment of the Jesuits, whom it exasperated in the highest degree; for the pontiff allowed the missionaries to make use of the word *tien*, to express the divine nature, with the addition of the word *tchu*, to remove its ambiguity, and make it evident, that it was not the *heaven*, but the *Lord of heaven*, that the Christian doctors worshipped:[a] he also permitted the observance of those ceremonies which had so highly offended the adversaries of the Jesuits, on condition that they should be considered merely as marks of respect to their parents, and as tokens of civil homage to their lawgivers, without being abused to the purposes of superstition, or even being viewed in a religious point of light. In consequence of this second papal edict, considerable indulgence is granted to the Chinese converts: among other things, they have in their houses tablets, on which the names of their ancestors, and particularly of Confucius, are written in golden letters; they are allowed to light candles before these tablets, to make offerings to them of rich perfumes, victuals fruits, and other delicacies, and even to prostrate the body before them until the head touches the ground. The same ceremony of prostration is performed by the Chinese Christians at the tombs of their ancestors.

The former edict, which was designed to prevent the motley mixture of Chinese superstition with the institu-

[a] The phrase *Tien Tchu* signifies the Lord of heaven.

tic s of Christianity, was conveyed into China, in 1705, by cardinal Tournon, the pope's legate; and the second, which was of a more indulgent nature, was sent, in 1721, with Mezzabarba, who went to China with the same character. Neither the emperor nor the Jesuits were satisfied with these edicts. Tournon, who executed the orders of his spiritual employer with more zeal than prudence, was, by the express command of the emperor, thrown into prison, where he died in 1710. Mezzabarba, though more cautious and prudent, yet returned home without having succeeded in his negotiation; nor could the emperor be engaged, either by arguments or entreaties, to make any alteration in the institutions and customs of his ancestors.[a] At present the state of Christianity in China being extremely precarious and uncertain, this famous controversy is entirely suspended; and many reasons induce us to think, that both the pontiffs and the enemies of the Jesuits will unite in permitting the latter to depart from the rigour of the papal edicts, and to follow their own artful and insinuating methods of conversion; for they will both esteem it expedient and lawful to submit to many inconveniences and abuses, rather than to risk the entire suppression of popery in China.

IV. The attempts made since the commencement of the present century, by the English and Dutch, and more especially by the former, to diffuse the light of Christianity through the benighted regions of Asia, and America, have been carried on with more assiduity and zeal than in the preceding age. That the Lutherans have borne their part in this salutary work appears abundantly from the Danish mission, planned with such piety in 1706 by Frederic IV. for the conversion of the Indians who inhabit the coast of Malabar, and attended with such remarkable success. This noble establishment, which surpasses all that have been yet erected for the propagation of the Gospel, not only subsists still in a flourishing state, but progressively acquires new degrees of perfection under the auspicious and munificent patronage of that excellent monarch Christian VI. We will, indeed, readily grant, that the converts to Christianity, made by the Danish missionaries, are less numerous than those which we find in the lists of the popish legates; but it may be affirmed, that they are much better Christians, and far excel the latter in sincerity and zeal. There is a great difference between Christians in reality, and Christians in appearance; and it is very certain, that the popish missionaries are much more ready than the protestant doctors, to admit into their communion proselytes, who have nothing of Christianity but the name.

We have very imperfect accounts of the labours of the Russian clergy, the greatest part of whom are still involved in that gross ignorance which covered the most unenlightened ages of the church: but we learn, from the modern records of that nation, that some of their doctors have employed, with a certain degree of success, their zeal and industry in spreading the light of the Gospel in those provinces which border upon Siberia.

V. While the missionaries now mentioned exposed themselves to the greatest dangers and sufferings, in order to diffuse the light of divine truth among these remote and darkened nations, there arose in Europe, where the Gospel had obtained a firm footing, a multitude of adversaries who shut their eyes upon its excellence, and endeavoured to eclipse its immortal lustre. There is no country in Europe where infidelity has not exhaled its poison; and scarcely any denomination of Christians among whom we may not find several persons, who either aim at the extinction of all religion, or at least endeavour to invalidate the authority of the Christian system. Some carry on these unhappy attempts in an open manner, others under the mask of a Christian profession; but no where have these enemies of the purest religion, and consequently of mankind, whom it was designed to render wise and happy, appeared with more effrontery and insolence, than under the free governments of Great-Britain and the United Provinces. In England, more especially, it is not uncommon to meet with books, in which, not only the doctrines of the Gospel, but also the perfections of the Deity, and the solemn obligations of piety and virtue, are impudently called in question, and turned into derision.[b] Such impious productions have cast a deserved reproach on the names and memories of Toland, Collins, Tindal, and Woolston, a man of an inauspicious genius, who made the most audacious though senseless attempts to invalidate the miracles of Christ. Add to these Morgan, Chubb, Mandeville, and others. And writers of the same class will be soon found in all the countries of Europe, particularly in those where the Reformation has introduced a spirit of liberty, if mercenary booksellers are still allowed to publish, without distinction or reserve, every wretched production that is addressed to the passions of men, and designed to obliterate in their minds a sense of religion and virtue.

VI. The sect of Atheists, by which, in strictness of speech, those only are to be meant who deny the existence and moral government of an infinitely wise and powerful Being, by whom all things subsist, is reduced to a very small number, and may be considered as almost totally extinct. Any who yet remain under the influence of this unaccountable delusion, adopt the system of Spinosa, and suppose the universe to be one vast substance, which excites and produces a great variety of motions, all uncontrollably necessary, by a sort of internal force, which they carefully avoid defining with perspicuity and precision.

The Deists, under which general denomination those

☞ [a] Tournon had been made, by the pope, patriarch of Antioch; and Mezzabarba, to add a certain degree of weight to his mission, was created patriarch of Alexandria. After his return, the latter was promoted to the bishopric of Lodi, a preferment which, though inferior in point of station to his imaginary patriarchate, was far more valuable in point of ease and profit.

See a more ample account of this mission in Dr. Mosheim's Memoirs of the Christian Church in China.

☞ [b] This observation, and the examples by which it is supported in the following sentence, stand in need of some correction. Many books have, indeed, been published in England against the divinity both of the Jewish and Christian dispensations; and it is justly to be lamented, that the inestimable blessing of religious liberty, which the wise and good have improved to the glory of Christianity, by setting its doctrines and precepts in a rational light, and bringing them back to their primitive simplicity, has been so far abused by the pride of some, and the ignorance and licentiousness of others, as to excite an opposition to the Christian system, which is both designed and adapted to lead men, through the paths of wisdom and virtue, to happiness and perfection. It is, nevertheless, carefully to be observed, that the most eminent of the English unbelievers were far from renouncing, at least in their writings and profession, the truths of what they call natural religion, or denying the unchangeable excellence and obligations of virtue and morality. Dr. Mosheim is more especially in an error, when he places Collins, Tindal, Morgan, and Chubb, in the list of those who called in question the perfections of the Deity and the obligations of virtue: it was sufficient to put Mandeville, Woolston, and Toland, in this infamous class.

are comprehended who deny the divine origin of the Gospel in particular, and are enemies to all revealed religion, form a motley tribe, which, on account of their jarring opinions, may be divided into different classes. The most decent, or to use a more proper expression, the least extravagant and insipid form of Deism, is that which aims at an association between Christianity and natural religion, and represents the Gospel as no more than a republication of the original laws of nature and reason, that were more or less obliterated in the minds of men. This is the hypothesis of Tindal, Chubb, Mandeville, Morgan, and several others, if we are to give credit to their own declarations, which, indeed, ought not always to be done without caution. This also appears to have been the sentiment of an ingenious writer, whose eloquence has been ill employed in a book, entitled, Essential Religion distinguished from that which is only accessory;[a] for the whole religious system of this author consists in the three following points:—That there is a God, that the world is governed by his wise providence, and that the soul is immortal; and he maintains, that it was to establish these three points by his ministry, that Jesus Christ came into the world.

VII. The church of Rome has been governed, since the commencement of this century, by Clement XI. Innocent XIII. Benedict XIII. Clement XII. and Benedict XIV. who may be all considered as men of eminent wisdom, virtue, and learning, if we compare them with the pontiffs of the preceding ages. Clement XI. and Prosper Lambertini, who at present fills the papal chair under the title of Benedict XIV.,[b] stand much higher in the list of literary fame than the other pontiffs now mentioned; and Benedict XIII. surpassed them all in piety, or at least in its appearance, which, in the whole of his conduct, was extraordinary and striking. It was he that conceived the laudable design of reforming many disorders in the church, and restraining the corruption and licentiousness of the clergy; and for this purpose, in 1725, he held a council in the palace of the Lateran, whose acts and decrees have been made public. But the event did not answer his expectations; nor is it probable that Benedict XIV. who is attempting the execution of the same worthy purpose, though by different means, will meet with better success.

We must not omit observing here, that the modern bishops of Rome make but an indifferent figure in Europe, and exhibit little more than an empty shadow of the authority of the ancient pontiffs. Their prerogatives are diminished, and their power is restrained within very narrow bounds. The sovereign princes and states of Europe, who embrace their communion, no longer tremble at the thunder of the Vatican, but treat their anathemas with contempt. They, indeed, load the holy father with pompous titles, and treat him with all the external marks of veneration and respect; yet they have given a mortal blow to his authority, by the prudent and artful distinction they make between the court of Rome and the Roman pontiff; for, under the cover of this distinction, they buffet him with one hand, and stroke him with the other; and, under the most respectful profession of attachment to his person, oppose the measures, and diminish still more, from day to day, the authority of his court. A variety of modern transactions might be alleged in confirmation of this, and more especially the debates that have arisen in this century, between the court of Rome and those of France, Portugal, Naples, and Sardinia, in all of which that ghostly court has been obliged to yield, and to discover its insignificancy and weakness.

VIII. There have been no serious attempts made in recent times to bring about a reconciliation between the Protestant and Romish churches; for, notwithstanding the pacific projects formed by private persons with a view to this union, it is justly considered as an impracticable scheme. The difficulties that attend its execution were greatly augmented by the bull *Unigenitus*, which deprived the peace-makers of the principal expedient they employed for the accomplishment of this union, by putting it out of their power to soften and mitigate the doctrines of popery, that appeared the most shocking to the friends of the Reformation. This expedient had been frequently practised in former times, in order to remove the disgust that the Protestants had conceived against the church of Rome; but that edict put an end to all these modifications, and, in most of those points that had occasioned our separation from Rome, represented the doctrine of that church in the very same shocking light in which it had been viewed by the first reformers. This shews, with the utmost evidence, that all the attempts the Romish doctors have made, from time to time, to give an air of plausibility to their tenets, and render them palatable, were so many snares insidiously laid to draw the Protestants into their communion; that the specious conditions they proposed as the terms of a reconciliation, were perfidious stratagems; and that, consequently, there can be no firm dependence upon the promises and declarations of such a disingenuous set of men.

IX. The intestine discords, tumults, and divisions, that reigned in the Romish church, during the preceding century, were so far from being terminated in this, that new fuel was added to the flame. These divisions still subsist; and the animosities of the contending parties seem to grow more vehement from day to day. The Jesuits are at variance with the Dominicans, and some other religious orders, though these quarrels make little noise, and are carried on with some regard to decency and prudence; the Dominicans are on bad terms with the Franciscans; the controversy concerning the nature, lawfulness, and expediency of the Chinese ceremonies, still continues, at least in Europe; and were we to mention all the debates that divide the Romish church, which boasts so much of its unity and infallibility, the enumeration would be almost endless. The controversy relating to Jansenism, one of the principal sources of that division which reigned within the papal jurisdiction, has been carried on with great spirit and animosity in France and in the Netherlands. The Jansenists, or, as they rather choose to be called, the disciples of Augustin, are inferior to their adversaries the Jesuits, in number,

☞ [a] The original title of this book (which is supposed to have been written by one Muralt, a Swiss, author of the Lettres sur les Anglois et sur les Francois,) is as follows:' 'Lettres sur la Religion essentielle à l'Homme, distinguée de ce qui n'en est que l'accessoire." There have been several excellent refutations of this book published on the continent; among which the Lettres sur les vrais Principes de la Religion composed by the late learned and ingenious M. Bouiller, deserve particular notice.

☞ [b] This history was published before the death of Benedict XIV.

power, and influence; but they equal them in resolution, prudence, and learning, and surpass them in sanctity of manners and superstition, by which they excite the respect of the people. When their affairs take an unfavourable turn, and they are oppressed and persecuted by their victorious enemies, they find an asylum in the Low-Countries; for the greatest part of the catholics in the Spanish Netherlands, and all the Romanists who live under the jurisdiction of the United Provinces, embrace the principles and doctrines of Jansenius.[a] The latter have almost renounced their allegiance to the pope, though they profess a warm attachment to the doctrine and communion of the church of Rome; nor are either the exhortations or threats of the holy father, sufficient to subdue the obstinacy of these wayward children, or to reduce them to a state of subjection and obedience.

X. The cause of the Jansenists acquired a peculiar degree of credit and reputation, both in this and the preceding century, by a French translation of the New Testament, made by the learned and pious Pasquier Quesnel, a priest of the Oratory, and accompanied with practical annotations, adapted to excite lively impressions of religion in the minds of men. The quintessence of Jansenism was blended, in an elegant and artful manner, with these annotations, and was thus presented to the reader under the most pleasing aspect. The Jesuits were alarmed at the success of Quesnel's book, and particularly at the change it had wrought in many, in favour of the doctrines of Jansenius; and, to remove out of the way an instrument which proved so advantageous to their adversaries, they engaged that weak prince Louis XIV. to solicit the condemnation of this production at the court of Rome. Clement XI. granted the request of the French monarch, because he considered it as the request of the Jesuits; and, in 1713, issued the famous bull Unigenitus, in which Quesnel's New Testament was condemned, and a hundred and one propositions contained in it were pronounced heretical.[b] This bull, which is also known by the name of *The Constitution*, gave a favourable turn to the affairs of the Jesuits; but it was highly detrimental to the interests of the Romish church, as many of the wiser members of that communion candidly acknowledge; for it not only confirmed the Protestants in their separation, by convincing them that the church of Rome was resolved to adhere obstinately to its ancient superstitions and corruptions, but also offended many of the catholics who had no particular attachment to the doctrines of Jansenius, and were only bent on the pursuit of truth and the advancement of piety. It must also be observed, that the controversy relating to Jansenism was much heated and augmented, instead of being mitigated or suspended, by this despotic and ill-judged edict.

XI. The dissensions and tumults excited in France by this edict were violent in the highest degree. A considerable number of bishops, and a large body composed of persons eminently distinguished by their piety and erudition, both among the clergy and laity, appealed from the bull to a general council. It was more particularly opposed by the cardinal Louis Antoine de Noailles, archbishop of Paris, who, equally unmoved by the authority of the pontiff, and by the resentment and indignation of Louis XIV., made a noble stand against the despotic proceedings of the court of Rome. These defenders of the ancient doctrine and liberties of the Gallican church were persecuted by the popes, the French monarch, and the Jesuits, from whom they received a series of injuries and affronts. Even their total ruin was aimed at by these unrelenting adversaries; but this inhuman purpose could not be entirely effected. Some of the Jansenists, however, were obliged to fly for refuge to their brethren in Holland; others were forced, by the terrors of penal laws, and by various acts of tyranny and violence, to receive the papal edict; while a considerable number, deprived of their places, and ruined in their fortunes, looked for subsistence and tranquillity at a greater distance from their native country. The issue of this famous contest was favourable to the bull, which was at length rendered valid by the authority of the parliament, and was registered among the laws of the state. This contributed, in some measure, to restore the public tranquillity; but it was far from diminishing the number of those who complained of the despotism of the pontiff; and the kingdom of France is still full of appellants,[c] who reject the authority of the bull, and only wait for an opportunity of reviving a controversy which is rather suspended than erminated, and of re-kindling a flame, that is covered without being extinguished.

XII. Amidst the calamities in which the Jansenists have been involved, they have only two methods left of maintaining their cause against their powerful adversaries; and these are their *writings* and their *miracles*. The former alone have proved truly useful to them; the latter gave them only a transitory reputation, which being ill founded, contributed in the issue to sink their credit. The writings in which they have attacked both the pope and the Jesuits are innumerable; and many of them are composed with such eloquence, spirit, and solidity, that they have produced a remarkable effect. The Jansenists, however, looking upon all human means as insufficient to support their cause, turned their views toward supernatural succours, and endeavoured to make it appear, that their cause was the peculiar object of the divine protection and approbation. For this purpose they persuaded the multitude, that God had endowed the bones and ashes

☞ [a] This assertion is too general. It is true, that the greatest part of the catholics in the United Provinces are Jansenists, and that there is no legal toleration of the Jesuits in that republic. It is, nevertheless, a known fact, and a fact that cannot be indifferent to those who have the welfare and security of these provinces at heart, that the Jesuits are daily gaining ground among the Dutch papists. They have a flourishing chapel in the city of Utrecht, and have places of worship in several other cities, and in a great number of villages. It would be worthy of the wisdom of the rulers of the republic to put a stop to this growing evil, and not to suffer, in a protestant country, a religious order which has been suppressed in a popish one, and declared hostile to the state.*

☞ [b] To show what a political weathercock the *infallibility* of the holy father was upon this occasion, it may not be improper to introduce an anecdote which is related by Voltaire in his Seicle de Louis XIV. vol. ii. The credit of the narrator, indeed, weighs lightly in the balance of historical fame; but the anecdote is well attested, and is as follows: "The abbé Renaudot, a learned Frenchman, happening to be at Rome in the first year of the pontificate of Clement XI., went one day to see the pope, who was fond of men of letters, and was himself a learned man, and found his holiness reading Father Quesnel's book. On seeing Renaudot enter the apartment, the pope said, in a kind of rapture, 'Here is a most excellent book: we have no body at Rome that is capable of writing in this manner;—I wish I could engage the author to reside here!'" And yet this same book was condemned afterwards by this same pope.

☞ [c] This was the denomination assumed by those who appealed from the bull and the court of Rome to a general council.

* This note is left for the purpose of showing the state of affairs, at the time when Dr. Maclaine inserted it; but its purport is superseded by the effects of the French revolution. EDIT.

of certain persons, who had distinguished themselves by their zeal in the cause of Jansenius, and had, at the point of death, appealed a second time from the pope to a general council, with the power of healing the most inveterate diseases. The person whose remains were principally honoured with this efficacy, was the abbé Paris, a man of a respectable family, whose natural character was dark and melancholy; whose superstition was excessive beyond all credibility; and who, by an austere abstinence from bodily nourishment, and the exercise of other inhuman branches of penitential discipline, was the voluntary cause of his own death.[a] To the miracles which were said to be wrought at the tomb of this fanatic, the Jansenists added a great variety of visions and revelations to which they audaciously attributed a divine origin; for several members of the community, and more especially those who resided at Paris, pretended to be filled with the Holy Ghost; and, in consequence of this prerogative, delivered instructions, predictions, and exhortations, which, though frequently extravagant, and almost always insipid, yet moved the passions, and attracted the admiration, of the ignorant multitude. The prudence, however, of the court of France, put a stop to these fanatical tumults and false miracles; and, in the situation in which things are at present, the Jansenists have nothing left but their genius and their pens to maintain their cause.[b]

XIII. We can say very little of the Greek and Eastern churches. The profound ignorance in which they live, and the despotic yoke under which they groan, prevent their forming any plans to extend their limits, or making any attempts to change their state. The Russians, who, in the reign of Peter the Great, assumed a less savage and barbarous aspect than they had before that memorable period, have in this century given some grounds to hope that they may one day be reckoned among the civilized nations. There are, nevertheless, immense multitudes of that rugged people, who are still attached to the brutish superstition and discipline of their ancestors; and there are many in whom the barbarous spirit of persecution still so far prevails, that, were it in their power, they would cut off the Protestants, and all other sects that differ from them, by fire and sword. This appears evident from a variety of circumstances, and more especially from the book which Stephen Javorski has composed against heretics of all denominations.

The Greek Christians are said to be treated at present by their haughty masters with more clemency and indulgence than in former times. The Nestorians and Monophysites in Asia and Africa persevere in their refusal to enter into the communion of the Romish church, notwithstanding the earnest intreaties and alluring offers that have been made from time to time by the pope's legates, to conquer their inflexible constancy.—The pontiffs have frequently attempted to renew, by another sacred expedition, their former connexions with Abyssinia; but they have not yet been able to find out a method of escaping the vigilance of that court, which still persists in its abhorrence of popery. Nor is it at all probable that the embassy which is now preparing at Rome for the Abyssinian emperor, will be attended with success.[c] The Monophysites propagate their doctrine in Asia with zeal and assiduity, and, not long ago, gained over to their communion a part of the Nestorians who inhabit the coasts of India.

XIV. The Lutheran church, which dates its foundation from the year 1517, and the confession of Augsburg from 1530, celebrated in peace and prosperity the secular return of those memorable periods in the years 1717 and 1730. It received, some years ago, a considerable accession to the number of its members by the emigration of those protestants, who abandoned the territory of Saltzburg, and the town of Berchtolsgaden, in order to breathe a free air, and to enjoy unmolested the exercise of their religion. One body of these emigrants settled in Prussia, another in Holland; and many of them transplanted themselves and their families to America, and other distant regions. This circumstance contributed greatly to propagate the doctrine, and extend the reputation of the Lutheran church, which thus formed several congregations of no small note in Asia and America. The state of Lutheranism at home has not been so prosperous, since we learn both from public transactions, and also from the complaints of its professors and patrons, that, in several parts of Germany, this church has been injuriously oppressed, and unjustly deprived of some of its privileges and advantages, by the votaries of Rome.

XV. It has been scarcely possible to introduce any change into the doctrine and discipline of that church, because the ancient confessions and rules that were drawn up to point out the tenets that were to be believed, and the rites and ceremonies that were to be performed, still remain in their full authority, and are considered as the sacred guardians of the Lutheran faith and worship. The method, however, of illustrating, enforcing, and defending the doctrines of Christianity, has undergone several changes. About the commencement of this century, an artless simplicity was generally observed by the Lutheran ministers, and all philosophical terms and abstract reasonings were relinquished, as more adapted to obscure than to illustrate the truths of the Gospel. But, in process of time, a very different way of thinking began to take place; and several learned men entertained a notion that the doctrines of Christianity could not maintain their ground, if they were not supported by the aids of philosophy, and exhibited and proved in geometrical order.

The adepts in jurisprudence, who undertook, in the last century, the revision and correction of the ecclesiastical code that is in force among the Lutherans, carried on their undertaking with great assiduity and spirit; and our church-government would at this day bear another aspect, if the ruling powers had judged it expedient to listen to their counsels and representations. We see, indeed, evident proofs that the directions of these great

[a] The imposture, that reigned in these pretended miracles, has been detected and exposed by various authors, but by none with more acuteness, perspicuity, and penetration, than by the ingenious Dr. Douglas, in his excellent treatise on miracles, entitled the Criterion, published in 1754.

☞ [b] Things are greatly changed since the learned author wrote this paragraph. The storm of just resentment that has arisen against the Jesuits, and has been attended with the extinction of their order in Portugal, France, and in all the Spanish dominions, has disarmed the most formidable adversaries of Jansenism, and must consequently be considered as an event highly favourable to the Jansenists.*

[c] See the *Continuation*.

* In consequence of the French revolution, more important changes have taken place since the translator wrote the last note.—EDIT.

men, relating to the external form of ecclesiastical government, discipline, and worship, are highly respected; and that their ideas, even of doctrine, have been more or less adopted by many. Hence it is not surprising, that warm disputes have arisen between them and the rulers of the church concerning several points. The Lutheran doctors are apprehensive that, if the sentiments of some of these reformers should take place, religion would become entirely subservient to the purposes of civil policy, and be converted into a mere state-machine; and this apprehension is not peculiar to the clergy, but is also entertained by some persons of piety and candour, even among the civilians.

XVI. The liberty of thinking, speaking, and writing, concerning religious matters, which began to prevail in the last century, was, in this, confirmed and augmented; and it extended so far as to encourage both infidels and fanatics to pour forth among the multitude, without restraint, all the crudities of their enthusiasm and extravagance. Accordingly we have seen, and still see, numbers of fanatics and innovators start up, and, under the influence of enthusiasm or of a disordered brain, divulge their crude fancies and dreams among the people, by which they either delude many from the communion of the established church, or at least occasion contests and divisions of the most disagreeable kind. We mentioned formerly several of these disturbers of the tranquillity of the church, to whom we may now add the notorious names of Tennhart, Gichtel, Uberfeld, Rosenbach, Bredel, Seiz, Roemeling, and many others, who either imagined that they were divinely inspired, or, from a persuasion of their superior capacity and knowledge, set up for reformers of the doctrine and discipline of the church. Many writers drew their pens against this presumptuous and fanatical tribe, though the greatest part of those who composed it were really below the notice of men of character, and were rather worthy of contempt than of opposition. And, indeed, it was not so much the force of reason and argument, as the experience of their ill success, that convinced these fanatics of their folly, and induced them to desist from their chimerical projects. Their attempts could not stand the trial of time and common sense; and therefore, after having made a transitory noise, they fell into oblivion. Such is the common and deserved fate of almost all the fanatic ringleaders of the deluded populace; they suddenly start up, and make a figure for a while; but, in general, they ruin their own cause by their imprudence or obstinacy, by their austerity or perverseness, by their licentious conduct or their intestine divisions.

XVII. Many place in this fanatical class the Brethren of Herrenhut, who were first formed into a religious community in the village so named, in Lusatia, by the famous count Zinzendorff, and afterwards grew so numerous that their emigrants were spread abroad in almost all the countries of Europe, formed settlements in the Indies, and even penetrated to the remotest parts of the globe. They call themselves the descendants of the Bohemian and Moravian Brethren, who, in the fifteenth century, threw off the despotic yoke of Rome, animated by the zealous exhortations and heroic example of John Huss. They may, however, be said, with more propriety, to imitate the example of that famous community, than to descend from those who composed it; for it is well known, that there are very few Bohemians and Moravians in the fraternity of the Herrenhutters; and it is extremely doubtful, whether even this small number are to be considered as the posterity of the ancient Bohemian Brethren, that distinguished themselves so early by their zeal for the Reformation.

If we are to give credit to the declarations of the Herrenhutters, they agree with the Lutherans in their doctrine and opinions, and only differ from them in their ecclesiastical discipline, and in those religious institutions and rules of life which form the resemblance between the Bohemian Brethren and the disciples of Zinzendorff. There are, indeed, many who doubt much of the truth of this declaration, and suspect that the society now under consideration, and more especially their rulers and ringleaders, speak the language of Lutheranism when they are among the Lutherans, in order to obtain their favour and indulgence; and those who have examined this matter with the greatest attention, represent this fraternity as composed of persons of different religions, as well as of various ranks and orders. Be that as it may, it is at least very difficult to guess the reason that induces them to live in such an entire state of separation from the Lutheran communion, and to be so ambitiously zealous in augmenting their sect, if there be no other difference between them and the Lutherans than that of discipline and of ceremony; for the true and genuine followers of Jesus Christ are little concerned about the outward forms of ecclesiastical government and discipline, knowing that real religion consists in faith and charity, and not in external rites and institutions.[a]

XVIII. It was the opinion of many, that the succours

☞ [a] It is somewhat surprising to hear Dr. Mosheim speak in such vague and general terms of this sect, without taking the least notice of their pernicious doctrines and their flagitious practices, that not only disfigure the sacred truths of the Gospel, but also sap all the foundations of morality. To be persuaded of this, the reader, beside the accounts which Rimius has given of this enormous sect, will do well to consult a curious Preface, prefixed to the French translation of a Pastoral Letter against Fanaticism, addressed by Mr. Stinstra, an Anabaptist minister in Friseland, to his congregation, and published at Leyden in 1752. It may not be amiss to add here a passage relating to this odious community, from the bishop of Glocester's treatise, entitled, the Doctrine of Grace. The words of that great and eminent prelate are as follow: "As purity respects practice, the Moravians give us little trouble. If we may credit the yet unconfuted relations, both in print and in MS., composed by their own members, the participants in their most sacred mysterious rites, their practices in the consummation of marriage are so horribly, so unspeakably flagitious, that this people seem to have no more pretence to be put into the number of Christian sects, than the Turlupins of the thirteenth century, a vagabond crew of miscreants, who rambled over Italy, France, and Germany, calling themselves the Brothers and Sisters of the Free Spirit, who, in speculation, professed that species of atheism called Pantheism, and, in practice, pretended to be exempted from all the obligations of morality and religion." See The Doctrine of Grace, vol. ii. As to the doctrines of this sect, they open a door to the most licentious effects of fanaticism. Such among many others are the following, drawn from the express declarations of count Zinzendorff, the head and founder of the community: that the law is not a rule of life to a believer;—that the moral law belongs only to the Jews;—that a converted person cannot sin against light. But of all the singularities for which this sect is famous, the notions they entertain of the organs of generation in both sexes are the most enormously wild and extravagant. I consider (says Zinzendorff, in one of his sermons) the parts for distinguishing both sexes in Christians, as the most honourable of the whole body, my Lord and God having partly inhabited them, and partly worn them himself. This raving secretary looks upon the conjugal act as a piece of scenery, in which the male represents Christ the husband of souls, and the female the church. 'The married brother (says he) knows matrimony, respects it, but does not think upon it of his own accord; and thus the precious member of the covenant (i. e. the penis) is so much forgotten, becomes so useless, and consequently is reduced to such a natural numbness, by not being used, that afterwards, when he is to marry, and use it, the

of philosophy were absolutely necessary to stem the torrent of superstition, and stop its growing progress, and that these alone were adapted to accomplish this desirable purpose. Hence the study of philosophy, which, toward the conclusion of the last century, seemed to decline, was now revived, established upon a more rational footing, and pursued with uncommon assiduity and ardour. The branch of philosophy which is commonly known under the denomination of *Metaphysics*, was generally preferred, as it leads to the first principles of things; and the improvements made in this important science were very considerable. These improvements were chiefly produced by the genius and penetration of Leibnitz, who threw a new light upon metaphysics, and gave this interesting branch of philosophy a more regular form. This science received a still greater degree of perfection from the philosophical labours of the acute and indefatigable Wolff, who reduced it into a scientific order, and gave to its decisions the strength and evidence of a geometrical demonstration. Under this new and respectable form it captivated the attention and esteem of the greatest part of the German philosophers, and of those in general who pursue truth through the paths of strict evidence; and it was applied with great ardour and zeal to illustrate and confirm the great truths both of natural and revealed religion. This application of the First Philosophy gave much uneasiness to some pious men, who were extremely solicitous to preserve, pure and unmixed, the doctrines of Christianity; and it was accordingly opposed by them with great eagerness and obstinacy. Thus the ancient contest between philosophy and theology, faith and reason, was unhappily revived, and has been carried on with much animosity for several years past. For many are of opinion, that this metaphysical philosophy inspires youthful minds with notions that are far from being favourable either to the doctrines or to the positive institutions of religion; that, seconded by the warmth of fancy, at that age of levity and presumption, it engenders an arrogant contempt of Divine Revelation, and an excessive attachment to human reason, as the only infallible guide of man; and that, instead of throwing new light on the science of theology, and giving it an additional air of dignity, it has contributed, on the contrary, to cover it with obscurity, and to sink it into oblivion and contempt.

XIX. In order to justify this heavy charge against the metaphysical philosophy, they appeal to the writings of Laurent Schmidt, whom they commonly call the Wertheim interpreter, from the place of his residence. This man, who was by no means destitute of abilities, and had acquired a profound knowledge of the philosophy now under consideration, undertook, some years ago, a new German translation of the Holy Scriptures, to which he prefixed a new system of theology, drawn up in a geometrical order, that was to serve him as a guide in the exposition of the sacred oracles. This undertaking proved highly detrimental to its author, as it drew upon him from many quarters severe marks of opposition and resentment; for he had scarcely published the Five Books of Moses, as a specimen of his method and abilities, when he was not only attacked by several writers, but also brought before the supreme tribunal of the empire, and there accused as an enemy of the Christian religion, and a caviller at divine truth. This severe charge was founded upon this circumstance only, that he had boldly departed from the common explication of certain passages in the books of Moses, which are generally supposed to prefigure the Messiah.[a] On this account he was sent to prison, and his errors were looked upon as capitally criminal; but he escaped the vigilance of his keepers, and saved himself by flight.

XX. The bare indication of the controversies that have divided the Lutheran church since the commencement of this century would make up a long list. The religious contests that were set on foot by the Pietists were carried on in some places with animosity, in others with moderation, according to the characters of the champions, and the temper and spirit of the people. These contests, however, have gradually subsided, and seem at present to be all reduced to the following question, whether a wicked man be capable of acquiring a true and certain knowledge of divine things, or be susceptible of any degree or species of divine illumination. The controversy that has been excited by this question is considered by many as a mere dispute about words; its decision, at least, is rather a matter of curiosity than importance. Many other points, that had been more or less debated in the last century, occasioned keen contests in this, such as the eternity of hell torments; the reign of Christ upon earth during a thousand years; and the final restoration of all intelligent beings to order, perfection, and happiness. The mild and indulgent sentiments of John Fabricius, professor of divinity at Helmstadt, concerning the importance of the controversy between the Lutherans and Catholics, excited also a warm debate; for this doctor and his disciples went so far as to maintain, that the difference, between those churches, was of so little consequence, that a Lutheran might safely embrace popery. The warm controversies that have been carried on between certain divines, and some eminent civilians, concerning the rites and obligations of wedlock, the lawful grounds of divorce, and the nature and guilt of concubinage, are sufficiently known. Other disputes of inferior moment, which have been of a sudden growth, and of a short duration, we shall pass over in silence, as the knowledge of them is not necessary to our forming an accurate idea of the internal state of the Lutheran church.

XXI. The reformed church still carries the same external aspect under which it has been already described;[b] for, though there be everywhere extant certain books, creeds, and confessions, by which the wisdom and vigilance of ancient times thought proper to perpetuate the truths of religion, and to preserve them from the contagion of heresy, yet, in most places, no person is obliged to adhere strictly to the doctrines they contain; and those who profess the main and fundamental truths of the Chris-

Saviour must restore him from this deadness of body. And when an Esther by grace, and sister according to her make, gets sight of this member, her senses are shut up, and she piously perceives that God the Son was a boy. *Ye holy matrons, who as wives are about your Vice-Christs, honour that precious sign with the utmost veneration.*' We beg the chaste reader's pardon for presenting him with this odious specimen of the horrors of the Moravian theology.

☞ [a] Dr. Mosheim gives here but one half of the accusation brought against Schmidt, in 1737, when he was charged with attempting to prove, that there was not the smallest trace or vestige of the doctrine of the Trinity, nor any prediction pointing out the Messiah, to be found in the Five Books of Moses. It was by the authority of an edict addressed by Charles VI. to the princes of the empire, that Schmidt was imprisoned.

☞ [b] This description the reader will find above, at the beginning of the preceding century.

than religion, and take care to avoid too *great an intimacy*[a] with the tenets of Socinianism and popery, are deemed worthy members of the reformed church.[b] Hence, in our times, this great and extensive community comprehends, in its bosom, Arminians, Calvinists, Supralapsarians, Sublapsarians, and Universalists, who live together in charity and friendship,[c] and unite their efforts in healing the breach, and diminishing the weight and importance of those controversies that separate them from each other.[d] This moderation is, indeed, severely censured by many of the reformed divines in Switzerland, Germany, and more especially in Holland, who lament, in the most sorrowful strains, the decline of the ancient purity and strictness that characterized the doctrine and discipline of the church, and sometimes attack, with the strongest marks of indignation and resentment, these modern contemners of primitive orthodoxy. But, as the moderate party have an evident superiority in point of number, power, and influence, these attacks of their adversaries are, in general, treated with the utmost indifference.

XXII. Whoever considers all these things with due attention, will be obliged to acknowledge that neither the Lutherans nor Arminians have, at this day, any farther subject of controversy or debate with the reformed church, considered in a general point of view, but only with individual members of this great community;[e] for the church, considered in its collective and general character, allows now to all its members the full liberty of entertaining the sentiments which they think most reasonable, in relation to those points of doctrine that formerly excluded the Lutherans and Arminians from its communion, and looks upon the essence of Christianity and its fundamental truths as in no wise affected by these points, however variously they may be explained by the contending parties. But this moderation, instead of facilitating the execution of the plans that have been proposed by some for the re-union of the Lutheran and Reformed churches, contributes rather to prevent this re-union, or at least to render it much more difficult; for those among the Lutherans who are zealous for the maintenance of the

☞ [a] *Nimiam consuetudinem.* The expression is remarkable and malignant; it would make the ignorant and unwary apt to believe, that the reformed church allows its members certain approaches toward popery and Socinianism, provided they do not carry these approaches too far, even to an intimate union with them. This representation of the reformed church is too glaringly false to proceed from ignorance; and Dr. Mosheim's extensive knowledge places him beyond the suspicion of an involuntary mistake in this matter. It is true, this reflection bears hard upon his candour; and we are extremely sorry that we cannot, in this place, do justice to the knowledge of that great man, without arraigning his equity.

☞ [b] Nothing can be more unfair, or at least more inaccurate, than this representation of things. It proceeds from a supposition that is quite chimerical, even that the reformed churches in England, Scotland, Holland, Germany, Switzerland, &c. form one general body, and, beside their respective and particular systems of government and discipline, have some general laws of religious toleration, in consequence of which they admit a variety of sects into their communion. But this general hierarchy does not exist. The friends of the Reformation, whom the multiplied horrors and absurdities of popery obliged to abandon the communion of Rome, were formed, in process of time, into distinct ecclesiastical bodies, or national churches, every one of which has its peculiar form of government and discipline. The toleration that is enjoyed by the various sects and denominations of Christians, arises in part from the clemency of the ruling powers, and from the charity and forbearance which individuals think themselves bound to exercise one toward another. See the following note.

☞ [c] If the different denominations of Christians here mentioned live together in the mutual exercise of charity and benevolence, notwithstanding the diversity of their theological opinions, this circumstance, which Dr. Mosheim seems to mention as a reproach, is, on the contrary, a proof, that the true and genuine spirit of the Gospel (which is a spirit of forbearance, meekness, and charity,) prevails among the members of the reformed churches. But it must be carefully observed, that this charity, though it discovers the amiable *bond of peace*, does not, by any means, imply uniformity of sentiment or indifference about truth, or lead us to suppose that the reformed churches have relaxed or departed from their system of doctrine. Indeed, as there is no general reformed church, so there is no general reformed Creed or Confession of Faith. The church of England has its peculiar system of doctrine and government, which remains still unchanged, and in full force; and to which an assent is demanded from all its members, and in a more especial, solemn, and express manner from those who are its ministers. Such is the case with the national reformed churches in the United Provinces. The dissenters in these countries, who are tolerated by the state, have also their respective bonds of ecclesiastical union; and such of them, particularly in England and Ireland, as differ from the establishment only in their form of government and worship, and not in matters of doctrine, are treated with indulgence by the moderate members of the national church, who look upon them as their brethren.

☞ [d] In the 4to edition of this work, I mistook, in a moment of inadvertency, the construction of this sentence in the original Latin, and rendered the passage as if Dr. Mosheim had represented the reformed churches as diminishing the weight and importance of those controversies that 'separate them from the church of Rome;' whereas he represents them (and, indeed, what he says is rather an encomium than a reproach) as diminishing the weight of those controversies which 'separate them from each other.' One of the circumstances that made me fall more easily into this mistake was my having read, the moment before I committed it, Dr. Mosheim's insinuation with respect to the spirit of the church of England in the very next page, where he says, very inconsiderately, that we may judge of that spirit by the conduct of Dr. Wake, who formed a project of peace and union between the English and Gallican churches, founded upon this condition, that each community should retain the greatest part of its peculiar doctrines. This is supposing, though upon the foundation of a mistaken fact, that the church of England, at least, is making evident approaches to the church of Rome.—When I had made the mistake, which turned really an encomium into an accusation, I thought it incumbent on me to defend the reformed church against the charge of an approximation to popery. For this purpose, I observed (in note [s] of the 4to edition,) "that the reformed churches were never at such a distance from the spirit and doctrine of the church of Rome as they are at this day; and that the improvements in science, that characterize the last and the present age, seem to render a relapse into Romish superstition morally impossible in those who have been once delivered from its baneful influence." The ingenious author of the Confessional did not find this reasoning conclusive; but the objections he has started against it, do not appear to me insurmountable. I have, therefore, thrown upon paper some farther thoughts upon the present state of the reformed religion, and the influence of improvements in philosophy upon its advancement; and these thoughts the reader will find in the third part of the Appendix.

☞ [e] Even if we grant this to be true with respect to the Arminians, it cannot be affirmed, with equal truth, in regard to the Lutherans, whose doctrine concerning the corporal presence of Christ in the eucharist, and the communication of the properties of his divine to his human nature, is rejected by all the reformed churches, without exception. But it is not universally true, even with respect to the Arminians; for, though the latter are particularly favoured by the church of England; though Arminianism may be said to have become predominant among the members of that church, or at least to have lent its influence in mitigating some of its articles in the private sentiments of those who subscribe them; yet the thirty-nine Articles of the same church still maintain their authority; and, when we judge of the doctrine and discipline of any church, it is more natural to form this judgment from its established creeds and confessions of faith, than from the sentiments and principles of particular persons; so that, with respect to the church of England, the direct contrary of what Dr. Mosheim asserts is strictly true; for it is rather with that church, and its rule of faith, that the Lutherans are at variance, than with private persons, who, prompted by a spirit of Christian moderation, mitigate some of its doctrines, in order charitably to extend the limits of its communion. But, if we turn our view to the reformed churches in Holland, Germany, and a part of Switzerland, the mistake of our author will still appear more palpable; for some of these churches consider certain doctrines both of the Arminians and Lutherans, as a just cause of excluding them from their communion. The question here is not, whether this rigour is laudable; it is the matter of fact that we are examining at present. The church of England, indeed, if we consider its present temper and spirit, does not look upon any of the errors of the Lutherans as *fundamental*, and is therefore ready to receive them into its communion; and the same thing may, perhaps, be affirmed of several of the reformed churches upon the continent. But this is very far from being a proof, that the "Lutherans have at this day (as Dr. Mosheim asserts) no farther subject of controversy or debate with these churches;" it only proves, that these churches nourish a spirit of toleration and charity worthy of imitation.

truth, complain, that the reformed church has rendered too wide the way of salvation, and opened the arms of fraternal love and communion, not only to us (Lutherans,) but also to Christians of all sects and denominations. Accordingly, we find, that when, about twenty years ago, several eminent doctors of our communion, with the learned and celebrated Matthew Pfaff at their head, employed their good offices with zeal and sincerity in order to our union with the reformed church, this specific project was so warmly opposed by the majority of the Lutherans, that it was soon rendered abortive.[a]

XXIII. The church of England, which is now the chief branch of the great community denominated the Reformed Church, continues in the same state, and is governed by the same principles, that it assumed at the Revolution. The established form of church government is episcopacy, which is embraced by the sovereign, the nobility, and the greatest part of the people. The Presbyterians, and the numerous sects that are comprehended under the general title of Non-conformists, enjoy the sweets of religious liberty, under the influence of a legal toleration. Those, indeed, who are best acquainted with the present state of the English nation, confidently affirm that the dissenting interest is declining, and that the cause of non-conformity owes this gradual decay, in a great measure, to the lenity and moderation that are practised by the rulers of the established church. The members of this church may be divided into two classes, according to their different ideas of the origin, extent, and dignity of episcopal jurisdiction. Some look upon the government of bishops as founded on the authority of a divine institution, and are immoderately zealous in extending the power and prerogatives of the church; others, of a more mild and sedate spirit, while they consider that form of government as far superior to every other system of ecclesiastical polity, and warmly recommend all the precautions that are necessary to its preservation and the independence of the clergy, yet do not carry this attachment to such an excessive degree, as to refuse the name of a *church* to every religious community that is not governed by a bishop, or to defend, with intemperate zeal, the prerogatives and pretensions of the episcopal order.[b]—These two classes are sometimes involved in warm debates, and oppose each other with no small degree of animosity, of which this century has exhibited the following remarkable example. Dr. Benjamin Hoadly, bishop of Winchester, a prelate eminently distinguished by the accuracy of his judgment, and the purity of his flowing and manly eloquence, used his utmost endeavours, and not without success, to lower the authority of the church, or at least to reduce the power of its rulers within narrow bounds. On the other hand, the church and its rulers found several able defenders; and, among the rest, Dr. John Potter, archbishop of Canterbury, maintained the rights and pretensions of the clergy with great eloquence and erudition. As to the spirit of the established church of England, in relation to those who dissent from its rules of doctrine and government, we see it no where better than in the conduct of Dr. Wake, archbishop of Canterbury, who formed a project of peace and union between the English and Gallican churches, founded upon this condition, that each community should retain the greatest part of its peculiar doctrines.[c]

XXIV. The unbounded liberty which every individual in England enjoys of publishing, without restraint, his religious opinions, and of worshipping God in the manner which he deems the most conformable to reason and Scripture, naturally produces a variety of sects, and gives rise to an uninterrupted succession of controversies about theological matters. It is scarcely possible for any historian who has not resided for some time in England, and examined with attention, upon the spot, the laws, the privileges, the factions, and opinions of that free and happy people, to give a just and accurate account of these religious sects and controversies. Even the names of the greatest part of these sects have not yet reached us; and many of those which have come to our knowledge, we know but imperfectly. We are greatly in the dark with respect to the grounds and principles of these controversies, because we are destitute of the sources from which proper information might be drawn. At present the ministerial labours of George Whitefield, who has formed a community, which he proposes to render superior in sanctity and perfection to all other Christian churches, make a considerable noise in England, and are not altogether destitute of success. If there is any consistency in this man's theological system, and if we are not to look upon him as a mere enthusiast, led by the blind impulse of an irregular fancy, his doctrine seems to amount to these two propositions:—"That true religion consists alone in holy affections, or in a certain inward *feeling*, which it is impossible to explain; and that Christians ought not to seek truth by the dictates of reason, or by the aids of learning, but by laying their minds open to the direction and influence of divine illumination."

XXV. The Dutch church is still divided by the con-

☞ [a] The project of the very pious and learned Dr. Pfaff for uniting the Lutheran and Reformed churches, and the reasons on which he justified this project, are worthy of the truly Christian spirit, and do honour to the accurate and sound judgment of that most eminent and excellent divine;* and it is somewhat surprising, considering the proofs of moderation and judgment that Dr. Mosheim has given in other parts of this valuable history, that he neither mentions the project of Dr. Pfaff with applause, nor the stiffness of the Lutherans on this occasion with any mark of disapprobation.

☞ [b] The learned and pious archbishop Wake, in a letter to Father Courayer, dated from Croydon-House, July 9, 1724, expresses himself thus: "I bless God that I was born and have been bred in an episcopal church, which, I am convinced, has been the government established in the Christian church from the very time of the apostles. But I should be unwilling to affirm, that, where the ministry is not episcopal, there is no church, nor any true administration of the sacraments; and very many there are among us who are zealous for episcopacy, yet dare not go so far as to annul the ordinances of God performed by any other ministry."

☞ [c] Archbishop Wake certainly corresponded with some learned and moderate Frenchmen on this subject, particularly with M. Du-Pin, the ecclesiastical historian: and no doubt the archbishop, when he assisted Courayer in his Defence of the Validity of the English Ordinations, by furnishing him with unanswerable proofs drawn from the registers at Lambeth-Palace, had it in his view to remove certain groundless prejudices, which, while they subsisted among catholics, could not but defeat all projects of peace and union between the English and Gallican churches. The interests of the protestant religion could not be in safer hands than those of archbishop Wake. He who had so ably and so successfully defended protestantism, as a controversial writer, could not surely form any project of peace and union with a Roman catholic church, the terms of which would have reflected on his character as a negociator. ☞ This note has been misunderstood and censured by the acute author of the Confessional. This censure gave occasion to the fourth Appendix, which the reader will find in this volume, and in which the matter contained in this note is fully illustrated, and the conduct of archbishop Wake set in its true light.

☞ * See this learned author's Collectio Scriptorum Irenicorum ad Unionem inter Protestantes facientium, published at Hall, in 1723.

troversies that arose from the philosophy of Des-Cartes and the theology of Cocceius; but these controversies are carried on with less bitterness and animosity at present than in former times. It is even to be hoped that these contests will soon be totally extinguished, since it is well known, that the Newtonian philosophy has expelled Cartesianism from almost all the seminaries of learning in the United Provinces. We have already mentioned the debates that were occasioned by the opinions of Roell. In 1703, Frederic Van Leenhof was suspected of a propensity toward the system of Spinosa, and drew upon himself a multitude of adversaries, by a remarkable book, entitled Heaven upon Earth, in which he maintained literally, that it was the duty of Christians to rejoice always, and to suffer no feelings of affliction and sorrow to interrupt their gaiety. The same accusations were brought against an illiterate man, named William Deurhoff, who, in some treatises composed in the Dutch language, represented the Divine Nature under the idea of a certain force, or energy, that is diffused throughout the whole universe, and acts in every part of the great fabric. The more recent controversies that have made a noise in Holland, were those that sprang from the opinions of James Saurin and Paul Maty, on two very different subjects. The former, who was minister to the French at the Hague, and acquired a shining reputation by his genius and eloquence, fell into an error, which, if it may be called such, was at least an error of a very pardonable kind; for, if we except some inaccurate and incautious expressions, his only deviation from the received opinions consisted in his maintaining, that it was sometimes lawful to swerve from truth, and to deceive men by our speech, in order to the attainment of some great and important good.[a] This sentiment did not please, as the most considerable part of the reformed churches adopt the doctrine of Augustin, "That a lie or a violation of the truth can never be allowable in itself, or advantageous in the issue." The conduct of Maty was much more worthy of condemnation; for, in order to explain the mystery of the Trinity, he invented the following unsatisfactory hypothesis: "That the Son and the Holy Ghost were two finite Beings, who had been created by God, and at a certain time were united to the divine nature.[b]

XXVI. The particular confession of faith, that we have already had occasion to mention under the denomination of the Formulary of Agreement or Concord, has, since the commencement of this century, produced warm and vehement contests in Switzerland, and more especially in the canton of Bern. In 1718, the magistrates of Bern published an order, by which all professors, and particularly those of the university and church of Lausanne, who were suspected of entertaining erroneous opinions, were obliged to declare their assent to this Formularly, and to adopt it as the rule of their faith. This injunction was so much the more grievous, as no demand of that kind had been made for some time before this period; and the custom of requiring subscription to this confession had been suspended in the case of several who were promoted in the university, or had entered into the church. Accordingly many pastors and candidates for holy orders refused the assent that was demanded by the magistrates, and some of them were punished for this refusal. Hence arose warm contests and heavy complaints, which engaged the king of Great Britain, and the states-general of the United Provinces, to offer their intercession, in order to terminate these unhappy divisions; and hence the Formulary lost much of its credit and authority.

Nothing memorable happened during this period in the German churches. The Reformed church that was established in the Palatinate, and had formerly been in such a flourishing state, suffered greatly from the persecuting spirit and the malignant counsels of the votaries of Rome.

XXVII. The Socinians, dispersed through the different countries of Europe, have not hitherto been able to form a separate congregation, or to celebrate publicly divine worship, in a manner conformable to the institutions of their sect, although, in several places, they hold clandestine meetings of a religious kind. The person that made the principal figure among them in this century, was the learned Samuel Crellius, who died in an advanced age at Amsterdam: he indeed preferred the denomination of Artemonite to that of Socinian, and departed in many points from the received doctrines of that sect.

The Arians found a learned and resolute patron in William Whiston, professor of mathematics in the university of Cambridge, who defended their doctrine in various productions, and chose rather to resign his chair, than to renounce his opinions. He was followed in these opinions, as is commonly supposed, by Dr. Samuel Clarke, a man of great abilities, judgment, and learning, who, in 1724, was accused of altering and modifying the ancient and orthodox doctrine of the Trinity.[c] But it must argue a

☞ [a] See Saurin's Discours Historiques, Theologiques, Critiques, et Moraux, sur les Evenements les plus memorables du Vieux et du Nouveau Testament, tom. i. of the folio edition.

☞ [b] Dr. Mosheim, in another of his learned productions, has explained, in a more accurate and circumstantial manner, the hypothesis of Maty, which amounts to the following propositions: "That the Father is the pure Deity; and that the Son and the Holy Ghost are two other persons, in each of whom there are two natures; one divine, which is the same in all the three persons, and with respect to which they are one and the same God, having the same numerical divine essence; and the other a finite and dependent nature, which is united to the divine nature in the same manner in which the orthodox say, that Jesus Christ is God and man." See Dissertationes ad Historiam Ecclesiasticam pertinentes, (published at Altena in 1743,) vol. ii. p. 498, but principally the original work of Mr. Maty, which was published (at the Hague) in 1729, under the following title: Lettre d'un Theologien à un autre Theologien sur le Mystere de la Trinité.—The publication of this hypothesis was unnecessary, as it was destitute even of the merit of novelty, being very little more than a repetition of what Dr. Thomas Burnet, prebendary of Sarum, had said, about ten years before, upon this mysterious subject, which nothing but presumption can make any man attempt to render intelligible. See a treatise published without his name by Dr. Burnet, in 1720, with this title: The Scripture Trinity intelligibly explained; or, An Essay towards the Demonstration of a Trinity in Unity from Reason and Scripture, in a Chain of Consequences from certain Principles, &c. by a Divine of the Church of England. See also the same author's Scripture Doctrine of the Redemption of the World by Christ, intelligibly explained, &c.

☞ [c] It is too evident that few controversies have so little augmented the sum of knowledge, and so much hurt the spirit of charity, as the controversies that have been carried on in the Christian church in relation to the doctrine of the Trinity. Mr. Whiston was one of the first divines who revived this controversy in the xviiith century. About the year 1706, he began to entertain some doubts about the proper eternity and omniscience of Christ. This led him to review the popular doctrine of the Trinity; and, in order to execute this review with a degree of diligence and circumspection suitable to its importance, he read the New Testament twice over, and also all the genuine monuments of the Christian religion prior to the conclusion of the second century. By this inquiry, he was led to think, that, at the incarnation of Christ, the *Logos*, or Eternal Wisdom, supplied the place of the *rational soul*, or πνευμα: that the eternity of the Son of God was not a real *distinct* existence, as of a son properly *co-eternal* with his father by a true eternal generation, but rather a metaphysical existence *in potentiâ*, or in some sublimer man-

great want of equity and candour, to rank this eminent man in the class of Arians, taking that term in its proper and natural signification; for he only maintained what is commonly called the Arminian Subordination, which has been, and is still, adopted by some of the greatest men in England, and even by some of the most learned bishops in that country. This doctrine he illustrated with greater care and perspicuity than any before him had done, and taught that the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, are equal in nature, and different in rank, authority, and subordination.[a] A great number of English writers have endeavoured, in a variety of modes, to invalidate and under-

ner, in the Father, as his wisdom or word; that Christ's real *creation* or *generation* (for both these terms are used by the earliest writers) took place some time before the creation of the world; that the council of Nice itself established no other eternity of Christ; and, finally, that the Arian doctrine, in these points, was the original doctrine of Christ himself, of his holy apostles, and of the primitive Christians. Mr. Whiston was confirmed in these sentiments by reading Novatian's treatise concerning the Trinity, but more especially by the perusal of the Apostolical Constitutions, the antiquity and authenticity of which he endeavoured, with more zeal than precision and prudence, to prove, in the third part of his Primitive Christianity Revived.

This learned visionary, and upright man, was a considerable sufferer by his opinions. He was not only removed from his theological and pastoral functions, but also from his mathematical professorship, as if Arianism had extended its baneful influence even to the science of lines, angles, and surfaces. This measure was undoubtedly singular, and it appeared rigid and severe to all those, of both parties, who were dispassionate enough to see things in their true point of light; and, indeed though we should grant that the good man's mathematics might, by erroneous conclusions, have corrupted his orthodoxy, it will still remain extremely difficult to comprehend, how his heterodoxy could hurt his mathematics. It was not therefore consistent, either with clemency or good sense, to turn Mr. Whiston out of his mathematical chair, because he did not believe the explication of the Trinity that is given in the Athanasian creed; and I mention this as an instance of the unfair proceedings of immoderate zeal, which often confounds the plainest distinctions, and deals its punishments without measure or proportion.

Dr. Clarke also stepped aside from the notions commonly received concerning the Trinity; but his modification of this doctrine was not so remote from the popular and orthodox hypothesis, as the sentiment of Whiston. His method of inquiring into that incomprehensible subject was modest, and, at least, promised fairly as a guide to truth. For he did not begin by abstract and metaphysical reasonings in his illustrations of this doctrine, but turned his first researches to the word and to the testimony, being persuaded that, as the doctrine of the Trinity was a matter of mere revelation, all human explications of it must be tried by the declarations of the New Testament, interpreted by the rules of grammar, and the principles of sound criticism. It was this persuasion that produced his famous book entitled, The Scripture Doctrine of the Trinity, wherein every Text in the New Testament relating to that Doctrine is distinctly considered, and the Divinity of our blessed Saviour, according to the Scriptures, proved, and explained. The doctrine, which this learned divine drew from his researches, was comprehended in 55 propositions, which, with the proper illustrations, form the second part of the work. As the reader will find them in that work at full length, we shall only observe here, that Dr. Clarke, if he was careful in searching for the true meaning of those scriptural expressions that relate to the divinity of the Son and the Holy Ghost, was equally circumspect in avoiding the accusation of heterodoxy, as appears by the series of propositions now referred to. There are three great rocks of heresy on which many bold adventurers on this Anti-Pacific ocean have been seen to split violently. These rocks are Tritheism, Sabellianism, and Arianism. Dr. Clarke got evidently clear of the first, by denying the self-existence of the Son and the Holy Ghost, and by maintaining their derivation from, and subordination to, the Father. He strenuously laboured to avoid the second, by acknowledging the personality and distinct agency of the Son and the Holy Ghost; and he flattered himself with having escaped from the dangers of the third, by his asserting the eternity (for he believed the possibility of an eternal production which Whiston could not digest) of the two divine subordinate persons. But, with all his circumspection, Dr. Clarke did not escape opposition and censure. He was answered and abused; and heresy was subdivided and modified, in order to give him an opprobrious appellation, even that of Semi-Arian. The convocation threatened; but the doctor calmed by his prudence the apprehensions and fears which his scripture-doctrine of the Trinity had excited in that learned and reverend assembly. An authentic account of the proceedings of the two houses of convocation upon this occasion, and of Dr. Clarke's conduct in consequence of the complaints that were made against his book, may be seen in a piece supposed to have been written by the Rev. Mr. John Laurence, and published at London, in 1714, under the following title: An Apology for Dr. Clarke, containing an account of the late Proceedings in Convocation upon his Writings concerning the Trinity. The true copies of all the original papers relating to this affair are published in this apology.

If Dr. Clarke was attacked by authority, he was also combatted by

argument. The learned Dr. Waterland was one of his principal adversaries, and stands at the head of a polemical body, composed of eminent divines, such as Gastrell, Wells, Nelson, Mayo, Knight, and others who appeared in this controversy. Against these, Dr. Clarke, unawed by their numbers, defended himself with great spirit and perseverance, in several letters and replies. This prolonged a controversy, which may often be suspended through the fatigue of the combatants, or the change of the mode in theological researches, but which will probably never be terminated: for nothing affords such an endless subject of debate as a doctrine above the reach of human understanding, and expressed in the ambiguous and improper terms of human language, such as persons, generations, substance, &c. which, in this controversy, either convey no ideas at all, or false ones. The inconveniences, accordingly, of departing from the divine simplicity of the scripture-language on this subject, and of converting a matter of mere revelation into an object of human reasoning, were palpable in the writings of both the contending parties. For, if Dr. Clarke was accused of verging toward Arianism, by maintaining the derived and caused existence of the Son and the Holy Ghost, it seemed no less evident that Dr. Waterland was verging toward Tritheism, by maintaining the self-existence and independence of these divine persons, and by asserting that the subordination of the Son to the Father is only a subordination of office and not of nature: so that, if the former divine was deservedly called a Semi-Arian, the latter might, with equal justice, be denominated a Semi-Tritheist. The difference between these learned men lay in this, that Dr. Clarke, after making a faithful collection of the texts in Scripture that relate to the Trinity, thought proper to interpret them by those maxims and rules of right reasoning, which are used on other subjects; whereas Dr. Waterland denied that this method of reasoning was to be admitted in illustrating the doctrine of the Trinity, which was far exalted above the sphere of human reason; and therefore he took the texts of Scripture in their direct, literal, and grammatical sense. Dr. Waterland, however, employed the words persons, subsistence, &c. as useful for fixing the notion of distinction; the words uncreated, eternal, and immutable, for ascertaining the divinity of each *person*; and the words interior, generation, and procession, to indicate their *union*. This was departing from his grammatical method, which ought to have led him to this plain conclusion, that the Son and the Holy Ghost, to whom divine attributes are ascribed in Scripture (and even the denomination of God to the former,) possess these attributes in a manner which it is impossible for us to understand in this present state, and the understanding of which is consequently unessential to our salvation and happiness. The doctor, indeed, apologises in his *queries* (p. 321.) for the use of these metaphysical terms, by observing, that "they are not designed to enlarge our views, or to add any thing to our stock of ideas, but to secure the plain fundamental truth, that Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, are all strictly divine, and uncreated; and yet are not three Gods, but one God." It is, however, difficult to comprehend how terms that neither enlarge our views, nor give us ideas, can secure any truth. It is difficult to conceive what our faith gains by being entertained with a certain number of sounds. If a Chinese should explain a term of his language which I did not understand, by another term, which he knew beforehand that I understood as little, his conduct would be justly considered as an insult against the rules of conversation and good breeding; and I think it is an equal violation of the equitable principles of candid controversy, to offer, as illustrations, propositions or terms that are as unintelligible and obscure as the thing to be illustrated. The words of the excellent and learned Stillingfleet (in the Preface to his Vindication of the Doctrine of the Trinity) administer a plain and a wise rule which, if observed by divines, would greatly contribute to heal the wounds which both truth and charity have received in this controversy. "Since both sides yield (says he) that the matter they dispute about is above their reach, the wisest course they can take is, to assert and defend what is revealed, and not to be peremptory and quarrelsome about that which is acknowleged to be above our comprehension; I mean as to the *manner* how the *three persons* partake of the *divine nature*."

Those who are desirous of a more minute historical view of the manner in which the Trinitarian controversy has been carried on during the present century, may consult a pamphlet that was published in 1720, entitled, An Account of all the considerable Books and Pamphlets that have been written on either Side in the Controversy concerning the Trinity since the year 1712; in which is also contained an Account of the Pamphlets written this last year, on each side, by the Dissenters, to the end of the year 1719. The more recent treatises on the subject of the Trinity are sufficiently known.

☞ [d] It will appear to those who read the preceding note [c] that Dr.

mine the doctrine of the holy Trinity; and it was this consideration that engaged a lady,[a] eminently distinguished by her orthodoxy and opulence, to bequeath a valuable legacy as a foundation for a lecture, in which eight sermons are preached annually by a learned divine, who is nominated to that office by the trustees. This foundation has subsisted since the year 1720, and promises to posterity an ample collection of learned productions in defence of this branch of the Christian faith.

Mosheim has here mistaken the true hypothesis of Dr. Clarke, or, at least, expresses it imperfectly; for what he says here is rather applicable to the opinion of Dr. Waterland. Dr. Clarke maintained an equality of perfections in the three persons, but a subordination of nature in point of existence and derivation.

[a] Lady Moyer.

THE FIRST APPENDIX.

Mosheim's Ecclesiastical History can be justly appreciated only by considering it as a general epitome. As such, it is indeed excellent; the arrangement is luminous; the style both of the author and of his translator, is in general perspicuous; and though topics of the greatest importance are, from the nature of the work, necessarily treated with a brevity which the reader may sometimes regret, the references at the bottoms of the pages inform him where he may, on every subject, find fuller information. It must, however, be confessed, that those references, being for the most part made to the works of German authors, are of less value to us than to those for whose use the history was originally composed; and, perhaps, it cannot be wholly denied, that the author, learned and pious as he undoubtedly was, either had not studied the works of the primitive fathers of the Christian church with sufficient care, or laboured under some prejudices, from which the most powerful minds are not wholly exempt, that made him refer to learned moderns for the decision of questions, which the ancients alone can decide. This we think, appears most remarkably in the view which he exhibits of the constitution, government, and discipline, of the primitive church, of which it is obvious that we can know nothing but from the testimony of the primitive writers.

The Fathers, as they are called, may have been bad critics, as we think they generally were; they may have been extremely credulous, and ready to attribute, to the miraculous interposition of God, natural events, for which their philosophy did not enable them to account; and their speculative doctrines may have been often corrupted by that science, falsely so called, which spread from the Alexandrian school over the whole Christian world; but the *integrity* of men who laid down their lives for what they *believed to be the truth*, cannot surely be questioned. "I see no reason," said one,[a] who did not pay to them undue deference, "why their veracity should be questioned, when they bear witness to the state of religion in their own times, because they disgraced their judgment, in giving ear to every strange tale of monkish extraction. Controversy apart, their testimony to common facts may yet stand good;" and surely the constitution, government and discipline of the church, were common facts, about which none of them could be deceived.

The view however which Dr. Mosheim has given of the primitive church appears not to us to be countenanced by any primitive writer; and accordingly he rarely appeals directly to them in support of what he advances, but refers to modern authors, generally French or Germans, who have written on the subject, and who could write nothing on it authentic, which they did not derive from the ancients. The qualifications indeed which he thinks essential to an historian, and the rules which he lays down for the manner of treating ecclesiastical history, though highly valuable in themselves, are by him stated in such a manner as cannot fail to excite, in the reflecting mind, suspicions of the authenticity of his account of the government and discipline of the primitive church. After observing that, in order to render the history of the church useful and interesting, it is necessary to trace effects to their causes, and to connect events with the circumstances, views, principles, and instruments that have contributed to their existence, he adds, "In order to discover the secret causes of public events, some general succours are to be derived from the history of the times in which they happened, and the testimonies of the authors by whom they are recorded. But, beside these, a considerable acquaintance with human nature, founded on long observation and experience, is extremely useful in researches of this kind. The historian who has acquired a competent knowledge of the views that occupy the generality of men, who has studied a great variety of characters, and attentively observed the force and violence of human passions, together with the infirmities and contradictions they produce in the conduct of life, will find, in this knowledge, a key to the secret reasons and motives which gave rise to many of the most important events of ancient times. A knowledge also of the manners and opinions of the persons concerned in the events that are related, will contribute much to lead us to the true origin of things."[b]

There is unquestionably much truth as well as good sense in this account of the qualifications requisite to render an historian instructive and interesting; for it is obvious that he who has merely studied human nature through the medium of books, not in the society of men, and who has not observed the motives which generally influence human conduct, can never trace events to their causes, or discover the springs of those actions on which perhaps the happiness or misery of millions may depend. But, if this knowledge of human nature be ever employ-

[a] Warburton in his introduction to Julian.

[b] Introduction, sect. xiii.

ed to counteract the testimony of ancient authors, who were under no conceivable temptation to write falsely; or if the actions of men in one stage of society be traced to the same motives from which similar actions are observed to spring in another stage altogether different, and in many respects the reverse; if, because men are prompted by avarice and ambition to solicit offices which at one period lead to honour and opulence, it be inferred that they must have been influenced by similar motives at a period when such offices led not to opulence or honour, but to certain death, in its most hideous forms; if an historian reason thus from the observations which he has made on the force and violence of human passions, and set his conclusions in opposition to facts recorded by ancient authors, who were witnesses of what they relate; it is obvious that his confidence in the knowledge which he has acquired of human nature by mixing in society, may lead him into the greatest errors; by inducing him either to neglect entirely, or to inspect carelessly, those writings from which alone he can derive any authentic information concerning the events of which he is writing.

That Dr. Mosheim was not entirely free from some bias of this kind, seems evident, as, without appealing to any ancient authority whatever, he represents the government of the primitive church as democratical—a form of government unknown in the religious societies of that age, as well heathen as Jewish.

He had witnessed the tyranny of the Romish clergy, and had traced the steps and discovered the causes by which the bishops of Rome had gradually reached the summit of ecclesiastical usurpation; and not adverting perhaps to the fact that, before the conversion of Constantine, ecclesiastical preferment could be no object of worldly ambition or avarice, he appears to have hastily concluded that this progress had commenced from the very beginning.

Accordingly, as if the matter were self-evident, he affirms, in the introduction to his work,[a] "that, when we look back to the commencement of the Christian church, *we find its government administered jointly by the pastors and the people.* But, in process of time, the scene changes, and we see these pastors affecting an air of preeminence and superiority, trampling upon the rights and privileges of the community, and assuming to themselves a supreme authority, both in civil and religious matters."

Of this joint administration of the government of the original church by the pastors and the people, he thinks it not necessary here to offer any evidence whatever; but, when he enters on the subject as an historian, and observes that the form of government, which the primitive churches borrowed from that of Jerusalem established by the apostles themselves, must be esteemed as of divine institution, he gives the following account of that form, which he endeavours to support by the authority of Scripture.

"In those early times, every Christian church consisted of the people, their leaders, and the ministers, or deacons; and these indeed belong essentially to every religious society. The people were, undoubtedly, the first in authority; for the apostles showed by their own example, that nothing of moment was to be carried on or determined without the consent of the assembly; and such a method of proceeding was both prudent and necessary in those critical times. It was, therefore, the assembly of the people, which chose their own rulers and teachers, or received them by a free and authoritative consent, when recommended by others. The same people rejected or confirmed, by their suffrages, the laws that were proposed by their rulers to the assembly; excommunicated profligate and unworthy members of the church; restored the penitent to their forfeited privileges; passed judgment upon the different subjects of controversy and dissension, that arose in the community; examined and decided the disputes which happened between the elders and deacons; and, in a word, exercised all that authority which belongs to such as are invested with the sovereign power."[b]

Such, according to our author, was the government of the Christian church during the greater part of the first century; and he infers this supreme authority of the people from the Acts of the Apostles, chap. i. v. 15. vi. 3. xv. 4. xxi. 22; but it is difficult to conceive by what mode of interpretation these texts can be made to countenance the supreme authority of the *people* in the church.

At the time of the transaction mentioned in the fifteenth and following verses of the first chapter of the Acts of the Apostles, we know, from the testimony of St. Paul,[c] that the number of believers in Jerusalem and its neighbourhood amounted at least to five hundred; but St. Luke assures us that the number of names met together at the appointment of Matthias to the apostleship, did not exceed one hundred and twenty. If the authority of the people was at that period supreme, and if it belonged to them to elect by their own suffrages even a successor in the apostleship to Judas, how came so very large a majority to be deprived of their right at the election of Matthias? On this question Dr. Lightfoot says,[d] Quum Matthias et Joses coram apostolis, ut par candidatorum, sisterentur, haud constat universum fidelium cœtum, sive individuum quemvis in eorum electione suo nomine suffragia tulisse, quin in presbyterio potius, sive in collegio virorum 108, inter se coacto, jus et potestatem eligendi resedisse." And though in ordinary cases it belonged to the apostles to ordain, by imposition of hands, such as were chosen to fill any office in the church by those to whom they had deputed the right of election, yet in the present case, they left the determination between the candidates wholly to the giving-forth of lots, after solemnly praying that the divine head of the church would show which of them he had chosen to take part of the ministry and apostleship from which Judas had fallen; and all this was done, as the same learned writer observes, "utpote qui gradus apostolicos immediatâ quasi Christi manuductione adierint."

The second text quoted by our author in support of the power of the people, appears to us to teach the very opposite doctrine in terms which cannot be mistaken. When the murmuring of the Grecians against the Hebrews arose on account of the neglect, real or supposed, of their widows in the daily ministration, the sovereign people did not take the treasure of the church into their own hands, and by their supreme authority appoint officers to distribute it to the poor with greater equity. They

[a] Sect. vii.
[b] Cent I. part ii. chap. ii. sect. 5, &c.
[c] I Cor. xv. 6.
[d] Oper. Omn. tom. ii. p. 758, edit. Roterodami.

seem not indeed to have imagined that they had a right to take any step whatever in the matter, till "the twelve called them together, and said—Look ye out among you seven men of honest report, full of the Holy Ghost and wisdom, whom *we* (not *ye*) may appoint over this business;" thus giving the people authority to elect, specifying the number and qualifications of the persons to be elected, and still reserving to themselves the authoritative appointment of those persons to the work for which they were to be chosen.

In the fifteenth chapter of the Acts of the Apostles we are told, that a deputation was sent from Antioch to Jerusalem to consult—not the people—but the apostles and elders about the necessity of circumcision; that, when the deputies had come to Jerusalem, they were received by the church and by the apostles and elders; that these distinguished persons came together to consider of the matter referred to their decision; that, after much disputing among the apostles and elders, the question was decided against the necessity of circumcision; and that then it pleased the apostles and elders, with the whole church, to send chosen men of their own company to Antioch with their synodical decree. In all this there is not the slightest countenance given to the authority of the multitude. The people were not called together on the arrival of the deputies from Antioch; and indeed their number was so great long before that period, that the tenth part of them could not have been contained in any house at the command of the apostles within the city of Jerusalem; nor would such a multitude have been allowed by the civil power to assemble quietly in the street or in the field. As many of them as could find admission were doubtless present at the deliberations of the apostles and elders on a question of such great and general importance; but the multitude is mentioned but once, and then as keeping profound silence. The synodical epistle to the Gentiles at Antioch and in Syria and Cilicia, is indeed written in the name of the apostles and elders and brethren; but this was, in those days, the common style of such epistles. Thus St. Paul's epistle to the Galatians is written, not in his own name only, but also in the names of all the brethren who were with him; and the first epistle of St. Clement his fellow-labourer (which is undoubtedly genuine) is in the name of "the church of God which dwelleth or sojourneth at Rome, to the church of God which sojourneth at Corinth;" though it is certain that all the brethren who were with St. Paul had no authority over the Galatians, nor the lay members of the church in Rome any right to expostulate with the church in Corinth. The synodical decree issued at Jerusalem may indeed, with the greatest propriety, be called the decree of the church, because it was enacted by the undoubted governors of the church; just as the acts of the British parliament are called the laws of Great Britain, though the people at large were not consulted in the framing of one of them.

The last text appealed to by Dr. Mosheim as a proof of the supreme authority of the people in the church, not only proves no such thing, but, if it be at all applicable to the question at issue, is of itself a complete proof that they had then no such authority, and indeed that they were wholly unfit to be entrusted with such authority.

The case was this. St. Paul, after an absence of some length from Jerusalem, returned to that city, and on the day after his arrival went into the house of James, who is represented as having *all* the elders about him; but, as is evident from what passed, with not so much as *one* of the multitude of laymen in the company. When St. Paul had declared particularly what things God had wrought among the Gentiles by his ministry, James and the elders glorified the Lord, and said unto him, "Thou seest, brother, how many thousands of Jews there are who believe; and they are all zealous of the law; and they are informed of thee, that thou teachest all the Jews who are among the Gentiles to forsake Moses, saying, that they ought not to circumcise their children, neither to walk after the customs. What is it (what is to be done) therefore? The multitude must needs come together, (it cannot be but they will come together,) for they will hear that thou art come. Do therefore this that we say unto thee: we have four men which have a vow on them; them take, and purify thyself with them, and be at charges with them, that they may shave their heads: and all may know (think or judge)[a] that those things whereof they were informed concerning thee are nothing but that thou thyself also walkest orderly and keepest the law." (Acts xxi. 19—24.)

This advice St. Paul followed, not however in *obedience* to the people as possessing in his opinion the supreme authority in the church of Jerusalem, but to humour a harmless prejudice, upon that principle which induced him, as he declares to the Corinthians,[b] "to become unto the Jews as a Jew, that he might gain the Jews: to them that were under the law, as under the law, that he might gain them that were under the law; to them that were without the law, as without the law, that he might gain them that were without the law;" and, even in matters indifferent, "to become all things to all men, that he might by all means save some." Had the multitude possessed the supreme power in the church of Jerusalem, St. James and the elders would undoubtedly have called them together to hear St. Paul's declaration of the things which God had wrought among the Gentiles by his ministry, and not have left them to be drawn together by their own curiosity and zeal, when they should hear of his arrival. At any rate St. James and the elders could not have proposed, nor would St. Paul have agreed, to impose on the people by even an innocent deception, had those people in the church of Jerusalem been the first in authority; for, in that case, it would have been the duty of the two apostles and elders to give a full and fair account of their own conduct to their superiors.

It was certainly known to St. Paul and St. James, and probably to the elders, that from the moment when the veil of the temple was rent in twain, the ceremonies of the Mosaic law were no longer obligatory on the disciples of their master. This, however, it appears, was not known to the great body of Jewish Christians dwelling at Jerusalem, who still continued zealous for the law as well as for the faith, and strongly attached to the customs of their fathers. Were men labouring under prejudices so inveterate, and in truth so inconsistent with the final object of the Gospel, fit to be entrusted with sovereign power in the

[a] In Stephens' Thesaurus, and even in Scapula's Lexicon, the reader will find a number of extracts from Xenophon, Plutarch, and other Greek writers, in which γινωσκω is of the same import with *censeo*, *existimo*, and *judico* in Latin. That it is used in that sense by St. Luke is obvious, since the multitude could not *know* that to be false, which was undoubtedly true.

[b] 1 Cor. ix. 20—28.

Christian church; with authority to excommunicate unworthy members, or even with the privilege of choosing their own teachers? What should we think of the constitution of a great school, in which the sovereign power was committed to the scholars, with authority to expel every member whom they might deem unworthy, and even to dismiss the masters, and choose teachers for themselves out of their own number? Could such a school be reasonably expected to prove a seminary of learning, science, virtue, or truth? Surely not; and yet Dr. Mosheim supposes that the Christian church, founded by the Son of God himself for the purpose of training up mankind in the faith, piety, and virtue necessary to render them "meet to be partakers of the inheritance of the saints in light," was thus constituted. That he is in an error, no man can doubt, who reflects that the doctrines to be taught in the church were, till the manifestation of Christ, unknown in the world, and such as human reason could never have discovered; that of such doctrines half-converted Jews and Heathens were incompetent to judge; that these doctrines were therefore revealed, not to every individual in the church, but to those who were "given for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ;" and that by those inspired teachers they were "committed only to faithful men, whom *they* (not the multitude at large) judged able to teach others also." How this was done, we shall endeavour to show, when we come to give a view of the rise, progress, constitution, and object of the Christian church, from the infallible records of the New Testament, illustrated, where they seem obscure, by primitive practice; but, before we enter on that detail, it will be proper to analyse our author's account of the officers or ministers of the church, and of their different privileges, about which he seems to have fallen into mistakes as great as those which led him to attribute the supreme authority in each church to the people.

According to Dr. Mosheim, "the rulers of the church were called either *presbyters* or *bishops*, which two titles are, in the New Testament, undoubtedly applied to the same order of men, and such as had distinguished themselves by their superior sanctity and merit. Their particular functions were not always the same; for, while some of them confined their labours to the instruction of the people, others contributed in different ways to the edification of the church. Among the first professors of Christianity, there were few men of learning; few who had capacity enough to insinuate, into the minds of a gross and ignorant multitude, the knowledge of divine things. God, therefore, in his infinite wisdom, judged it necessary to raise up, in many churches, extraordinary teachers, who were to discourse, in the public assemblies, upon the various points of the Christian doctrine, and to treat with the people in the name of God, as guided by his direction, and clothed with his authority. Such were the *prophets* of the New Testament, an order of men which ceased, when the want of teachers, which gave rise to it, was abundantly supplied.

"The church was undoubtedly provided from the beginning with inferior ministers or *deacons*. No society can be without its servants, and still less such societies as those of the first Christians were; and it appears not only probable, but evident, that the young men, who carried away the dead bodies of Ananias and Sapphira, were the subordinate ministers or deacons of the church of Jerusalem, who attended the apostles to execute their orders. All the other Christian churches followed the example of that of Jerusalem, in whatever related to the choice and office of the deacons. Some, particularly the eastern churches, elected deaconesses, and chose, for that purpose, matrons or widows of eminent sanctity, who also ministered to the necessities of the poor, and performed several other offices, that tended to the maintenance of order and decency in the church.

"Such was the constitution of the Christian church in its infancy, when its assemblies were neither numerous nor splendid. Three or four presbyters, men of remarkable piety and wisdom, ruled these small congregations in perfect harmony; nor did they stand in need of any president or superior to maintain concord and order where no dissensions were known. But the number of presbyters and deacons increasing with that of the churches, and the sacred work of the ministry growing more painful and weighty, by a number of additional duties, these new circumstances required new regulations. It was then judged necessary that a man of distinguished gravity and wisdom should preside in the council of presbyters, in order to distribute among his colleagues their several tasks, and to be a centre of union to the whole society. This person was at first styled the *angel* of the church to which he belonged, but was afterwards distinguished by the name of *bishop*, or inspector; a name borrowed from the Greek language, and expressing the principal part of the episcopal function, which was to inspect and superintend the affairs of the church. It is highly probable, that the church of Jerusalem, grown considerably numerous, and deprived of the ministry of the apostles, who were gone to instruct the other nations, was the first which chose a president or bishop; and it is no less probable, that the other churches followed by degrees such a respectable example.

"A bishop, during the first and second centuries, was a person who had the care of one Christian assembly, which, at that time, was, generally speaking, small enough to be contained in a private house. In this assembly he acted, not so much with the authority of a *master*, as with the zeal and diligence of a faithful *servant*. He charged, indeed, the presbyters with the performance of those duties and services, which the multiplicity of his engagements rendered it impossible for him to fulfil; but he had not the power to decide or enact any thing without the consent of the presbyters and people; and, though the episcopal office was both laborious and singularly dangerous, yet its revenues were extremely small, since the church had no certain income, but depended on the gifts or oblations of the multitude, which were, no doubt, inconsiderable, and were, moreover, to be divided between the bishop, presbyters, deacons, and poor.

"The power and jurisdiction of the bishops were not long confined to these narrow limits, but soon extended themselves, and that by the following means. The bishops who lived in the cities, had, either by their own ministry, or that of their presbyters, erected new churches in the neighbouring towns and villages. These churches, continuing under the inspection and ministry of the bishops, by whose labours and counsels they had been en-

gaged to embrace the Gospel, grew imperceptibly into ecclesiastical provinces, which the Greeks afterwards called *dioceses*. But, as the bishop of the city could not extend his labours and inspection to all those churches in the country and in the villages, so he appointed certain suffragans or deputies to govern and to instruct these new societies ; and they were distinguished by the title of *Chorepiscopi*, i. e. country bishops. This order held the middle rank between bishops and presbyters, being inferior to the former and superior to the latter."[a]

Such, according to our author, was the constitution of the Christian church during the first century and part of the second: for he affirms,[b] that the jurisdiction of a bishop extended not over more than one Christian assembly, and that the authority of the people continued supreme, until the middle of the second century, when the ancient privileges of the people were considerably diminished, and the power and authority of the bishops greatly augmented, by *councils*, of which, he says, we find not the smallest trace before that period. It was not, he adds,[c] till some time after the reign of Adrian, that the Christian doctors had the good fortune to persuade the people, that the ministers of the Christian church succeeded to the character, rights, and privileges of the Jewish priesthood. Then, indeed, the bishops began to consider themselves as invested with a rank and character similar to those of the high-priest among the Jews, while the presbyters represented the priests, and the deacons the Levites.

In support of this detail, the author appeals not to one ancient writer; and the consequence is, that the greater part of it is in direct opposition to the unanimous testimony of all antiquity. He refers, indeed, to several texts in the Acts of the Apostles and in the Epistles of St. Paul, as proofs of what, we believe, has never been controverted—that the titles of bishop and presbyter are in the New Testament indifferently applied to the same order of men. He seems however to mistake when he supposes that the order, to which these titles were commonly applied, consisted of the *rulers* of the church ; for, though the apostles sometimes call themselves elders, the order to which that title as well as the title of bishop more properly belonged, was evidently subordinate to the apostles, as well as to the church rulers, whom he admits to have been known by the appellation of angels.

That the bishops or elders of the New Testament were subordinate to the apostles, has never been controverted ; and that they were likewise subordinate to the *angels* of the churches, appears indisputable from the charges given by "him who hath the sharp sword with two edges, who hath his eyes like unto a flame of fire, and his feet like fine brass," to the angels of the churches of Pergamos and Thyatira.[d] These angels are described as eminent for their "good works, charity, service, steadfastness in the faith, and patience;" and yet they are both severely blamed, and the former threatened for suffering in their respective churches false teachers, whom, if they were themselves nothing more than such presidents of congregational presbyteries as Dr. Mosheim describes, it is obvious that they could not remove from their churches. According to him, these presidents, afterwards called bishops, were chosen by the joint suffrages of the other presbyters and of the lay members of the congregation to which they respectively belonged ; when thus chosen, they acted in their respective congregations, not with the authority of masters, but with the zeal and diligence of faithful servants ; they had not the power to decide or enact any thing without the consent of the presbyters and the people, who were in every church the first in authority ; and therefore the censure and threatening, for suffering false teachers in the churches of Pergamos and Thyatira, were on his principles due, not to the *angels* of those churches, but to the presbyters and *people!* That the principles are erroneous which infer injustice in the Son of God, Dr. Mosheim would have been as ready as any man to confess ; and therefore we have not a doubt that, if, instead of paying undue deference to the opinions of some of his less candid countrymen, he had duly weighed in his own mind the import of what the Spirit said to the seven churches, he would have perceived that the *angels* must have been of an order superior to the presbyters properly so called ; and that they must have derived their superiority from some other source than the mere choice of the presbyters and people.

To the truth of this inference it is no objection, that, in the New Testament, all officers in the church above the order of deacons are indiscriminately called sometimes bishops and sometimes presbyters. In the Old Testament, the individuals of every order of priesthood, with the exception of the mere Levites, are generally styled priests without any distinction ; though every Jew and every Christian know, that the high-priest was of an order superior to the rest, and authorized to perform at least one ministration to which none of his inferiors were competent.

Dr. Mosheim, indeed, seems to think, that there is no resemblance, and hardly any analogy between the Jewish priesthood and the Christian ministry ; but this is a mistake so palpable, that a man of learning and integrity could not have fallen into it, but through the influence of some deep-rooted prejudice. In the fifth chapter of the Epistle to the Hebrews there is an evident analogy pointed out between the Jewish and Christian churches, and, of course, between their respective ministers ; and the first epistle of St. Clement of Rome furnishes incontrovertible evidence, that long before the reign of Adrian—and even in the first century,—the bishops, presbyters, and deacons, were considered as invested with rank and characters similar to those of the high-priest, priests, and Levites among the Jews. That apostolical father, whose name, we are assured by St. Paul, was in the book of life, expostulating with the Corinthians, then in a state of schism among themselves, and of sedition against the governors of their church, thus reasons with them.

"Let us consider those who fight under our *earthly* governors ; how orderly, how readily, and with what exact obedience they perform those things which are commanded them. All are not generals, nor commanders of thousands, nor centurions, nor captains of fifties, and so on ; but every one doeth those things which are enjoined him by the king, and by those officers who have the command over him. They who are great, cannot yet subsist without those that are little ; nor the little without the

[a] Cent. I. part ii. chap. ii. sections 8, 9, 11, 12, 13.
[b] Cent. II. part ii. chap. ii. sect. 1, 2, 3.
[c] Sect. 4.
[d] Rev. chap. ii. 12—21.

great. There is a certain mixture in all things, and in these *there is* fitness, χρησις. Let us take our own body: the head is nothing without the feet; so neither are the feet of use without the head: even the smallest members of our body are necessary and useful to the whole body: all conspire together, and are *adapted by one subordination*[a] to the preservation of the whole. Let therefore our whole body be saved in Christ Jesus; and let every one be subject to his neighbour according to the order in which he is placed by the grace given him. Let not the powerful despise the weak, and let the weak reverence the powerful.

"Seeing then that these things are manifest unto us, even looking into the depths of the divine knowledge, we ought to do, in order, all things which the Lord hath commanded us to do; at stated times to perform our offerings and public services; for he hath commanded them to be done not rashly and disorderly, but at predetermined times and hours. He hath determined also by his own supreme will, *where* and *by whom* he would have them to be celebrated; that so all things beings piously done, unto all well-pleasing, they may be acceptable to his will. They therefore who make their offerings at the appointed seasons, are accepted and happy; for, following the instituted laws (νομιμοις) of the Lord, they do not go astray. For to the chief priest his proper services (λειτουργίαι) are committed; and to the priests their proper place is ordained; and on the Levites their proper ministries (διακονιαι) are imposed; and the layman is confined by the laws ordained for laymen."[b]

It is impossible for an unprejudiced man to read these extracts with attention, and to entertain a doubt that St. Clement considered the bishops, priests, and Levites in the Christian church, as succeeding to the high-priest, priests, and Levites in the Jewish. Indeed, if he understood, as he appears to have done, the great scheme of human redemption; if he believed, as our church believes, that, in the Old as well as in the New Testament, "everlasting life is offered to mankind by Christ, who is the only mediator between God and man;" if, with St. Paul and the inspired author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, he considered Judaism as Christianity under a veil; he must have considered the Jewish and Christian churches as essentially the same, though the ministrations of the former were more carnal than those of the latter, on account of the grossness of the people. With this view of the stupendous plan of redemption, it seems impossible that he, or indeed any other man, could have considered the bishops, presbyters, and deacons of the church, as succeeding to any thing else than the rank and character of the high-priest, priests and Levites of the temple; unless, indeed, there had been any text of Scripture *plainly declaring*, that the Jewish and Christian churches were wholly unconnected with each other, and that the former was not intended to serve as a school-master to lead the descendants of Abraham to Christ. Such a text as this, however, none of the sons of latitude have yet pretended to discover.

It seems likewise very strange that Dr. Mosheim should have supposed that, in the church of Jerusalem, there was no fixed president over the presbyters or elders, till the dispersion of the apostles; and that the jurisdiction of such presidents, who were then styled angels, and afterwards bishops, extended no farther, during the first and second centuries, than over one Christian assembly, which was generally small enough to be contained in a private house.

It has been already observed that St. James is represented, with the elders about him, as bishop of Jerusalem, when St. Paul returned to that city, and declared what things God had wrought among the Gentiles by his ministry. Indeed the part which, in the New Testament, James appears to have acted from a very early period, cannot be accounted for on any other supposition, than that he really was, what the concurring testimony of all antiquity declares him to have been, the fixed bishop or angel of the church of Jerusalem. When St. Peter was miraculously deliyered from prison, and had been received into the house of Mary the mother of John, whose surname was Mark, (Acts xii.) he said, "Go show these things to James and to the brethren." Why to James in particular? and why were the brethren with James rather than with John, who had acted a more conspicuous part than he during the life of our Lord, as well as at the first preaching of the apostles after the shedding abroad of the Holy Ghost, and who had not at the period of St. Peter's deliverance, or for four years afterwards, left Jerusalem? In the second chapter of the Epistle to the Galatians, St. Paul says, that "when Peter was come to Antioch, he withstood him to the face, because he was to be blamed. For before that certain came from James, he (Peter) did eat with the Gentiles; but, when they were come, he withdrew, and separated himself, fearing them who were of the circumcision." In the Acts of the Apostles we have no other account of persons from Judea teaching the Gentiles of Antioch, that, except they should be circumcised, they could not be saved, than that which is given in the fifteenth chapter; and it is indeed highly improbable, that, after the synodical decree at Jerusalem, St. Peter could have acted the part of which he was accused by St. Paul, or have *attempted* "to *compel* the Gentiles to live as do the Jews," contrary to the solemn decision of himself and the whole church under the immediate influence of the Holy Ghost. There is therefore no room for reasonable doubt that it was on the occasion mentioned in the fifteenth chapter of the Acts, and some time before the meeting of the council at Jerusalem, that this dissension took place between those great apostles. But by St. Luke the certain men, who wished to impose circumcision and the other rites of the Mosaic law on the Gentile Christians at Antioch, are said only to have come from *Judea;* whereas by St. Paul they are said to have come from *James.* Why are certain men, who came down from Judea, represented as having come from James, rather than from the other apostles and elders, of whom it is evident, from the short history of the council, that there must have been many then residing in Jerusalem.

If St. James was the proper bishop of Jerusalem, all these facts, which, upon any other supposition, cannot be accounted for, were perfectly natural; for, to whom was it so expedient that St. Paul should give an account of "the things which God had wrought among the Gentiles by his ministry," as to the bishop and presbyters of the mother church of the Hebrews? To what individual of the church of Jerusalem should St. Peter have sent the earliest account of his miraculous deliverance from prison,

[a] ὑποταγῇ μιᾷ χρῆται.

[b] Chapters 37, 38 and 40.

but to the bishop of that church? If St. James had not been that bishop, is it conceivable that St. Peter would have sent such welcome intelligence to him, rather than to his more intimate friend and companion, St. John, who was the disciple peculiarly dear to their divine Master? And could any thing be more natural than for St. Paul to say that certain brethren, who came to Antioch from the church of Judea, came from the *governor* of that church? This accounts likewise for St. James's presiding in the council of apostles and elders, which was holden in Jerusalem, for determining the question about circumcising the Gentiles; for that he was president of that council is incontrovertible, if any credit be due to the testimony of antiquity, to the unanimous opinion of critics and commentators, (a few members of the modern church of Rome excepted,) or, indeed, to the obvious meaning of his words, Διὸ ἐγὼ κρίνω, &c.

But if James was bishop of the church of Jerusalem, and if the constitutions of all other churches were framed after that model, there is surely no reason to suppose that even in the first century, and still less in the second, the bishop or angel of any church had the care of only one Christian assembly. The episcopal care of James unquestionably extended over many assemblies. By the preaching of St. Peter on the day of Pentecost, after the miraculous effusion of the Holy Ghost we are assured,[a] that to the number of the disciples "there were added about three thousand souls." It is indeed probable, that of these many were strangers, who, after the celebration of the feast, which had brought them to Jerusalem, departed from that city, and returned to their respective countries. It appears, however, that, soon afterwards, the number of believers resident in Jerusalem amounted to five thousand; and, by the time that St. Paul returned to give an account to James and the elders, of what things God had done by his ministry among the Gentiles, even that number had greatly increased.[b] But ten or even five thousand men could not meet for public worship, for the breaking of bread and for prayers, in any private house, or any ten private houses, belonging to the Christians in Jerusalem; and, therefore, as James appears to have had the episcopal care of them all, that care must have extended over many assemblies.

That such was the nature of episcopal jurisdiction even in that age appears still more evident, if possible, from St. John's epistle, in the Apocalypse, to the seven churches in Asia. That epistle is addressed, not ἑπτὰ ἐκκλησίαις τῶν ἐν τῇ Ἀσίᾳ, as it probably would have been, had it been intended for seven of a greater number of churches in Asia Minor, but ταις ἑπτα ἐκκλησίαις ταις (ἐκκλησιαις) εν τῃ Ἀσια, to the seven churches, the churches in Asia. Those seven, therefore, must have been the only societies in Asia Minor so organized as to be entitled to the appellation of churches, at the time when St. John wrote the Apocalypse. But is it conceivable that, in an age when "so mightily grew the word of God, and prevailed," the number of believers, in a country so extensive, which had been visited by different apostles and apostolical men, should, in the year 96, have been so very small as to constitute only seven Christian congregations? Even if this could be conceived, the Christians in Asia Minor were too much scattered over the face of the country, to repair, every one, for the purpose of public worship, to one or other of the small oratories of Ephesus, Smyrna, Pergamos, Thyatira, Sardes, Philadelphia, and Laodicea. From the Acts of the Apostles, and the Epistles of St. Paul, we know that, long before the writing of the Apocalypse, there were believers in various provinces and towns of Asia Minor, and even regular churches in the province of Galatia and the city of Colosse; but it seems evident, from the manner in which St. John expresses himself, that, before the year 96, "the candlesticks of Galatia and Colosse," to use the apostle's language, "had been removed out of their places." This indeed can excite no wonder, when we reflect that every where the churches were in that age beset by persecution without, and by heresies within; that the churches of the Galatians appear to have been exceedingly corrupt, even when St. Paul wrote his Epistle to them; and that the city of Colosse was destroyed by an earthquake during the reign of Nero, and, if ever rebuilt, certainly not when the Apocalypse was written. It is not however to be supposed that there were then no Christians in Galatia or the neighbourhood of Colosse, or that those Christians did not meet regularly in different congregations for "the breaking of bread and for prayers." The only inferences that can be drawn, are, that those assemblies did not constitute what St. John called *churches*, and that they, with their presbyters and deacons, were under the temporary inspection either of the apostle himself, or of some of the angels of the seven churches, of which he speaks as the only churches then in Asia.

That the jurisdiction of Timothy and Titus extended over more than one Christian assembly at Ephesus and in Crete; that by the apostle they were invested with authority over the presbyters as well as people of those assemblies; and that to them an exclusive right was given to ordain elders or presbyters in every city under their jurisdiction; are facts which no man has ventured to deny, and which no man can deny, who has read St. Paul's epistles to Timothy and Titus, and at the same time possesses common sense and honesty. Attempts have indeed been made to get rid of the inference from these facts, by representing the extensive authority with which Timothy and Titus were entrusted, as the authority, not of fixed governors of the churches over which they were to preside, but of *Evangelists!* This, however, cannot be admitted. We are not aware of a single instance in the New Testament, where an evangelist, as such, is represented as ordaining elders or even deacons; and it is certain that Timothy and Titus neither acted nor could act as evangelists at Ephesus or in Crete, except in a sense which, under that denomination, includes elders.

The word *evangelist* is unquestionably derived from the verb εὐαγγελιζω, which, according to an able critic[c] not prejudiced in behalf of a hierarchy, "relates to the *first* intimation that is given to a person or people, that is, when the subject may be properly called *good news*. Thus, in the Acts of the Apostles, it is frequently used for the first publication of the Gospel in a city or village, or amongst a particular people." But if this be essential to the radical import of the verb, of which indeed there can be no doubt, then it follows that an evangelist, considered as a distinct

[a] Acts ii. 41. [b] The words of St. James in the original Greek are, Θεωρεῖς, ἀδελφὲ, πόσαι μυριάδες εἰσὶν Ἰουδαίων τῶν πεπιστευκότων, &c. You see, brother, how many *myriads* there are of Jews who believe. &c.

[c] Dr. Campbell of Aberdeen.

character, could only be one, whether apostle, elder, deacon, or layman, who first carried the glad tidings of the Gospel to an individual or a people. Hence it is, that of the seven deacons not one is called an evangelist but Philip, because, though Stephen preached the Gospel as well and as ably as he, Philip is the only one of the number mentioned by St. Luke as having carried the glad tidings of the Gospel beyond the limits of Judea, within which these tidings were *first told* by Christ and his apostles. Hence too it follows, that those, whom St. Paul says that Christ, after his ascension, "gave as *evangelists* for the work of the ministry," must have been men miraculously inspired with the knowledge of the Gospel, which cannot be said of Timothy or of Titus, and impelled by the same heavenly influence to communicate that knowledge to those to whom it was *new*. But in this sense Timothy and Titus could not be evangelists to the churches of Ephesus and Crete, because St. Paul himself had preached the Gospel in those churches before them, and had even ordained presbyters in the church of Ephesus.

It has indeed been said that *εὐαγγελίζομαι* is occasionally used in the same sense with *διδάσκω*. If we grant this for the sake of argument, though we are not aware of a single instance in which one of these verbs could be properly substituted for the other, still we must observe, that the character of an evangelist, in this sense of the word, could give to Timothy no superiority over the elders of Ephesus, who were *teachers* as well as he, and enjoined by the apostle to "feed the church of God, which he had purchased with his own blood." Timothy was indeed exhorted by St. Paul to "do the work of an evangelist" at Ephesus; but the elders were in duty bound, as well as he, to do the work of evangelists; for in Ephesus there were then many people who had not *heard* of the Gospel, which every minister of Christ is bound, as he has opportunity, to propagate among the heathens as well as to preach among Christians. Timothy was likewise exhorted, in the very same verse, to "accomplish his deaconship"—*την διακονίαν σου πληροφόρησον*; but it would surely be absurd to infer from such an exhortation that the overseer of the presbyters and people of Ephesus was himself nothing more than a deacon.

If it be thus evident that the bishops known in the first century by the titles of apostles or angels of the churches presided each over more than one Christian assembly, we need not pursue the argument through the second and third centuries, since it is on all hands agreed, that the powers of the bishops were not diminished as the boundaries of the church were enlarged. This would have been extremely absurd; though we see no evidence that, during the second and third centuries, the bishops in general either claimed or had the smallest inducement to claim any power or pre-eminence which they possessed not in the first. What the hierarchy was in the beginning of the second century is apparent from the epistles of Ignatius, and from the fragments of other primitive writers preserved by Eusebius, whilst the canons commonly called apostolical, with the writings of St. Cyprian and other fathers of the church, define the powers and privileges of each of the three orders in the third century in terms which cannot be mistaken. From these canons and writings it appears evident, that no bishop in that century, with the exception perhaps of Victor and Stephen, bishops of Rome, arrogated to himself any authority which was not committed to the angels of the Asiatic churches, and which Timothy and Titus were not enjoined to exercise in the churches of Ephesus and Crete.

The only thing else, in Dr. Mosheim's view of the constitution of the primitive church, which calls for animadversion, is the account which he gives of the origin of *chorepiscopi*, and of deacons in the church of Jerusalem, before the ordination of the seven recorded in the sixth chapter of the Acts of the Apostles.

There is no evidence of *chorepiscopi* being any where established in the first or second century, or in the beginning of the third. They are not mentioned in the apostolical canons, nor in the writings of Clement of Rome, Ignatius of Antioch, or even St. Cyprian. The first council that takes any notice of them is that of Ancyra, holden in 315, which prohibits them from ordaining priests and deacons. They are mentioned by the great council of Nice, which provides the place of a village-bishop or *chorepiscopus* for such of the Novatian bishops as should abjure their schism, and be reconciled to the catholic church. But the fullest, as well as the most accurate and at the same time concise account, that is perhaps any where extant of the *chorepiscopi*, is in the tenth canon of the Synod of Antioch, holden in the year 341, which decrees,

"That village-bishops, though they have received episcopal ordination, shall yet keep within their bounds, and administer the affairs of the churches subject to them, and be content with the management of them, and ordain readers, and sub-deacons, and exorcists, and content themselves with the power of promoting men to these offices, and not dare to ordain a priest or deacon, without the consent of the bishop of the city to which they themselves and their districts are subject; and, if any one dare to transgress, what has now been determined, he shall be deprived of the honour which he has. A village-bishop is made by the bishop of the city to which he is subject."[a]

From this canon it is evident that the *chorepiscopi* were bishops regularly ordained; that they were chosen or nominated by the city-bishop, or diocesan, to take upon them part of his labour, and were in all things to be directed by him, when their duty was not expressly pointed out by any canon. They seem to have been introduced into the church toward the end of the third century, when the extent of some dioceses, the poverty of the bishops, and the occasional severity of persecution, rendered it difficult, if not impossible, for the diocesan to perform, as often as was proper, the various duties of his function; but those village-bishops appear to have sometimes acted very irregularly, by multiplying without reason the number of the inferior clergy,[b] and therefore were soon laid aside. They were indeed retained for some time after the danger of persecution was over, and when the revenues of the city-bishop enabled him, without inconvenience, to visit every church under his jurisdiction; but, in 367, it was

[a] Τὰς ἐν ταῖς κώμαις, ἢ ταῖς χώραις, ἢ τῆς καλουμένης χωρεπισκόπους, εἰ καὶ χειροθεσίαν εἶεν ἐπισκόπων εἰληφότες, ἔδοξε τῇ ἁγίᾳ συνόδῳ εἰδέναι τὰ ἑαυτῶν μέτρα, καὶ διοικεῖν τὰς ὑποκειμένας αὐτοῖς ἐκκλησίας, καὶ τῇ τούτων ἀρκεῖσθαι φροντίδι καὶ κηδεμονίᾳ, καθίσταν δὲ ἀναγνώστας, καὶ ὑποδιακόνους, καὶ ἐξορκίστας, καὶ τῇ τούτων ἀρκεῖσθαι προαγωγῇ, μήτε δὲ πρεσβύτερον, μήτε διάκονον χειροτονεῖν τολμᾶν, δίχα τοῦ ἐν τῇ πόλει ἐπισκόπου, ᾧ ὑπόκεινται αὐτός τε καὶ ἡ χώρα. Εἰ δὲ τολμήσειεν τις παραβῆναι τὰ ὁρισθέντα, καθαιρεσθαι αὐτὸν, ἧς μετέχει τιμῆς. Χωρεπίσκοπον δὲ γίνεσθαι ὑπὸ τοῦ τῆς πόλεως, ἡ ὑπόκειται, ἐπισκοπεῖ.

[b] See the Canons of St. Basil, bishop of Cæsarea in Cappadocia, canon 90.

decreed by the council of Laodicea, that no more village-bishops or *chorepiscopi* should be ordained.

Though we see no evidence whatever that the young men, who carried away the dead bodies of Ananias and Sapphira, were such ministers of the church of Jerusalem, as Stephen and Philip and the other five, who were ordained at the same time with them by the apostles; yet we readily admit that the words νεώτεροι and νεανίσκοι *may* signify the inferior ministers of the church, as well as the word πρεσβύτεροι signifies those of a higher order: we even readily adopt Dr. Mosheim's opinion, that the words μείζων and νεώτερος (St. Luke xxii. 26.) νεώτεροι and πρεσβυτέροις (1 Peter v. 5.) relate to *offices* and not to *age*, and that νεώτεροι *may*, in both these texts, mean those ministers of the church, who from the beginning have been known by the designation of deacons: but it does not therefore follow that the young men, who carried out the dead bodies of Ananias and Sapphira, were likewise deacons in the ecclesiastical sense of the word.

Among the Jews, every person who touched a dead body was hereby rendered unclean; and it is not very probable that St. Peter would wantonly give offence to that people, by ordering the ministers of the religion which it was his duty to preach, but against which he knew them to entertain the most inveterate prejudices, to render themselves unclean by doing what the door-keepers could have done as well as they. The young men who were employed to carry away the dead bodies, may indeed have been διάκονοι in the sense of menial servants of the infant church; but, in the Acts of the Apostles, there is not the slightest allusion to *ordained* deacons until we come to the sixth chapter, which gives so full an account of the ordination of the seven. Accordingly an ancient commentator, whose testimony, respecting a matter of fact, is surely entitled to greater credit than the mere conjecture of the most learned modern, says expressly, when speaking of the conversion and baptism of Cornelius the centurion,—*Adhuc enim præter septem diaconos nullus fuit ordinatus.*[a]

The difficulty in ascertaining the original constitution of the church is indeed greater than he can easily conceive, who has not attended to the power of prejudice. The controversies on the subject have been so acrimonious, and the tendency to confound Christianity with a mere system of what is called natural religion, is in the present age so very prevalent, that few men have brought, to the inquiry, minds so completely divested of prepossession, as to be capable of judging impartially. The truth may be detailed in the Scriptures with sufficient clearness; but we all study those writings under a bias, more or less powerful, in favour of the party to which we belong; and that bias, especially if we have ourselves been engaged in controversy, is very apt to prevent us from seeing what is written even as with a sun-beam. We may be ambitious of making *discoveries* in theology, and of becoming the founders of new sects; and such ambition must necessarily impel us to differ as much as possible from the luminaries of antiquity, that we may display the vigour of our own minds, and our superiority to what we are pleased to call prejudice: or we may be so attached to antiquity as to consider every practice and every rite of the primitive church, as of perpetual obligation, not distinguishing between what was deemed essential, and what was even then considered as only expedient, in consequence of the circumstances in which the church was placed.

To avoid as much as possible the errors which flow from these sources, it will be proper to trace the progress of the Gospel from the first preaching of John the Baptist, to the completion of the canon of the New Testament ascertaining, as we proceed, the import of the principle doctrines preached, as well as the offices and authority of the several preachers; and pointing out at the same time the privileges of the people. As all parties appeal to Scripture in support of their own opinions and systems, it would be fortunate if men could agree on some rule, by which Scripture, where it appears obscure, should be interpreted: and the constitution of the church being a matter of fact obvious to all mankind, it seems not difficult to find the rule, by which whatever relates to it may be interpreted with little danger of mistake. If the principles of the persons, to whom the writings which compose the New Testament were immediately addressed, can be ascertained, it will be easy, in cases of any importance, to discover how those writings should themselves be understood; and with respect to *matters of fact*, there can be no doubt, that they who conversed with the apostles, perfectly understood their meaning. Indeed, as long as the pastors of the Christian church had no worldly ambition to gratify, by bringing themselves into public notice; as long as pre-eminence among them led not to opulence and power, but to poverty, persecution and death, it would be in the highest degree unreasonable to question their veracity, when they are giving an account of the constitution of the church, as established by the apostles. Their testimony therefore may be safely employed, not as of authority in itself, but as an authentic commentary on what is taught on that subject in the sacred pages; and as such only do we mean to appeal to it.

That the church, whatever be its constitution, is something of great importance, is unquestionable, since it was deemed worthy of being alluded to, even by the *forerunner* of our Lord. The very first words on record, of the venerable Baptist's preaching, are, "repent ye, for the kingdom of Heaven is at hand;" by which was undoubtedly meant the kingdom of the Messiah, or the church of Christ, soon to be established instead of the Jewish polity and temple. He goes on, to say, "that every valley should be filled, and every mountain and hill be made low; that the crooked should be made straight, and the rough ways smooth; and that all flesh should see the salvation of God;" and soon afterwards, when he saw Jesus coming unto him, he said to the multitude, "Behold the lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world."

Our blessed Lord began his own preaching with the very same words—"Repent, for the kingdom of Heaven is at hand;" or, as St. Mark expresses it, "Jesus came into Galilee, preaching the Gospel of the kingdom of God, and saying, The time is fulfilled, and the kingdom of God is at hand: repent ye, and believe the Gospel." According to St. Luke, "When Jesus returned, in the power of the Spirit, into Galilee, from the scene of his temptation, he came to Nazareth, where he had been brought up; and, as his custom was, he went into the Synagogue

[a] Hilar. in Eph. cap. iv.

on the Sabbath-day, and stood up to read. And there was delivered to him the book of the prophet Esaias; and, when he had opened the book, he found the place where it is written, the Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because he hath anointed me to preach the Gospel to the poor, he hath sent me to heal the broken-hearted, to preach deliverance to the captives, and recovering of sight to the blind, to set at liberty them that are bruised; to preach the acceptable year of the Lord;" and this passage of the prophet, he applied to himself.

No christian can be ignorant, that, in this first preaching of our Lord and his faithful forerunner, there is at least one very important truth, which was wholly unknown to the Gentiles, and very little understood by the generality of the Jews. It is contained in these words of the Baptist—"Behold the Lamb of God which taketh away *the sin*, (την ἁμαρτίαν) not the *sins*, of the world." What is the sin of the world? Evidently the transgression of our first parents, which brought death and many other miseries on themselves, and all their posterity; and to take away these consequences of that sin, was the purpose for which a redeemer was first promised to the fallen pair, from which the "Word, which was in the beginning with God, and was God," condescended to take upon him human nature, and, with the patience of a lamb led to the slaughter, to die on a cross. Controversies have been agitated in the church from a very early period, concerning the nature of that *death*, which was brought upon the human race by the fall of our first parents. This is not a proper place for discussing such topics; but, whatever more may be included in the signification of the words מות תמות, it is evident from the whole scope of the Christian revelation, that the death incurred by the first transgression was absolute, without any reason to hope for a resurrection from the dead, but through the interposition of that seed of the woman, which was to bruise the head of the serpent.

Our Saviour says expressly—"*I am the resurrection and the life:* he that believeth in me, though he were dead, yet shall live; and whosoever liveth, and believeth in me, shall never die:" and, in another place, he says, "I am he that liveth and was dead: and behold, I am alive for evermore; and have the keys of hell (hades) and death." In perfect conformity with this, St. Paul taught the Corinthians, and, through them, the whole Christian world, that "Christ is risen from the dead, and become the first fruits of them that slept; for, since by man came death, by man came also the resurrection of the dead: and, as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive." That these salutary truths were not wholly unknown to the ancient prophets, and such other Israelites as could look through the shadows of the law to the substance of the Gospel, is indisputable: but that they were not fully comprehended by any Jew, in the days of our Saviour's sojourning on earth, is evident from a variety of passages in the New Testament, as well as from the unquestionable fact, that the Sadducees, "who said that there is no resurrection, neither angel nor spirit," were not only in communion with the other Jews, but capable even of executing the office of high-priest. The people therefore were not prepared, at our blessed Lord's first appearance, to receive these truths in all their lustre; but, as it would have been improper—and too like the common practice of impostors—to conceal entirely the great object of his mission even for a moment, he proclaimed in the words of the prophet Isaiah, that he was sent to preach the Gospel to the poor, and 'deliverance to the captives,' and to 'set at liberty them that were bruised,' which can mean nothing but deliverance from the curse of death, brought on mankind when the serpent bruised Adam's heel.

As these truths are wholly discovered by revelation, they could not be left to make their way in the world, like the dogmas of philosophy, by the discussions of human reason; for, by the philosophers of that age, a resurrection from the dead was deemed impossible. Accordingly both our Lord and his forerunner declared that a *kingdom* was at hand—even the kingdom of heaven or of God, in which all obstacles to their reception were to be taken away; which should comprehend the Gentiles here called the *blind*,[a] and in which "*all flesh* should see the salvation of God." That by the kingdom of Heaven was meant the church of Christ, will be seen more clearly in the sequel. At present it is sufficient to observe that, though at hand, it was not yet come.

Our Saviour, however, began to lay the foundation of it immediately after his baptism, by preaching the Gospel, by inviting all the Jews to become his disciples, and by working miracles to prove the truth of his mission. By these means he attracted many disciples, whom he baptized, not, as John had done, in the name of "one to come after him,"[b] but probably in general terms unto faith in the Messiah, declaring that without his baptism no man should enter into *the kingdom of God*[c] or the church. Of these disciples, after continuing all night in prayer to God, "he chose twelve, that they should be with him, and that he might send them forth to preach, whom he named apostles;"[d] and some time afterwards "he appointed other seventy also, and sent them two and two before his face into every city and place whither he himself would come."[e] That the seventy were subordinate to the twelve, and that they were all subject to their divine Master, is evident from every passage in the Gospels, in which any mention is made of these two orders of ministers; and in this arrangement for laying the foundation of the Christian church, there is a striking resemblance to the means employed for conducting the Israelites to the land of promise.

The Israelites were delivered from Egyptian slavery by Moses the *servant* of God; the members of the Christian church, who walk worthy of the vocation wherewith they are called, are delivered from slavery infinitely more intolerable by Jesus Christ the *Son* of God. The twelve tribes of Israel were conducted under Moses through the wilderness, by twelve officers, the heads of their respective tribes; and, on the foundation of the Christian church, Christ appointed twelve apostles, who, when he should sit on the throne of his "Glory, should also sit on twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel." And to complete the analogy, as the Lord commanded

[a] That such is the meaning of the word *blind*, in this passage of St. Luke's gospel, appears unquestionable, when it is compared with other parts of Scripture, more especially with St. John, chap. x. 16, and Rom. ii. 17, 21.

[b] Acts xix. 4.
[c] John iii. 5.
[d] St. Luke vi. 12, 13.
[e] St. Luke x. 1.

Moses to gather unto him seventy men of the elders of Israel, who, partaking of the spirit that was upon him, should bear the burthen of the people with him ;[a] so Christ appointed the like number of disciples to go before his face to every place, whither he himself should come.

An analogy so striking could not escape the observation of the apostles, after their divine Master had "opened their understandings, that they might understand the Scriptures,"[b] and perceive the close connexion between the Mosaic and Christian dispensations. But, if the analogy between what may be called the civil polity of the Israelites in the wilderness, and the subordination established among our Lord's immediate followers, be thus evident, the analogy between the polity of the Jewish church and the same subordination is surely not less evident.

In what relates to religion, the disciples could not but perceive that the station of Jesus himself resembled that of the high-priest; that the twelve held a place in the little flock similar to that of the priests among the Jews; and that the seventy answered to the Levites in the temple service. The twelve were sent out to preach the Gospel to all the Jews; to baptize[c] the converts to the Christian faith; and, a little before the death of their Master. they were authorised to administer the rite commemorative of his sacrifice on the cross. To the seventy no other commission was given than to go before the face of Christ, and prepare the people for his reception, as "the Levites were given to Aaron and his sons, to wait upon the service of the tabernacle of the congregation."[d] But neither the twelve nor the seventy had yet power to admit a single labourer into the vineyard, or to cast an individual out of the flock.

The church indeed was not yet built,[e] though its foundation was laid, and a model exhibited for its future superstructure. As it is the purchase of Christ's blood, who gave himself for it,[f] the building could not be completed till after his resurrection from the dead, and his ascension into heaven; and therefore the apostles were from the beginning intended to be the builders,[g] as soon as they should, for that purpose, be endowed with power from on high. It has accordingly been justly observed by an eminent prelate of the church of England,[h] that they were gradually raised to their high office in a manner strikingly analogous to that in which their blessed Master was raised to his; and that hardly any power is said to have belonged to him, which he did not delegate to them, when he commissioned them to complete the work which he had begun.

Although he was anointed, from his first appearance in this world, to be a king, priest, and prophet, he did not actually enter on any of those offices, until the Holy Ghost, descending visibly from heaven, had anointed him to them a second time. In like manner, though at an early period of his ministry he had separated the twelve from the multitude of believers, and promised even then that they "should sit on twelve thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel," and that "whatsoever they should bind on earth should be bound in heaven, and whatsoever they should loose on earth should be loosed in heaven;" they did not actually receive this high commission, till after the resurrection of their divine Master, when he appeared to them saying,—"Peace be unto you; as my Father hath sent me, even so send I you. And when he had said this, he breathed on them, saying—Receive ye the Holy Ghost; whose-soever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whose-soever sins ye retain, they are retained."[i]

Whilst our blessed Lord sojourned on earth, he was the king of the Jews only, and, as such, when he sent forth the twelve to preach, he said, "Go not into the way of the Gentiles, and into any city of the Samaritans enter ye not; but go rather to the lost sheep of the house of Israel."[k] After his resurrection from the dead, as the limits of his kingdom were extended, he extended likewise the commission of his apostles; for he said unto them, "All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth. Go ye therefore and teach *all nations*, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world."[l] They were not however to enter on this great office of converting the nations, and opening to them the kingdom of heaven, until they should receive the promise of the Father, which they had heard from him; for, added he, "John truly baptized with water, but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost not many days hence;"[m] alluding undoubtedly to his own baptism, when the Holy Ghost visibly descended on himself, as he did on them at the ensuing festival of Pentecost.

Thus striking is the analogy between the manner in which the man Christ Jesus was raised to his high office, and that in which he raised the apostles to theirs; and thus ample was the authority which he conferred on those master-builders of his church. As the promise of the keys of the kingdom was first made to St. Peter, he had the honour to make the first converts both among the Jews and the Gentiles. It was in consequence of his preaching on the day of Pentecost, that three thousand souls were added to the number of the disciples; and then we read for the first time of a *church* as actually *built*. Immediately after the effects of that preaching it is said that "the Lord added to *the church* daily such as should be saved."[n] St. Peter was likewise employed to open the door of the kingdom of Heaven, or the church, to the Gentiles,[o] who, being "aliens to the commonwealth of Israel, and strangers to the covenant of promise," had hitherto been shut out from it; and this personal distinction—the reward of his heroic zeal in confessing his master—is the only foundation on which the supremacy of his successors in the see of Rome is endeavoured to be built, although it is obviously a distinction in which he could have no successor, being indeed temporary, and consisting in two single acts.[p]

Of these acts one was performed in Jerusalem, and in that city was the first Christian church gradually organized; but it was not placed under the government of St. Peter, nor was it governed by the apostles in common.

[a] Numbers xi. 16.
[b] St. Luke xxiv. 45.
[c] St. John iv. 1, 2.
[d] Numbers iii. 9. viii. 24.
[e] St. Matth. xvi. 18, 19.
[f] Gal. v. 25.
[g] 1 Cor. iii. 10, 11.
[h] Archbishop Potter.
[i] St. John xx. 21, 22, 23.
[k] St. Matth. x. 5, 6.
[l] St. Matth. xxviii. 18, &c.
[m] Acts i. 4, 5.
[n] Acts ii. 14, &c.
[o] Acts x.
[p] This has been proved by bishop Horsley, in one of his published sermons, with a force of reasoning that admits no reply. See his Sermons.

We have already seen that he who presided over the church of Jerusalem, even before the dispersion of the apostles, was James, called the Lord's brother; that under him was a college of elders (we know not how many,) and subordinate to them were the seven deacons. When it is said that the church of Jerusalem was not governed by the apostles in common, nothing more is meant than that James was its *immediate* governor, or stood in a relation to the elders, deacons and people of that church, in which the other apostles did not stand; and of this fact no man can doubt who has read without prejudice the Acts of the Apostles. That James was ready to be guided by the judgment of the apostles; that he consulted them, as long as he had an opportunity, in all the trials to which he must have been subjected; and that he occasionally enforced his own admonitions by the weight of their authority, is readily granted; but he never appears in the Acts, or is mentioned in the epistles of St. Paul, but as the chief governor of the church of Jerusalem, of which he is called by the unanimous voice of antiquity the first bishop.

Here then is one church, of which the constitution was unquestionably not democratical; and all the other churches that we read of in the New Testament appear to have been constituted on the same model with the church of Jerusalem. The apostles, in the discharge of the duties of their high commission, not only preached the Gospel every where, but also "ordained presbyters or elders in every church;"[a] and in the churches of Ephesus and Philippi,[b] and doubtless in all the rest, they appear to have ordained deacons as well as presbyters. It has indeed been contended that the deacons were merely trustees for the poor in matters purely secular, and therefore no order of those who have long been known in every church by the denomination of *the clergy;* but the solemnity with which the first deacons were ordained by prayer and imposition of hands, the qualifications required of those who were to be ordained deacons in the church of Ephesus, and the universal practice of the primitive church, prove this to be a palpable mistake. To distribute the public charity has indeed been one part of the deacon's office in all ages, and in every church where a legal establishment was not made for the support of the poor; and it was that part of the office which gave rise to the order at *the particular time* at which it was instituted; but that the office included something more—and that the seven were, in the language of antiquity, διακονοι λογου—ministers of the word, as well as διακονοι τραπεζων—ministers of the tables,—is evident from every thing that we read of deacons in the New Testament.

It has been already observed that in the churches of Ephesus, Crete, and Asia Minor, as well as in the church of Jerusalem, there were officers of a higher order than the presbyters; and to these officers alone belonged the right to ordain the presbyters and deacons; to exhort them to the due discharge of their respective duties; to reprove them for their faults,[c] and by consequence to degrade them from their offices when no longer worthy of them. If Timothy and Titus had not been invested with all this authority, the admonitions of St. Paul to them would surely have been different from what we find them in his three epistles. Timothy is particularly instructed in the qualifications requisite for presbyters and deacons; cautioned against laying hands suddenly on any man, lest he should be partaker of other mens sins; and directed how to receive accusations against presbyters; but, if the supreme power in the church of Ephesus had been vested in the people, or if the presbyters had shared equally with Timothy authority to ordain and reprove each other, such instructions as these to any individual would have been palpably absurd. It would likewise have been absurd to appoint Titus to ordain presbyters in *every* city of Crete, and after the first and second admonition to reject heretics; for, if it had belonged to the office of a presbyter to ordain, and finally to judge of heresies, the presbyter first ordained by him, might, *ex officio*, and with the aid of the people, have either supported or resisted him in the discharge of these duties.

The governors of churches, to whom the presbyters as well as people were thus subject, appear, as Dr. Mosheim acknowledges, to have been generally called, during the first century, the *angels* or *apostles* of their respective churches. Such a governor certainly was Epaphroditus, styled by St. Paul his "brother, and companion in labour, and fellow-soldier; but the *apostle* of the church of Philippi," and therefore to be "holden by the Philippians in reputation."[d] Such likewise were Sosthenes and Sylvanus, whom he so frequently associates with himself as his partners, fellow-helpers and brethren; and such were those brethren whom he calls ἀπόστολοι ἐκκλησιῶν, δόξα Χριστοῦ—"apostles of the churches, the glory of Christ."[e]

Doubtless there were presbyters ordained in some places, where no men were sufficiently qualified for the government of the infant church; and the care of such churches was retained by the apostle by whom they were founded, until some persons could be found to whom the immediate inspection both of the presbyters and the people might be safely entrusted. Hence it is that St. Paul, when enumerating his labours and sufferings for the promotion of the Gospel, expressly mentions, as one of those labours which came upon him daily—"the care of all the churches which he had planted." It is however evident that each church was, as soon as possible, placed under the superintendance of an apostle or angel of its own, that the twelve, with St. Paul and Barnabas, might be as little as possible interrupted in their glorious career of converting all nations; but it does not appear that in the appointment of these *angels* or secondary *apostles*, or indeed of the *presbyters*, the people were, in the first century, so much as consulted. Paul and Barnabas ordained elders or presbyters in every church which they planted; but St. Paul himself assures us that the presbyters so ordained in the church of Ephesus, "were made overseers of the flock (not by the people but) by the Holy Ghost, to feed the church of God, which he hath purchased with his own blood."[f] He likewise informs us that God, and not the people, had set, in the church, governments and governors of different orders, of which the apostles were the first;[g] that there were in the church of Thessalonica those who, as the people were exhorted to *know* them, as well as esteem them very highly for their work's sake, could not have been *appointed* by those people themselves to "labour

[a] Acts xiv. 23. [b] 1 Philip. i. 1; and 1 Tim. iii. 8.
[c] See the Epistles to Timothy and Titus *passim*.
[d] Philip. ii. 25, 29. [e] 2 Cor. viii. 23.
[f] Acts xx. 28. [g] 1 Cor. xii. 28, and Eph. iv. 11, 12.

among them, and be over them in the Lord,"[a] and that in all churches there are overseers, whom the people are bound to "obey as those who have the rule over them, and to submit themselves as to those who watch for their souls."[b]

Who those rulers were, it is not difficult to discover. We have seen that, in every completely organized church mentioned in the New Testament, there were three orders of men, who, each in his station, laboured in the word and doctrine. Of these the lowest order was that of deacons, who appear, from the conduct of Stephen and Philip, to have preached and occasionally administered the sacrament of baptism. Superior to the deacons was the order of presbyters, often called bishops, whose duty it was to feed the flock of Christ, by preaching the word, and administering both the sacraments; and over both these orders we find a president, who is generally called in the New Testament the angel or apostle of the particular church over which he presided; whose pastoral care extended over more than one congregation; to whom alone belonged the privilege of ordaining presbyters and deacons; who was himself always ordained by apostolic hands; and who alone could finally cut off unworthy Christians from the communion of the church.

It has been often said that the apostles neither had nor could have successors, and that therefore the elders, whom all admit to be often called bishops in the New Testament, are the highest order of ministers intended to continue in the church of Christ. This, however, is said, not only without authority, but in direct contradiction to the plainest testimony of Scripture, and the consequent practice of all antiquity. It was to the apostles alone, and not to the multitude of believers, or even to the seventy, that our blessed Lord said, "Go ye and teach all nations." It was to them alone that he gave the keys of the kingdom of heaven, saying, "whatsoever ye shall bind on earth, shall be bound in heaven; and whatsoever ye shall loose on earth, shall be loosed in heaven:" and the apostles alone were sent by him, as his Father had sent him, with authority to govern that kingdom which he had purchased with his own blood. As he knew all things, he was fully aware that the apostles were mortal, and that, in fact, none of them would long survive the approaching destruction of Jerusalem. It could not therefore be with themselves personally, but with their successors in office from age to age, that he was to be always even to the end of the world. The church, which he every where calls his kingdom, and which he declared to Pilate was not to be of this world, was founded by himself, and built by his apostles acting under his authority; and its privileges whatever they may be, are derived wholly from him. No man could be admitted into the church, or cast out of it, but by the authority which he conferred on the apostles for these purposes; and therefore, if they were to have no successors, the church must have been swept from the face of the earth, almost as soon as that ritual service, which was established among the Jews, merely as preparatory to it. After the death of St. John, no man could either have been received into the church, or cast out of it; and the church itself must have perished with that generation. Yet Christ himself solemnly promised, that "against the church to be built on the faith confessed by St. Peter, the gates of hell—πύλαι ἅδου—the gates of *death*, or of the *receptacle* of the dead—should never prevail;" for he well knew, that the perpetuity of the church is necessary to the perpetuity of the faith.

There are indeed men of some learning, who seem to think otherwise; who profess great regard for the doctrines and morality of the Gospel; but who raise hideous outcries against every claim to any other authority in the church of Christ, than what is exercised in literary clubs, or philosophical societies. But what must have been the consequence to the faith, if, on the death of the apostles and other inspired preachers of the Gospel, all ecclesiastical authority had ceased, or devolved on the multitude at large? With the Old and New Testaments in their hands, could the rabble have maintained the purity of the faith? Could *they* have discovered, even from those writings, the consequences of the first transgression; the necessity of a redeemer to fallen man; or the nature and extent of the redemption wrought for him? Could they have discovered the necessity of divine aid to enable us to work out our own salvation with fear and trembling, or have guarded that doctrine, supposing it discovered, from the opposite and dangerous extremes, to which it is too often carried even by learned ministers of the church? Could such men have preserved in purity the doctrine of one God in three persons; or would they not rather have immediately relapsed into the polytheism and idolatry, with which, as they had themselves but lately emerged from it, they were still surrounded? Would they have long maintained the resurrection of the dead, and a general judgment, against the sophisms of those philosophers, who considered the body as the prison of the soul, who thought a resurrection of the dead impossible even to omnipotence, and who taught, either that the gods could not be offended with men, or that the human soul is no subject either of reward or of punishment; being in fact a portion of το ἐν, or the soul of the world, in which it was finally to be reabsorbed.

Even the morality of the Gospel, so justly admired, would, if left to the guardianship of the people at large, have been as liable to corruption as its peculiar doctrines. From the epistles of St. Paul, as well as from the philosophers, satirists, and profane historians of the age, it appears that the morals of the heathen world, at the period when the Gospel was first preached to all nations, were sunk to a state of the lowest depravity; that the sensual appetites of our nature were indulged to the utmost excess; that some of those, who were converted to the faith, had themselves, in their unregenerated state, given way to every inordinate affection; and that vices, not even to be named among Christians, were countenanced by the teaching, if not the practice, even of some of the philosophers. Had the multitude been left, each to interpret the scriptures for himself; had they been left without control, to choose their own teachers and governors; had the power of the *keys*, or the supreme authority in the church, been committed to them, is it not probable—is it not, indeed, morally certain, that they would soon have relapsed into their former courses, "as the dog turns to his vomit again, and the sow that is washed to her wallowing in the mire?"

Although all the doctrines and precepts of Christianity, which are essential to salvation, are easily understood by

[a] 1 Thess. v. 12, 13.

[b] Heb. xii. 17.

candour, combined with attention, yet some of them, such as St. Paul's doctrine of justification by faith for instance, are very liable to be misapprehended, where either candour or attention is wanting. But candour and attention are not to be looked for in ignorant and illiterate men, when they are under the dominion of corrupt habits, or are impelled by the strongest propensities of our animal nature; and therefore such men, and the teachers chosen by such men, may be expected to interpret that doctrine so as to make it encourage their "continuance in sin that grace may abound," and enable them to reconcile their impure practices with their profession of Christianity. This is not a mere hypothesis formed for the sake of argument. It is a fact well known to ecclesiastical historians, and occasionally pointed out by our author, that some of the ancient sects, who renounced the communion of the regular church, taught that Christ hath set men free, not only from the ritual law of Moses, but even from the obligations of morality; and there is reason to suspect that some of the mob-commissioned teachers of the present age, acquire their popularity by the same execrable doctrine.

All this was well known to Christ, who therefore established a society or church in the world, to be "the pillar and ground of his truth,"[a] and the guardian of the morals of his disciples. To that society are confined all the privileges of the Gospel;[b] men are to be admitted into it only by baptism;[c] he who, when the Gospel has been fully preached to him, refuses to be baptized, has no claim, by the Christian covenant, to salvation;[d] and he who submits not to the discipline of the church, is in the state of a heathen man or a publican.[e] But we have seen that the apostles alone had received authority to admit into the church, or cast out of it; and that therefore the apostolical order must be continued by succession from those, who were originally raised to that order by the divine head of the church, even to the end of the world. Accordingly St. Paul speaks of apostles ordained by men[f] in his time, of whom Epaphroditus appears to have been one, as Barnabas certainly was another, and warns the Corinthians against false apostles;[g] whilst our blessed Lord, by the pen of St. John, makes express mention of some, who "said they were apostles, and were not, but were found liars."[h] Nothing of all this could have happened, if it had been understood, that the primary apostles were to have no successors; for the twelve with St. Paul were all, except St. John, dead some time before the false apostles were detected by the angel of the church of Ephesus; and, had they been alive, they must have been too well known for the most impudent liars then existing, to personate them in a church which had been founded by St. Paul, and so lately governed by his son Timothy.

The case appears to have been as Theodoret and others expressly represent it—"That those now called bishops were anciently called apostles; but in process of time the name of apostle was left to them who were truly apostles (viz. the twelve and St. Paul;) and the name of bishop was restrained to those who were anciently called apostles. Thus Epaphroditus was the apostle of the Philippians, Titus of the Cretans, and Timothy of the Asiatics."[i] This change of the denomination of the highest order of ecclesiastics, from apostle to bishop, seems to have been made about the beginning of the second century, soon after the death of St. John, and probably gave occasion to Ignatius to insist so much on the obedience due to the bishops, lest the churches, to which his epistles were addressed, should imagine that the authority of their chief pastors had been diminished by the change of their designation. That change, however, appears not to have been strictly attended to, for several centuries, by those who had occasion to write of the immediate successors of the apostles in particular churches; for Clement, bishop of Rome, is by Clement of Alexandria, called[k] Αποστολος Κλημης, and Ignatius, one of the first bishops of Antioch, is by Chrysostom[l] styled ἀπόστολος και ἐπισκοπος.

Thus then it appears that the constitution of the church, in the first century, was episcopal in the diocesan sense of that word; that the bishop was the chief pastor of a greater or less number of congregations, according to the extent of his diocese; that though both presbyters and deacons preached and administered the sacrament of baptism, and the former the Lord's supper, they could perform no ecclesiastical office, but by authority derived from the bishop;[m] that the people had no such authority in the church, as Dr. Mosheim supposes; and that neither the presbyters, nor people, nor both united, could excommunicate any person, or cast him entirely out of the church, but by the sentence of the bishop. It does not however appear that for several centuries a bishop's diocese, or the tract of country over which his pastoral care extended, was every where divided into what we now call *parishes*, each with its resident pastor. On the contrary, this division became not general before the fifth century, and seems not to have been made in England previous to the seventh. It is indeed hardly supposable that in the first century the Christians had any buildings wholly set apart for the service of the church. During that period, the probability is that the bishop, with one or two inferior clergymen to assist him, convened part of his flock in his own or some other house; that the presbyters were sent by him to other private houses, where in different divisions, the remainder of the flock assembled themselves together, for the breaking of bread and for prayer; and it is certain, that, when the presbyters returned to their bishops, they delivered, each into the common stock of the church, the oblations which had been made by their respective congregations. When the number of Christians every where increased, presbyters appear indeed, even during the æra of persecution, to have been stationed in a suburb, or in the country-region of the bishop's diocese; but even then the oblations of the people were all delivered into the common stock of the mother-church, and there distributed into shares, for the maintenance of the bishop, for the support of the clergy under him, for

[a] 1 Tim. iii. 15.
[b] Acts ii. 47. Luke xviii. 18.
[c] St. Matth. xxviii. 19.
[d] St. Mark xvi. 16.
[e] St. Matth. xviii. 17, 18.
[f] Gal. i. 1.
[g] 2 Cor. xi. 13.
[h] Rev. ii. 2.

[i] Τους δε νυν καλουμενους επισκοπους αποστολους ωνομαζον, του δε χρονου προιοντος το μεν της αποστολης ονομα τοις αληθως αποστολοις κατελιπον την δε της επισκοπης προσηγοριαν τοις παλαι καλουμενοις αποστολοις επεθεσαν, &c. Theod. in Tim. cap. 3. He repeats the same thing, Com. in Phil. i. 1, and ii. 25. The author under the name of Ambrose, generally believed to be Hilary the deacon, asserts that all bishops were at first called apostles, and that it was to distinguish himself from such apostles, that St. Paul called himself an "apostle, not of men, neither by men, but by Jesus Christ and God the Father." Ambros. Com. in Eph. iv. and in Gal. i. 1.

[k] Strom. lib. 4.
[l] Encom. Ign.

[m] Μηδεις χωρις του επισκοπου τι πρασσετω των ανηκοντων εις την εκκλησιαν..... ουκ εξον εστιν, χωρις τοῦ επισκοπου, ουτε βαπτιζειν, ουτε αγαπην ποιειν· αλλ, δ αν εκεινος δοκιμάση, τουτο και τῷ Θεῳ ενάρεστον. Ignatii Epist. ad Smyrn. cap. 8.

assisting the poor and strangers, and for purchasing whatever was necessary for the public service of the church. After the empire became Christian, what we now call parish churches were built, and endowed, sometimes by the public, and more frequently by opulent individuals; and hence the origin of patronage, or the right granted to individuals, to present their own clerks to the churches which they had endowed. This practice seems to have become general about the year 500, as there are two laws by Justinian of that date, authorizing and confirming it; but even then no clerk could be presented without the concurrence of the bishop under whom he was to minister, nor be supported by any patron against the censures of his diocesan, when so unhappy as to have incurred them.

In the first and second centuries there seems to have been a perfect equality of rank among the several bishops of the church, he presiding in provincial synods, in whose diocese the synod was holden. Thus, though St. Peter certainly took place of St. James in the college of the Apostles, St James appears to have presided in the first council, because it took place in Jerusalem, of which he was acknowledged to be the bishop. This perfect equality, however, was gradually done away; for, by the middle of the third century, it is evident that, without acknowledging any superiority of order, the bishops of every province paid a particular respect to the bishop of the chief city; and hence the origin of metropolitans and patriarchs. To this deviation from primitive practice several things contributed. In the chief city, it must have been the practice of the church, from the beginning, to place as bishop a man of approved talents, and piety, and virtue; and even when the clergy subsisted on the voluntary oblations of the faithful, the bishops of the larger cities must have been more opulent than those of the smaller; and in every age of the church—the purest as well as the most corrupt—opulence has always commanded a degree of respect, especially when in the possession of talents and virtue.

There was, however, another and a better motive than this for giving precedency to the bishops of the chief cities. The whole Christian church is, or ought to be, one society or kingdom, united under its divine head, by the profession of the same faith, by the administration of the same sacraments, and by the same government and discipline. In the apostolic age, whoever had the misfortune to be expelled from one particular church, found himself expelled from all particular churches, or, in other words, excommunicated by the church universal; and, by the authority of Christ himself, was reduced to the state of a heathen man or a publican. Hence St. Cyprian says[a]—"Episcopatus unus est, cujus a singulis in solidum pars tenetur:"—and elsewhere, "Idcirco copiosum est sacerdotium concordiæ mutuæ glutino atque unitatis vinculo copulatum, ut siquis ex collegio nostro hæresin facere, et gregem Christi lacerare et vastare tentaverit, subveniant cæteri, et, quasi pastores utiles et misericordes, oves Dominicas in gregem colligant."[b] This is indeed the doctrine of a much greater man than Cyprian. It is the doctrine of the illustrious apostle of the Gentiles, who compares the unity of the church, and the due subordination of its several members, to the unity of the human body, and the adaptation of its members to their respective uses;[c] beseeching Christians "to keep the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace, because, among them, there is but one body and one spirit even as they are called in one hope of their calling, one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in them all."[d] It is the doctrine of a still greater—an infinitely greater personage than St. Paul—even of our Lord himself, who declared, that the whole Christian world was to be "one fold under him the one shepherd," and who, when praying for his immediate followers, added—"Neither pray I for these alone, but for them also who shall believe in me through their word, that they all may be one, as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be one in us; that the world may believe that thou hast sent me."[e]

That this catholic unity might be preserved entire, every bishop elect was obliged, before his ordination, to make a declaration of his faith to the bishops who ordained him, and, immediately after his ordination, to send, by the hands of some confidential clergymen, circular or *encyclical* letters, as they were called, to foreign churches, declaratory of his faith, announcing his promotion to such a see, and professing his communion with the churches to which the letters were sent. If his faith was deemed catholic, and nothing irregular appeared to have taken place in the various steps of his promotion, answers were immediately returned to his letters, approving what had been done, and acknowledging him as a bishop of the catholic church; but, if doubts were excited in the minds of those to whom the encyclical letters were addressed, no answer was returned until proper inquiries were made, and all doubts respecting the faith of the lately consecrated bishop, or the regularity of his promotion, were completely removed. It was thus that Christian communion was maintained between the remotest churches. But had the bishops been, in the modern sense of the word, *parochial*, and therefore as numerous as the various congregations of Christians, which assembled under separate roofs for the celebration of the mysteries of their religion, it is obvious that this salutary process could not have been carried on; the doctrines taught in distant churches must have been unknown to each other; and catholic unity could have been nothing but a name. Even among diocesan bishops, when all of equal rank, such a correspondence must have become so difficult and tedious, after churches were planted in every corner of the empire, that the authors of heresies might, as Cyprian expresses it, have divided and laid waste the flock of Christ, before the bishops at a distance could have stepped in to its assistance; but, by the institution of metropolitans and patriarchs, it became easy and expeditious, as the bishops corresponded with their own metropolitans, the metropolitans with their respective patriarchs, and the patriarchs with each other.

After the conversion of Constantine, the distinctions of rank which had thus been introduced among the bishops of the church, were confirmed by the council of Nice, and modelled according to the precedency that was allowed among the civil provinces into which the empire was divided; but, if such an arrangement was attended by some advantages, it was productive likewise of many evils. It was the parent of those fierce contentions between the

[a] De Unitate Ecclesiæ. [b] Epist. 67. ed. Pamel. 68. ed. Fell.
[c] Rom. xii. 4, 5. 1 Cor. xii. 12. 31. [d] Ephesians iv. 3, 17.
[e] St. John x. 16. xvii. 20, 21.

bishops of Rome and Constantinople for precedency, which disgraced the character of both as the ministers of the meek and lowly Jesus; and, at last, it furnished the former of those prelates with the means of erecting that tyranny, which he so long exercised over the whole western church.

About the æra of the council of Nice, if not at an earlier period, distinctions, unknown in the apostolic age, were introduced likewise among the inferior clergy of the same order. When parochial churches were endowed and provided each with a resident pastor, it was judged expedient to give to the bishop a permanent council, which might supply the place of those presbyters who had hitherto lived with him, but were now removed to their respective cures; and from this appointment may be dated the origin of deans and chapters.

At a very early period there seems to have been, in every church where there were many deacons, one who by the bishop's authority had precedence of the rest; but there is no good evidence that visiting presbyters were any where appointed to offices similar to those of our archdeacons, until the abolition of the order of *chorepiscopi*. That the appointment took place then, is rendered unquestionable by the 57th canon of the council of Laodicea, which substitutes visiting presbyters for those village-bishops, of whom it decreed that no more were to be ordained.

Whether the church acted prudently in all these apparent deviations from primitive simplicity, is a question which we are not called upon to answer; but it is certain that in none of them did she exceed that authority, with which, as an independent society to be spread over the whole world, she must have been invested by her divine lawgiver, to adapt her constitution, as much as possible, to the circumstances in which she might be placed. To this authority St. Paul repeatedly alludes; and if her metropolitans and patriarchs, her deans and chapters, her visiting presbyters and archdeacons, &c., contributed in any degree to the maintenance of order and decency, she had an unquestionable right to appoint them. Her patriarchs and metropolitans, however dignified with titles and outward splendour, derived from Christ, by apostolical succession, no authority which was not equally possessed by every other bishop; the visiting presbyters, though the bishop devolved on them such parts of his authority as presbyters were capable of exercising, were still nothing more than mere presbyters; and an archdeacon, although he had precedence among his brethren, could not administer the Lord's supper, and was therefore inferior to the lowest presbyter in the church.

The authority of the church to decree rites or ceremonies and to make such regulations in the mode of administering her discipline, as are best adapted to produce the effects for which her discipline itself was instituted, are facts which cannot indeed be questioned. When incorporated with the state, her governors may certainly be armed by the civil magistrate with civil rank and civil power; but she has no authority to depart in a single article from the faith which was once delivered to the saints, or to surrender to any man that authority which her bishops derive by succession from the apostles. The church is a kingdom not of this world; and therefore, as she derives not her inherent authority from the potentates of this world, to the potentates of this world she cannot resign that authority. Wherever the faith is maintained in purity, and the episcopal succession preserved, there is a true church, or the elements of a true church: "quando," to use the words of Cyprian, "Ecclesia in episcopo, et clero, et in omnibus stantibus, sit constituta;"[a] and to the efficacious administration of the word and sacraments, it is of no consequence whether the bishop of such a church be a prince, a peer or an obscure pastor; for, as another ancient writer[b] observes, "potestas peccatorum remittendorum apostolis data est, et ecclesiis quas illi a Christo missi constituerunt, et episcopis qui eis ordinatione vicariâ successerunt."

[a] Epist. 27, edit. Pamel.—33, edit. Fell.

[b] Firmilian. inter Cyp. Epistolas, Ep. 75. edit. Pamelii et Fell.

THE SECOND APPENDIX,

BY DR. MACLAINE;

CONCERNING THE SPIRIT AND CONDUCT OF THE FIRST REFORMERS, AND THE CHARGE OF ENTHUSIASM (*i. e.* FANATICISM) THAT HAS BEEN BROUGHT AGAINST THEM BY A CELEBRATED AUTHOR.

The candour and impartiality, with which Dr. Mosheim represents the transactions of those who were agents and instruments in bringing about the Reformation, are highly laudable. He acknowledges that imprudence, passion, and even a low self-interest, mingled sometimes their rash proceedings and ignoble motives in this excellent cause; and, in the very nature of things, it could not be otherwise. It is one of the inevitable consequences of the subordination and connexions of civil society, that many improper instruments and agents are set to work in all great and important revolutions, whether of a religious or political nature. When great men appear in these revolutions, they draw after them their dependents; and the unhappy effects of a party spirit are unavoidably displayed in the best cause. The subjects follow their prince; the multitude adopt the system of their leaders, without entering into its true spirit, or being judiciously attentive to the proper methods of promoting it; and thus irregular proceedings are employed in the maintenance of the truth. Thus it happened in the important revolution that delivered a great part of Europe from the ignominious yoke of the Roman pontiff. The sovereigns, the eccle-

siastics, the men of weight, piety, and learning, who arose to assert the rights of human nature, the cause of genuine Christianity, and the exercise of religious liberty, came forth into the field of controversy with a multitude of dependents, admirers, and friends, whose motives and conduct cannot be entirely justified. Besides, when the eyes of whole nations were opened upon the iniquitous absurdities of popery, and upon the tyranny and insolence of the Roman pontiffs, it was scarcely possible to set bounds to the indignation of an incensed and tumultuous multitude, who are naturally prone to extremes, generally pass from blind submission to lawless ferocity, and too rarely distinguish between the use and abuse of their undoubted rights. In a word, many things, which appear to us extremely irregular in the conduct and measures of some of the instruments of our happy reformation, will be entitled to a certain degree of indulgence, if the spirit of the times, the situation of the contending parties, the barbarous provocations of popery, and the infirmities of human nature, be duly and attentively considered.

The question here is, what was the spirit which animated the first and principal reformers, who arose in times of darkness and despair to deliver oppressed kingdoms from the dominion of Rome, and upon what principles a Luther, a Zuingle, a Calvin, a Melanchthon, a Bucer, &c. embarked in the arduous cause of the Reformation? This question, indeed, is not at all necessary to the defence of the Reformation, which rests upon the strong foundations of Scripture and reason, and whose excellence is absolutely independent of the virtues of those who took the lead in promoting it. Bad men may be, and often are, embarked in the best causes, as such causes afford the most specious mask to cover mercenary views, or to disguise ambitious purposes. But until the more than Jesuitical and disingenuous Philips resumed the trumpet of calumny,[a] even the voice of popery had ceased to attack the moral characters of the leading reformers.

These eminent men were indeed attacked from another quarter, and by a much more respectable writer. The truly ingenious Mr. Hume, so justly celebrated as one of the first favourites of the historic muse, has, in his history of England, and more especially in the history of the houses of Tudor and Stuart, represented the character and temper of the first reformers in a point of view, which undoubtedly shows, that he had not considered them with the close and impartial attention that ought always to precede personal reflections. He has laid it down as a principle, that *superstition* and *enthusiasm* are two species of religion that stand in diametrical opposition to each other; and seems to establish it as a fact, that the former is the genius of popery, and the latter the characteristic of the Reformation. Both the principle and its application must appear extremely singular; and three sorts of persons must be more especially surprised at it.

In the first place, persons of a philosophical turn, who are accustomed to study human nature, and to describe with precision both its regular and eccentric movements, must be surprised to see superstition and fanaticism[b] represented as opposite and jarring qualities. They have been often seen together, holding with each other a most friendly correspondence; and indeed if we consider their nature, and their essential characters, their union will appear, not only possible, but in some cases natural, if not necessary. *Superstition*, which consists in false and abject notions of the Deity, in the gloomy and groundless fears of invisible beings, and in the absurd rites, that these notions and these fears naturally produce, is certainly the root of various branches of fanaticism. For what is *fanaticism*, but the visions, illuminations, impulses, and dreams of an overheated fancy, converted into rules of faith, hope, worship, and practice? This fanaticism, as it springs up in a melancholy or a cheerful complexion, assumes a variety of aspects, and its morose and gloomy forms are certainly most congenial with superstition, in its proper sense. It was probably this consideration that led the author of the article *Fanaticism*, in the famous Dictionnaire Encyclopedique, to define it[c] as "a blind and passionate zeal, which arises from superstitious opinions, and leads its votaries, to commit ridiculous, unjust, and cruel actions, not only without shame, but even with certain internal feelings of joy and comfort;" from which the author concludes, that "fanaticism is really nothing more than superstition set in motion." This definition unites perhaps too closely these two kinds of false religion, whose enormities have furnished very ill-grounded pretexts for discrediting and misrepresenting the true. It is, however, a testimony from one of the pretended oracles of modern philosophy, in favour of the compatibility of fanaticism with superstition. These two principles are evidently distinct; because superstition is, generally speaking, the effect of ignorance, or of a judgment perverted by a sour and splenetic temper; whereas fanaticism is the offspring of an inflamed imagination, and may exist where there is no superstition, *i. e.* where no false or gloomy notions of the divinity are entertained. But, though distinct, they are not opposite principles; on the contrary, they lend on many occasions, some strength and assistance to each other.

If persons accustomed to philosophical precision will not relish the maxim of the celebrated writer which I have been now considering, so neither, in the second place, can those who are versed in ecclesiastical history look upon superstition as a more predominant characteristic of popery than fanaticism; and yet this is a leading idea, which is not only visible in many parts of this author's excellent History, but appears to be the basis of all the reflections he employs, and of all the epithets he uses, in his speculations upon the Romish religion.

And nevertheless it is manifest, that the multitudes of fanatics, which arose in the church of Rome before the Reformation, are truly innumerable; and the operations of fanaticism in that church were, at least, as visible and frequent, as the restless workings of superstition; they went, in short, hand in hand, and united their visions and their terrors in the support of the papacy. It is, more especially, well known, that the greatest part of the mo-

[a] See the various answers that were made to this biographer by the ingenious Mr. Pye, the learned Dr. Neve, and other commendable writers who have appeared in this controversy.

[b] I use the word *fanaticism* here, instead of *enthusiasm*, to prevent all ambiguity; because, as shall be shown presently, Mr. Hume takes *enthusiasm* in its worse sense when he applies it to the reformers; and in that sense it is not only equivalent to, but is perfectly synonymous with, fanaticism. Besides, the latter term is used indiscriminately with enthusiasm, by this celebrated historian, in characterising the Reformation.

[c] The words of the original are, "Le fanatisme est un zele aveugle et passionné, qui nait des opinions superstitieuses, et fait commettre des actions ridicules, injustes et cruelles, non seulement sans honte, mais avec une sorta de joye et de consolation. Le fanatisme donc n'est que la superstition mise en mouvement."

nastic establishments (that alternately insulted the benignity of Providence by their austerities, and abused it by their licentious luxury,) were originally founded in consequence of pretended illuminations, miraculous dreams, and other wild delusions, of an over-heated fancy. Whenever a new doctrine was to be established, that could augment the authority of the pope, or fill the coffers of the clergy; whenever a new convent was to be erected, there was always a vision or a miracle ready to facilitate the business; nor must it be imagined, that forgery and imposture were the only agents in this matter;—by no means; —imposture there was; and it was frequently employed; but impostors made use of fanatics; and in return fanatics found impostors, who spread abroad their fame, and turned their visions to profit. Were I to recount with the utmost simplicity, without the smallest addition of ludicrous embellishment, the ectasies, visions, seraphic amours, celestial apparitions, that are said to have shed such an odour of sanctity upon the male and female saints of the Romish church; were I to pass in review the famous conformities of St. Francis, the illuminations of St. Ignatius, and the enormous cloud of fanatical witnesses that have dishonoured humanity in bearing testimony to popery, this dissertation would become a voluminous history. Let the reader cast an eye upon Dr. Mosheim's account of those ages which more immediately preceded the Reformation, and he will see what a number of sects, *purely fanatical*, arose in the bosom of the Romish church.

But this is not all—for it must be carefully observed, that even those extravagant fanatics, who produced such disorders in Germany about the commencement of the Reformation, were nursed in the bosom of popery, were professed papists before they adopted the cause of Luther; and that many of them even passed directly from popery to fanaticism, without even entering into the outward profession of Lutheranism. It is also to be observed, that beside the fanatics, who exposed themselves to the contempt of the wise upon the public theatre of popery, Seckendorf speaks of a sect that merits this denomination, which had spread in the Netherlands, before Luther raised his voice against popery, and whose members were engaged, by the terror of penal laws, to dissemble their sentiments, and even affected a devout compliance with the ceremonies of the established worship, until religious liberty, introduced by the reformation, encouraged them to pull off the mask, and propagate their opinions, several of which were licentious and profane.

But, in the third place, the friends of the Reformation must naturally be both surprised and displeased to find enthusiasm, or fanaticism, laid down by Mr. Hume, as the character and spirit of its founders and abettors, without any exception or distinction in favour of any one of the reformers. That fanaticism was visible in the conduct and spirit of many who embraced the Reformation, is a fact which I do not pretend to deny; and it may be worthy of the reader's curiosity to consider, for a moment, how this came to pass. That religious liberty, which the Reformation introduced and granted (in consequence of its essential principles) indiscriminately to all, to the learned and unlearned, rendered this eruption of enthusiasm inevitable. It is one of the imperfections annexed to all human things, that our best blessings have their inconveniences, or, at least, are susceptible of abuse. As liberty is a natural right, but not a discerning principle, it could not open the door to truth without letting error and delusion come with it. If reason came forth with dignity, when delivered from the despotism of authority, and the blind servitude of implicit faith; imagination, also set free and less able to bear the prosperous change, came forth likewise, but with a different aspect, and exposed to view the reveries which it had been long obliged to conceal.

Thus many fanatical phantoms were exhibited, which neither arose from the spirit of the Reformation, nor from the principles of the reformers, but which had been engendered in the bosom of popery, and which the fostering rays of liberty had disclosed; similar in this, to the enlivening beams of the sun, which fructify indiscriminately the salutary plant in the well cultivated ground, and the noxious weed in a rank and neglected soil. And as the Reformation had no such miraculous influence (not to speak of the imperfection that attended its infancy, and that has not entirely been removed from its more advanced stages) as to cure human nature of its infirmities and follies, to convert irregular passions into regular principles, or to turn men into angels before the time, it has still left the field open, both for fanaticism and superstition to sow their tares among the good seed; and this will probably be the case until the end of the world. It is here, that we must seek for the true cause of all that condemnable enthusiasm which has dishonoured the Christian name and often troubled the order of civil society, at different periods since the Reformation; and for which the reformation is no more responsible, than a free government is for the weakness or corruption of those who abuse its lenity and indulgence. The Reformation established the sacred and inalienable right of private judgment; but it could not hinder the private judgment of many from being wild and extravagant.

The Reformation, then, which the multiplied enormities of popery rendered so necessary, must be always distinguished from the abuses that might be, and were often made, of the liberty it introduced. If you ask, indeed, what was the temper or spirit of the first heralds of this happy Reformation, Mr. Hume will tell you, that they were universally inflamed with the highest enthusiasm. This assertion, if taken singly, and not compared with other passages relating to the reformers, might be understood in a sense consistent with truth, and even honourable to the character of these eminent men. For, if by enthusiasm we understand that spirit of ardour, intrepidity, and generous zeal, which leads men to brave the most formidable obstacles and dangers in defence of a cause, whose excellence and importance have made a deep impression upon their minds, the first reformers will be allowed by their warmest friends to have been enthusiasts. This species of enthusiasm is a noble affection, when fitly placed and wisely exerted. It is this generous sensibility, this ardent feeling of the great and excellent, that forms heroes and patriots; and, without it, nothing difficult and arduous, that is attended with danger, or prejudice to our temporal interests, can either be attempted with vigour, or executed with success. If this ingenious writer had even observed, that the ardour of the first reformers was more or less violent, that it was more or less blended with the

warmth and vivacity of human passions, candour would be obliged to avow the charge.

But it is not in any of these points of view, that our eminent historian considers the spirit, temper, and enthusiasm of the first reformers. The enthusiasm he attributes to them is fanaticism in its worst sense. He speaks indeed of the 'inflexible intrepidity, with which they braved dangers, torments, and even death itself;' but he calls them 'the fanatical and enraged reformers;' he represents fanaticism, through the whole course of his history, as the characteristic of the protestant religion and its glorious founders: the terms, 'protestant fanaticism—fanatical churches'—are interspersed in various parts of his work; and we never meet with the least appearance of a distinction between the rational and enthusiastic, the wise and indiscreet friends of the Reformation. In short, we find a phraseology constantly employed upon this subject, which discovers an intention to confound protestantism with enthusiasm, and to make *reformers* and *fanatics* synonymous terms. We are told, that, while absurd rites and burthensome superstitions reigned in the Romish church, the reformers were 'thrown, by a spirit of opposition, into an enthusiastic strain of devotion;' and, in another place, that the latter 'placed all merit in a mysterious species of faith, in inward vision, rapture, and ecstasy.' It would be endless to quote the passages in which this representation of things is repeated in a great variety of phrases, and artfully insinuated into the mind of the reader, by dexterous strokes of a seducing pencil; which, though scattered here and there, yet gradually unite their influence on the imagination of an uninstructed and unwary reader, and form, imperceptibly, an unfavourable impression of that great event, to which we owe at this day our civil and religious liberty, and our deliverance from a yoke of superstitious and barbarous despotism. Protestants, in all ages and places, are stigmatised by Mr. Hume with very dishonourable titles; and it struck me particularly to see even the generous opposers of the Spanish inquisition in Holland, whose proceedings were so moderate, and whose complaints were so humble, until the barbarous yoke of superstition and tyranny became intolerable; it struck me, I say, to see these generous patriots branded with the general character of *bigots*. This is certainly a severe appellation; and were it applied with much more equity than it is, I think it would still come with an ill grace from a lover of freedom, from a man who lives and writes with security under the auspicious shade of that very liberty which the Reformation introduced, and for which the Belgic heroes (or *bigots*—if we must call them so) shed their blood. I observe with pain, that the phraseology and mode of expression, employed perpetually by Mr. Hume, on similar occasions, seem to discover a keen dislike of every opposition made to power in favour of the Reformation. Upon the too general principle which this eminent writer has diffused through his history, we shall even be obliged to brand, with the opprobrious mark of fanaticism, those generous friends of civil and religious liberty, who, in the revolution of 1688, opposed the measures of a popish prince and an arbitrary government, and to rank the Burnets, Tillotsons, Stillingfleets, and other immortal ornaments of the protestant name, among the enthusiastic tribe; it is a question, whether even a Boyle, a Newton, or a Locke, will escape a censure which is lavished without mercy and without distinction.—But my present business is with the first reformers, and to them I return.

Those who more especially merit that title were Luther, Zuingle, Calvin, Melancthon, Bucer, Martyr, Bullinger, Beza, Œcolampadius, and others. Now these were *all* men of learning, who came forth into the field of controversy (in which the fate of future ages, with respect to liberty, was to be decided) with a kind of arms that did not at all give them the aspect of persons agitated by the impulse, or seduced by the delusions of fanaticism. They pretended not to be called to the work they undertook by visions, or internal illuminations and impulses;—they never attempted to work miracles, or pleaded a divine commission;—they taught no new religion, nor laid claim to any extraordinary vocation;—they respected government, practised and taught submission to civil rulers, and desired only the liberty of that conscience which God has made free, and which ceases to be conscience if it be not free. They maintained, that the faith of a Christian was to be determined by the word of God alone; they had recourse to reason and argument, to the rules of sound criticism, and to the authority and light of history. They translated the Scriptures into the popular languages of different countries, and appealed to them as the only test of religious truth. They exhorted Christians to judge for themselves, to search the Scriptures, break asunder the bonds of ignorant prejudice and lawless authority, and assert that liberty of conscience to which they had an inalienable right as reasonable beings. Mr. Hume himself acknowledges, that they offered to submit 'all religious doctrines to private judgment, and exhorted every one to examine the principles formerly imposed upon him.' In short, it was their great and avowed purpose to oppose the gross corruptions and the spiritual tyranny of Rome,[a] of which Mr. Hume himself complains with a just indignation, and which he censures in as keen and vehement terms as those which were used by Luther and Calvin in their warmest moments.

I have already insinuated, and I acknowledge it here again, that the zeal of the reformers was sometimes intemperate; but I cannot think this circumstance sufficient to justify the aspersion of *fanaticism*, which is cast both on the spirit of the Reformation, and the principal agents concerned in it. A man may be over-zealous in the advancement of what he supposes to be the true religion, without being entitled to the denomination of a fanatic, unless we depart from the usual sense of this word, which is often enough employed to have acquired, before this time, a determinate signification. The intemperate zeal of the reformers was the result of that ardour, which takes place in all divisions and parties that are founded upon objects of real or supposed importance; and it may be affirmed, that, in such circumstances, the most generous minds, filled with a persuasion of the goodness of their end, and of the uprightness of their intentions, are the most liable to transgress the exact bounds of moderation, and to adopt measures, which, in the calm hour of deliberate reflection, they themselves would not approve. In

[a] See the sensible and judicious Letters on Mr. Hume's History of Great Britain, that were published at Edinburgh in 1756, and in which some points, which I have barely mentioned here, are enlarged upon and illustrated, in an ample and satisfactory manner.

all great divisions, the warmth of natural temper,—the provocation of unjust and violent opposition,—a spirit of sympathy, which connects, in some cases, the most dissimilar characters, renders the mild violent, and the phlegmatic warm ;—and frequently the pride of conquest, which mingles itself, imperceptibly, with the best principles and the most generous views,—produce or nourish an intemperate zeal ; and this zeal is, in some cases, almost inevitable. On the other hand, it may be suspected, that some writers, and Mr. Hume among others, may have given too high colours to their descriptions of this intemperate zeal. There is a passage of Sir Robert Cotton, that has much meaning. "Most men (*says he*) grew to be frozen in zeal and benumbed, so that whosoever pretended a little *spark of earnestness*, seemed no less than red fire hot, in comparison of the other."

Nothing can be more foreign from my temper and sentiments, than to plead the cause of an excessive zeal ; more especially, every kind of zeal that approaches to a spirit of intolerance and persecution ought to be regarded with aversion and horror by all who have at heart the interest of genuine Christianity, and the happiness of civil society. There may be, nevertheless, cases, in which a zeal (not that breathes a spirit of persecution, but) that mounts to a certain degree of intemperance, may be not only inevitable, but useful ; and not only useful but necessary. This assertion I advance almost against my will, because it is susceptible of great and dangerous abuse ; the assertion, however, is true, though the cases must be singularly important and desperate to which such zeal may be applied. It has been observed, that the reformation was one of these cases, and, all things attentively considered, the observation appears to be entirely just ; and the violence of expression and vehement measures employed by some of the reformers *might have been* (I do not say that they *really were*) as much the effect of provident reflection, as of natural fervour and resentment. To a calculating head, which considered closely, in those times of corruption and darkness, the strength of the court of Rome, the luxury and despotism of the pontiffs, the ignorance and licentiousness of the clergy, the superstition and stupidity of the people ; in a word, the deep root which the papacy had gained through all these circumstances combined,—what was the first thought that must naturally have occurred? No doubt, it was this—the improbability that cool philosophy, dispassionate reason, and affectionate remonstrances, would ever triumph over these multiplied and various supports of popery. And, if a calculating head must have judged in this manner, a generous heart, which considered the blessings that must arise upon mankind from religious liberty and a reformation of the church, would naturally be excited to apply even a violent remedy, if that were *necessary*, to remove such a desperate and horrible disease. It would really seem that Luther acted on such a view of things. He began mildly, and did not employ the fire of his zeal, before he saw that it was essential to the success of his cause. Whoever looks into Dr. Mosheim's history, or any other impartial account of the sixteenth century, will find, that Luther's opposition to the infamous traffic of indulgences, was carried on at first in the most submissive strain, by humble remonstrances addressed to the pope, and the most eminent prelates of the church. These remonstrances were answered not only by the despotic voice of authority, but also by opprobrious invectives, perfidious plots against his person, and the terror of penal laws. Even under these he maintained his tranquillity ; and his conduct at the famous diet of Worms, though resolute and steady, was nevertheless both respectful and modest. But, when all moderate measures proved ineffectual, then, indeed, he acted with redoubled vigour, and added a new degree of warmth and impetuosity to his zeal ; and (I repeat it) reflection might have dictated those animated proceedings, which were owing, perhaps, merely to his resentment, and the natural warmth of his temper inflamed by opposition. Certain it is at least, that neither the elegant satires of Erasmus (had he even been a friend to the cause of liberty), nor the timid remonstrances of the gentle Melancthon (who was really such), would ever have been sufficient to bring about a reformation of the church. The former made many *laugh*, the latter made some *reason ;* but neither of the two could make them *act*, or set them in motion. At such a crisis, bold speech and ardent resolution were necessary to produce that happy change in the face of religion, which has crowned with inestimable blessings one part of Europe, and has been productive of many advantages even to the other, which censures it.

As to Calvin, every one, who has any acquaintance with history, knows how he set out in promoting the Reformation. It was by a work composed with a classic elegance of style, and which, though tinctured with the scholastic theology of the times, breathes an uncommon spirit of good sense and moderation. This work was the Institutes of the Christian religion, in which the learned writer shows, that the doctrines of the reformers were founded in Scripture and reason ; and one of the designs of this book was to show, that the reformers ought not to be confounded with certain fanatics, who, about the time of the Reformation, sprang from the bosom of the church of Rome, and excited tumults and commotions in several places. The French monarch (Francis I.) to cover with a specious pretext his barbarous persecution of the friends of the Reformation, and to prevent the resentment of the protestants in Germany, with whom it was his interest to be on good terms, alleged that his severity fell *only* upon a sect of enthusiasts, who, under the title of Anabaptists, substituted their visions in the place of the doctrines and declarations of the Scriptures. To vindicate the reformers from this reproach, Calvin wrote the book now under consideration : and though the theology that reigns in it be chargeable with some defects, yet it is as remote from the spirit and complexion of fanaticism, as any thing can be. Nor indeed is this spirit visible in any of the writings of Calvin that I have perused. His commentary upon the Old and New Testament is a production that will always be esteemed, on account of its elegant simplicity, and the evident marks it bears of an unprejudiced and impartial inquiry into the plain sense of the sacred writings, and of sagacity and penetration in the investigation of it.

If we were to pass in review the writings of the other eminent reformers, whose names have been already mentioned, we should find abundant matter to justify them in the same respect. They were men of letters, and some of them were even men of taste for the age in which they

lived; they cultivated the study of languages, history, and criticism and applied themselves with indefatigable industry to these studies, which, of all others, are the least adapted to excite or nourish a spirit of fanaticism. They had, indeed, their errors and prejudices; nor perhaps were they few in number; but who is free from the same charge? We have ours too, though they may turn on a different set of objects. Their theology savoured somewhat of the pedantry and jargon of the schools;—how could it be otherwise, considering the dismal state of philosophy at that period? The advantages we enjoy above them, give them, at least, a title to our candour and indulgence; perhaps to our gratitude, as the instruments who prepared the way through which these advantages have been conveyed to us. To conclude, let us regret their infirmities; let us reject their errors; let us even condemn any instances of ill-judged severity and violence with which they may have been chargeable; but let us never forget, that, through perils and obstacles almost insurmountable, they opened the path to that religious liberty, which we cannot too highly esteem, nor be too careful to improve to rational and worthy purposes.

THE THIRD APPENDIX.

SOME OBSERVATIONS RELATIVE TO THE PRESENT STATE OF THE REFORMED RELIGION, AND THE INFLUENCE OF IMPROVEMENTS IN PHILOSOPHY AND SCIENCE ON ITS PROPAGATION AND ADVANCEMENT; OCCASIONED BY SOME PASSAGES IN THE PREFACE TO A BOOK, ENTITLED, *THE CONFESSIONAL.*

In one of the notes,[a] which I added to those of Dr. Mosheim, in my translation of his Ecclesiastical History, I observed, that 'the reformed churches were never at such a distance from the spirit and doctrine of the church of Rome as they are at this day;—that the improvements in science, that characterise the last and the present age, seem to render a relapse into Romish superstition morally impossible in those who have been once delivered from its baneful influence: and that, if the dawn of science and philosophy toward the end of the sixteenth, and the commencement of the seventeenth centuries, was favourable to the cause of the Reformation, their progress, which has a kind of influence even upon the multitude, must confirm us in the principles that occasioned our separation from the church of Rome.'

This reasoning did not appear conclusive to the ingenious author of the *Confessional*, who has accordingly made some critical reflections upon it in the preface to that work. However, upon an impartial view of these reflections, I find that this author's excessive apprehensions of the progress of popery have had an undue influence on his method of reasoning on this subject. He supposes that the improvements in science and philosophy, in some popish countries, have been as considerable as in any reformed country; and afterwards asks, 'What intelligence have we from these popish countries of a proportionable progress of religious reformation? Have we no reason to suspect (adds he) that, if an accurate account were to be taken, the balance, in point of conversions, in the *most improved* of these countries, would be greatly against the reformed religion?'

I cannot see how these observations, or rather conjectures, even were they founded in truth and fact, tend to prove my reasoning inconclusive. I observed that the progress of science was adapted to confirm *us* (namely, *Protestants*) in the belief and profession of the reformed religion; and I had here in view, as every one may see, those countries in which the Protestant religion is established; and this author answers me by observing, that the progress of reformation in some popish countries, is not proportionable to the progress of science and philosophy in these countries. This, surely, is no answer at all, since there are in popish countries accidental circumstances, that counteract, in favour of popery, the influence of those improvements in science, which are in direct opposition to its propagation and advancement; circumstances that I shall consider presently, and which do not exist in protestant states. This subject is interesting; and I therefore presume, that some farther thoughts upon it will not be disagreeable to the candid reader.

The sagacious author of the Confessional cannot, I think, seriously call in question the *natural* tendency of improvements in learning and science to strengthen and confirm the cause of the Reformation; for, as the foundations of popery are a blind submission to an usurped authority over the understandings and consciences of men, and an implicit credulity that adopts, without examination, the miracles and visions that derive their existence from the crazy brains of fanatics, or the lucrative artifice of impostors, so it is unquestionably evident, that the progress of sound philosophy, and the spirit of free inquiry it produces, strike directly at these foundations. I say the progress of sound philosophy, that the most inattentive reader may not be tempted to imagine (as the author of the Confessional has been informed,) that 'improvements in philosophy have made many sceptics in all churches reformed and unreformed.' For I am persuaded, that, as true Christianity can never lead to superstition, so true philosophy will never be a guide to infidelity and scepticism. We must not be deceived by the name of philosophers, which some poets and wits have assumed in our days, particularly upon the continent, and which many lavish upon certain subtle refiners in dialectics, who bear a much greater resemblance to overweening sophists, than to real sages. We must not be so far lost to all power of distinguishing as to confound, in one common mass, the philosophy of a Bacon, a Newton, a Boyle, and a Nieuwentyt, with the incoherent views and rhetorical rants of a Bolingbroke, or the flimsy sophistry of a Voltaire; and though candour must

[a] This note was occasioned by my inadvertently mistaking, the true sense of the passage to which it relates. It has since been corrected.

acknowledge, that some men of true learning have been so unhappy as to fall into infidelity, and charity must weep to see a Hume and a D'Alembert joining a set of men who are unworthy of their society, and covering a dark and uncomfortable system with the lustre of their superior talents, yet equity itself may safely affirm, that neither their science nor their genius are the causes of their scepticism.

But if the progress of science and free inquiry have a natural tendency to destroy the foundations of popery, how comes it to pass, that, in popish countries, the progress of religious reform bears no proportion to the progress of science? and how can we account for the ground which popery (if the apprehensions of the author of the Confessional are well founded) gains even in England?

Before I answer the first of these questions, it may be proper to consider the matter of fact, and to examine, for a moment, the state of science and philosophy in popish countries: this examination, if I mistake not, will confirm the theory I have laid down with respect to the influence of philosophical improvement upon true religion. Let us then turn our view first to one of the most considerable countries in Europe, I mean Germany; and here we shall be struck with this undoubted fact, that it is in the Protestant part of this vast region only, that the improvements of science and philosophy appear, while the barbarism of the fifteenth century reigns, as yet, in those districts of the empire which profess the Romish religion. The celebrated M. D'Alembert, in his treatise, entitled, 'de l'Abus de la Critique en Matiere de Religion,' makes the following remarkable observation on this head: "We must acknowledge, though with sorrow, the present superiority of the Protestant universities in Germany over those of the Romish persuasion. This superiority is so striking, that foreigners who travel through the empire, and pass from a Romish college to a Protestant university, even in the same neighbourhood, are induced to think that they have ridden, in an hour, four hundred leagues, or lived, in that short space of time, four hundred years; that they have passed from Salamanca to Cambridge, or from the times of Scotus to those of Newton." Will it be believed (says the same author,) "in succeeding ages, that, in the year 1750, a book was published in one of the principal cities of Europe (Vienna) with the following title: 'Systema Aristotelicum de Formis substantialibus et Accidentibus absolutis, *i. e.* 'The Aristotelian System concerning substantial Forms and absolute Accidents?' Will it not rather be supposed, that this date is an error of the press, and that 1550 is the true reading?" See D'Alembert's Melanges de Literature, d'Histoire, et de Philosophie, vol. iv. p. 376.—This fact seems evidently to show the connexion that subsists between improvements in science, and the free spirit of the reformed religion. The state of letters and philosophy in Italy and Spain, where canon-law, monkish literature, and scholastic metaphysics, have reigned during such a long course of ages, exhibits the same gloomy spectacle. Some rays of philosophical light are now breaking through the cloud in Italy; Boscovich, and some geniuses of the same stamp, have dared to hold up the lamp of science, without feeling the rigour of the Inquisition, or meeting with the fate of Galileo. If this dawning revolution be brought to any degree of perfection, it may, in due time produce effects that at present we have little hope of.

France, indeed, seems to be the country which the author of the Confessional has principally in view, when he speaks of a considerable progress in philosophy in popish states, that has not been attended with a proportionable influence on the reformation of religion. He even imagines that, 'if an account were to be taken, the the balance, in point of conversions, in this most improved of the popish countries, would be greatly against the reformed religion.' The reader will perceive, that I might grant this, without giving up any thing that I maintained in the note which this judicious author censures. I shall, however, examine this notion, that we may see whether it is to be adopted without restriction; and perhaps it may appear, that the improvements in philosophy have had more influence on the spirit of religion in France than this author is willing to allow.

And here I observe, in the first place, that it is no easy matter, either for him or for me, to calculate the number of conversions that are made, on both sides, by priests armed with the secular power, and Protestant ministers, discouraged by the frowns of government, and the terrors of persecution. If we judge of this matter by the external face of things, the calculation may, indeed, be favourable to his hypothesis, since the *apostate Protestant* comes forth to view, and is publicly enrolled in the registers of the church, while the *converted Papist* is obliged to conceal his profession, and to approach the truth, like Nicodemus, secretly and by night. This evident diversity of circumstances, in the respective proselytes, shows that we are not to form our judgment by external appearances, and renders it but equitable to presume, that the progress of knowledge may have produced many examples of the progress of reformation, which do not strike the eye of the public. Is it not, in effect, to be presumed, that if either a toleration, or even an indulgent connivance, were granted to French Protestants, many would appear friends of the Reformation, who, at present, have not sufficient strength of mind to become martyrs, or confessors, in its cause? History informs us of the rapid progress which the Reformation made in France in former times, when a legal toleration was granted to its friends. When this toleration was withdrawn, an immense number of Protestants abandoned their country, their relations, and their fortunes, for the sake of their religion. But when that abominable system of tyranny was set up, which would neither permit the Protestants to profess their religion at home, nor to seek for the enjoyment of religious liberty abroad, and when they were thus reduced to the sad alternative of dissimulation or martyrdom, the courage of many failed, though their persuasion remained the same. In the South of France many continued, and still continue, their profession, even in the face of those booted apostles, who are sent, from time to time, to dragoon them into popery. In other places (particularly in the metropolis, where the empire of the mode, the allurements of court favour, the dread of persecution, unite their influence in favour of popery,) the public profession of protestantism lies under heavy discouragements, and would require a zeal that rises to heroism,—a thing too rare in modern times! In a word, a religion like popery, which forms the main spring in the

political machine, which is doubly armed with allurements and terrors, must damp the fortitude of the feeble friend to truth, and attract the *external* respect even of libertines, free-thinkers, and sceptics.

In the second place, if it should be alleged, that men eminent for learning and genius have adhered *seriously* to the profession of popery, the fact cannot be denied. But what does it prove? It proves only that, in such persons, there are circumstances that counteract the natural influence of learning and science. It cannot be expected that the influence of learning and philosophy will always obtain a complete victory over the attachment to a superstitious church, that is riveted by the early prejudices of education, by impressions formed by the examples of respectable persons who have professed and defended the doctrine of that church, by a habit of veneration for authority, and by numberless associations of ideas, whose combined influence gives a wonderful bias to the mind, and renders the impartial pursuit of truth extremely difficult. Thus knowledge is acquired with an express design to strengthen previous impressions and prejudices. Thus many make considerable improvements in science, who have never once ventured to review their *religious* principles, or to examine the authority on which they have been taken up.

Others observe egregious abuses in the Romish church, and are satisfied with rejecting them in secret, without thinking them sufficient to justify a separation. This class is extremely numerous; and it cannot be said that the improvements in science have had no effect upon their religious sentiments. They are neither thorough Papists nor entire Protestants; but they are manifestly verging toward the Reformation.

Nearly allied to this class is another set of men, whose case is singular and worthy of attention. Even in the bosom of the Romish church, they have tolerably just notions of the sublime simplicity and genuine beauty of the Christian religion; but, either from false reasonings upon human nature, or an observation of the powerful impressions that authority makes upon the credulity, and a pompous ritual upon the senses of the multitude, imagine that Christianity, in its native form, is too pure and elevated for vulgar souls, and therefore countenance and maintain the absurdities of popery, from a notion of their utility. Those who conversed intimately with the sublime Fenelon, archbishop of Cambray, have declared, that such was the nature of his sentiments with respect to the public religion of his country.

To all this I may add, that a notion of the necessity of a visible universal church, and of a visible centre or bond of union, has led many to adhere to the papacy (considered in this light,) who look upon some of the principal and fundamental doctrines of the Romish church as erroneous and extravagant. Such is the case of the learned and worthy Dr. Courayer, whose unshaken fortitude in declaring his sentiments obliged him to seek an asylum in England; and who, notwithstanding his persuasion of the absurdities which abound in the church of Rome, has never totally separated himself from its communion; and such is known to be the case with many men of learning and piety in that church. Thus it happens, that particular and accidental circumstances counteract, in favour of popery, the natural effects of improvements in learning and philosophy, which have their full and proper influence in Protestant countries, where any thing that resembles these circumstances is directly in favour of the reformed religion.

But I beg that it may be attentively observed, in the third place, that, notwithstanding all these particular and accidental obstacles to the progress of the Reformation among men of knowledge and letters, its spirit has, in fact, gained more ground than the ingenious author of the Confessional seems to imagine. I think it must be allowed, that every branch of superstition that is retrenched from popery, as well as every portion of authority that is taken from its pontiff, is a real gain to the cause of the Reformation; and, though it does not render that cause absolutely triumphant, yet prepares the way for its progress and advancement. Now (in this point of view,) I am persuaded it will appear that, for twenty or thirty years past, the Reformation, or at least its spirit, has rather gained than lost ground in Roman catholic states. In several countries, and more particularly in France, many of the gross abuses of popery have been corrected. We have seen the saintly legend, in many places, deprived of its fairest honours. We have seen a mortal blow given in France to the absolute power of the pope. What is still more surprising, we have seen, even in Spain and Portugal, the display of a spirit of opposition to the pretended infallible ruler of the church. We have seen the very order, that has been always considered as the chief support of the papacy, the order of the Jesuits, the fundamental characteristic of whose institute is an inviolable obligation to extend, beyond all limits, the despotic authority of the pontiffs; we have seen, I say, that order suppressed, banished, covered with deserved infamy, in three powerful kingdoms;[a] and we see, at this moment, their credit declining in other Roman catholic states. We see, in several popish countries, and more especially in France, the Scriptures more generally in the hands of the people than in former times. We have seen the senate of Venice, not many months ago, suppressing, by an express edict,[b] the officers of the inquisition in all the small towns, reducing their power to a shadow in the larger cities, extending the liberty of the press; and all this in a steady opposition to the repeated remonstrances of the court of Rome. These, and many other facts that might be collected here, facts of a recent date, show that the essential spirit of popery, which is a spirit of unlimited despotism in the pretended head of the church, and a spirit of blind submission and superstition in its members, is rather losing than gaining ground, even in those countries that still profess the religion of Rome.

If this be the case, it would seem, indeed, very strange, that popery, which is losing ground at home, should be gaining it abroad, and acquiring new strength, as some imagine, even in Protestant countries. This, at first sight, must appear a paradox of the most enormous size; and it is to be hoped that it will continue to appear such, upon the closest examination.—While the spirit and vigour of popery are actually declining on the continent, I would fondly hope, that the apprehensions of some worthy persons, with respect to its progress in England, are without foundation. To account for the growth of popery in an

[a] France, Spain, and Portugal.

[b] This edict was issued in the month of February, 1767.

age of light would be incumbent upon me, if the *fact* were true. Until this fact be *proved*, I may be excused from undertaking such a task. The famous story of the golden tooth, that employed the laborious researches of physicians, chemists, and philosophers, stands upon record, as a warning to those who are over-hasty to account for a thing which has no existence. My distance from England, during many years past, renders me, indeed, less capable of judging of the state of popery, than those who are upon the spot: I shall therefore confine myself to a few reflections upon this interesting subject.

When it is said that popery gains ground in England, one of the two following things must be meant by this expression: either that the spirit of the established, and other reformed churches, is leaning that way; or that a number of individuals are made proselytes, by the seduction of popish emissaries, to the Romish communion. With respect to the established church, I think that a candid and accurate observer must vindicate it from the charge of a spirit of approximation to Rome. We do not live in the days of a Laud; nor do his successors seem to have imbibed his spirit. I do not hear that the claims of church-power are carried high in the present times, or that a spirit of intolerance characterises the episcopal hierarchy; and though it may be wished, that the case of subscription might be made easier to good and learned men, whose scruples deserve indulgence, and be better accommodated to what is known to be the reigning theology among the episcopal clergy, yet it is straining matters too far to allege the demand of subscription as a proof that the established church is verging toward popery. As to the Protestant dissenting churches in England and Ireland, they stand so avowedly clear of all imputations of this nature, that it is utterly unnecessary to vindicate them on this head. If any thing of this kind is to be apprehended from any quarter within the pale of the Reformation, it is from the quarter of fanaticism, which, by discrediting free inquiry, crying down human learning, and encouraging those pretended illuminations and impulses which give imagination an undue ascendency in religion, lays weak minds open to the seductions of a church, which has always made its conquests by wild visions and false miracles, addressed to the passions and fancies of men. Cry down reason, preach up implicit faith, extinguish the lamp of free inquiry, make inward experience the test of truth; and then the main barriers against popery will be removed. Persons who follow this method possibly *may* continue Protestants; but there is no security against their becoming Papists, if the occasion is presented. Were they placed in a scene where artful priests and enthusiastic monks could play their engines of conversion, their Protestant faith would be very likely to fail.

If by the supposed growth of popery be meant, the success of the Romish emissaries in making proselytes to their communion, here again the question turns upon a matter of fact, upon which I cannot venture to pronounce. There is no doubt that the Romish hierarchy carries on its operations under the shade of an indulgent connivance; and it is to be feared that its members are '*wiser* (i. e. more artful and zealous) in their generation than the children of light.' The establishment of the Protestant religion inspires, it is to be feared, an indolent security into the hearts of its friends. Ease and negligence are the fruits of prosperity; and this maxim even extends to religion. It is not unusual to see a victorious general sleep upon his laurels, and thus give advantage to an enemy, whom adversity renders vigilant. All good and true Protestants will heartily wish that this were otherwise. They will be sincerely afflicted at any decline that may happen in the zeal and vigilance that ought ever to be employed against popery and its emissaries, since they can never cease to consider it as a system of wretched superstition and political despotism, and must particularly look upon popery in the British isles as pregnant with the principles of disaffection and rebellion, and as at invariable enmity with our religious liberty and our happy civil constitution. But still there is reason to hope, that it makes very little progress, notwithstanding the apprehensions that have been entertained on this subject. The insidious publications of a Taafe and a Philips, who abuse the terms of charity, philanthropy, and humanity, in their flimsy apologies for a church whose *tender mercies* are known to be *cruel*, have alarmed many well-meaning persons. But it is much more wise, as well as noble, to be vigilant and steady against the enemy, than to take the alarm at the smallest of his motions, and to fall into a panic, as if we were conscious of our weakness. Be that as it will, I return to my first principle, and am still persuaded, that the Protestant church, and its prevailing spirit, are, at this present time, as averse to popery, as they were at any period since the Reformation, and that the thriving state of learning and philosophy, is adapted to confirm them in this well-founded aversion. Should it even be granted that proselytes to popery have been made, among the ignorant and unwary, by the emissaries of Rome, this would by no means invalidate what I here maintain, though it may justly be considered as a powerful incentive to the zeal and vigilance of rulers temporal and spiritual, of the pastors and people of the reformed churches, against the encroachments of Rome.

The author of the Confessional complains, and perhaps justly, of the bold and public appearance which popery has of late made in England. "The papists (*says he*) strengthened and animated by an influx of Jesuits, expelled even from popish countries for crimes and practices of the worst complexion, open public mass-houses, and affront the laws of this Protestant kingdom in other respects, not without insulting some of those who endeavour to check their insolence. And we are told, with the utmost coolness and composure, that popish bishops go about here, and exercise every part of their function, without offence, and without observation." This, is, indeed, a circumstance that the friends of reformation and religious liberty cannot behold without offence: I say, the friends of religious liberty; because the maintenance of all liberty, both civil and religious, depends on circumscribing popery within proper bounds, since it is not a system of *innocent* speculative opinions, but a yoke of despotism, an enormous mixture of princely and priestly tyranny, designed to enslave the consciences of mankind, and to destroy their most sacred and invaluable rights. But, at the same time, I do not think we can, from this public appearance of popery, rationally conclude that it gains ground, much less (as the author of the Confessional suggests,) 'that the two hierarchies (i. e. the episcopal and the popish) are growing daily more and more into a resemblance of each other.'

The natural reason of this bold appearance of popery is the spirit of toleration, that has been carried to a great height, and has rendered the execution of the laws against papists, in recent times, less rigorous and severe.

How it may be proper to act with regard to the growing insolence of popery, is a matter that must be left to the wisdom and clemency of government. Rigour against any thing that bears the name of *religion*, gives pain to a candid and generous mind; and it is certainly more eligible to extend too far, than to circumscribe too narrowly, the bounds of forbearance and indulgent charity.

If the dangerous tendency of popery, considered as a pernicious system of policy, should be pleaded as a sufficient reason to except it from the indulgence due to *merely speculative* systems of theology;—if the voice of history should be appealed to, as declaring the assassinations, rebellions, conspiracies, the horrid scenes of carnage and desolation, that popery has produced;—if standing principles and maxims of the Romish church should be quoted, which authorize these enormities;—if it should be alleged, finally, that popery is much more malignant and dangerous in Great Britain than in any other Protestant country;—I acknowledge that all these pleas against it are well-founded, and plead for modifications to the connivance which the clemency of government may think proper to grant to that unfriendly system of religion. All I wish is, that mercy and humanity may ever accompany the execution of justice, and that nothing like *merely religious* persecution may stain the British annals; and all I maintain with respect to the chief point under consideration is, that the public appearance of popery, which is justly complained of, is no *certain* proof of its growth, but rather shows its indiscretion than its strength, and the declining vigour of *our* zeal than the growing influence of *its* maxims.

THE FOURTH APPENDIX.

A CIRCUMSTANTIAL AND EXACT ACCOUNT OF THE CORRESPONDENCE THAT WAS CARRIED ON, IN THE YEARS 1717 AND 1718, BETWEEN DR. WILLIAM WAKE, ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY, AND CERTAIN DOCTORS OF THE SORBONNE AT PARIS, RELATIVE TO A PROJECT OF UNION BETWEEN THE ENGLISH AND GALLICAN CHURCHES.

——Magis amica veritas.

When the famous Bossuet, bishop of Meaux, laid an insidious snare for unthinking Protestants, in his artful Exposition of the Doctrine of the Church of Rome, the pious and learned Dr. Wake unmasked this deceiver; and the writings he published on this occasion gave him a distinguished rank among the victorious champions of the Protestant cause. Should any person, who had perused these writings, be informed, that this 'pretended champion of the Protestant religion had set on foot a project of union with a popish church, with concessions in favour of the grossest superstition and idolatry,'[a] he would be apt to stare; at least he would require the strongest possible evidence for a fact, in all appearance so contradictory and unaccountable. This accusation has, nevertheless, been brought against the eminent prelate, by the ingenious and intrepid author of the Confessional; and it is founded upon an extraordinary passage in Dr. Mosheim's Ecclesiastical History; where we are told, that Dr. Wake 'formed a project of peace and union between the English and Gallican churches, founded upon this condition, that each of the two communities should retain the greatest part of their respective and peculiar doctrines.'[b] This passage,

[a] See the Confessional, 2d edition, *Pref.* p. lxxvi.

[b] Dr. Mosheim had certainly a very imperfect idea of this correspondence; and he seems to have been misled by the account of it, which Kiorning has given in his dissertation De Consecrationibus Episcoporum Anglorum, published at Helmstadt in 1739; which account, notwithstanding the means of information its author seemed to have by his journey to England, and his conversations with Dr. Courayer, is full of mistakes. Thus Kiorning tells us, that Dr. Wake submitted to the judgment of the Romish doctors, his correspondents, the conditions of peace between the two churches, which *he* had drawn up;—that he sent a learned man (Dr. Wilkins, his chaplain) to Paris, to forward and complete, if possible, the projected union;—that, in a certain assembly holden at Paris, the difficulties of promoting this union without the pope's concurrence were insisted upon by some men of high rank, who seemed inclined to the union, and that these difficulties put an end to the conferences;—that, however, two French divines (whom he supposes to be Du-Pin and Girardin) were sent to England to propose new terms. It now happens unluckily for Mr. Kiorning's reputation as an historian, that not one syllable of all this is true, as will appear sufficiently to the reader, who peruses with attention the account and the pieces which I here lay before the public.—But one of the most egregious errors in the account given by Kiorning, is at page 61 of his Dissertation, where he says, that archbishop Wake was so much elated with the prospect of success in the scheme of an accommodation that he acquainted the divines of Geneva with it in 1719, and plainly intimated to them, that he thought it an easier thing than reconciling the Protestants with each other.—Let us now see where Kiorning received this information.—Why, truly, it was from a letter of Dr. Wake to Professor Turretin of Geneva, in which there is not one syllable relative to a scheme of union between the English and Gallican churches; and yet Kiorning quotes a passage in this letter as the only authority he has for this affirmation. The case was this: Dr. Wake, in the former part of his letter to Turretin, speaks of the sufferings of the Hungarian and Piedmontese churches, which he had successfully endeavoured to alleviate, by engaging George I. to intercede in their behalf; and then proceeds to express his desire of healing the differences that disturbed the union of the Protestant churches abroad. 'Interim (says he) dum hæc (i. e. the endeavours to relieve the Hungarian and Piedemontese churches) feliciter peraguntur, ignoscite, Fratres Dilectissimi, si majoris quidem laboris atque difficultatis, sed longè maximi omnibus commodi inceptum vobis proponam; unionem nimirùm, &c.' Professor Turretin, in his work entitled, Nubes Testium, printed only the latter part of Dr. Wake's letter, beginning with the words, 'Interim, &c.' and Kiorning, not having seen the preceding part of this letter, which relates to the Hungarian and Piedmontese churches, and with which these words are connected, took it into his head that these words were relative to the scheme of union between the English and Gallican churches. Nor did he only take this into his head by way of conjecture, but he affirms, very sturdily and positively, that the words have this signification: 'Hæc verba (says he) tangunt pacis cum Gallis instaurandæ negotium, quod ex temporum rationibus manifestum est.' To show him, however, that he grossly errs, I have published among the annexed pieces (No. XX.) the *whole* letter of archbishop Wake to Turretin.

though it is, perhaps, too uncharitably interpreted by the author already mentioned, would furnish, without doubt, just matter of censure, were it founded in truth. I was both surprised and perplexed while I was translating it. I could not immediately procure proper information with respect to the fact, nor could I examine Mosheim's proofs of this strange assertion, because he alleged none. Destitute of materials, either to invalidate or confirm the fact, I made a slight mention, in a short note, of a correspondence which had been carried on between archbishop Wake and Dr. Du-Pin, with the particulars of which I was not acquainted; and, in this my ignorance, only made a general observation, drawn from Dr. Wake's known zeal for the Protestant religion, which was designed, not to confirm that assertion, but rather to insinuate my disbelief of it. It never could come into my head, that the interests of the Protestant religion would have been safe in archbishop Wake's hands, had I given the smallest degree of credit to Dr. Mosheim's assertion, or even suspected that this eminent prelate was inclined to form a union between the English and Gallican churches, 'founded on this condition, that each of the two communities should retain the greatest part of their respective and peculiar doctrines.'

If the author of the Confessional had given a little more attention to this, he could not have represented me, as confirming the fact alleged by Mosheim, much less as giving it what he is pleased to call the *sanction* of my approbation. I did not confirm the fact; for I only said there was a correspondence on the subject, without speaking a syllable of the unpleasing *condition* that forms the charge against Dr. Wake. I shall not enter here into a debate about the grammatical import of my expressions, as I have something more interesting to present to the reader, who is curious of information about archbishop Wake's *real* conduct in relation to the correspondence already mentioned. I have been favoured with authentic copies of the letters which passed in this correspondence, which are now in the hands of Mr. Beauvoir of Canterbury, the worthy son of the clergyman who was chaplain to lord Stair in the year 1717, and also with others, from the valuable collection of manuscripts left by Dr. Wake to the library of Christ-Church College in Oxford. It is from these letters that I have drawn the following account, at the end of which copies of them are printed, to serve as proofs of the truth of this relation, which I publish with a disinterested regard to truth. This impartiality may be, in some measure, expected from my situation in life, which has placed me at a distance from the scenes of religious and ecclesiastical contention in England, and cut me off from those personal connexions, that nourish the prejudices of a party spirit, more than many are aware of; but it would be still more expected from my principles, were they known.

From this narrative, confirmed by authentic papers, it will appear with the utmost evidence,

1st, That archbishop Wake was not the *first mover* in this correspondence, nor the person who formed the project of union between the English and Gallican churches.

2dly, That he never made any concessions, nor offered to give up, for the sake of peace, any one point of the established doctrine and discipline of the church of England, in order to promote this union.

3dly, That any desires of union with the church of Rome, expressed in the archbishop's letters, proceeded from the hopes (well founded, or illusory, is not my business to examine here) that he at first entertained of a considerable reformation in that church, and from an expectation that its most absurd doctrines would fall to the ground, if they could once be deprived of their great support, the papal authority;—the destruction of which authority was the very basis of this correspondence.

It will farther appear, that Dr. Wake considered union in external worship, as one of the best methods of healing the uncharitable dissensions that are often occasioned by a variety of sentiments in point of doctrine, in which a perfect uniformity is not to be expected. This is undoubtedly a wise principle, when it is not carried too far; and whether or no it was carried too far by this eminent prelate, the candid reader is left to judge from the following relation:

In the month of November, 1717, archbishop Wake wrote a letter to Mr. Beauvoir, chaplain to the earl of Stair, then ambassador at Paris, in which his grace acknowledges the receipt of several obliging letters from Mr. Beauvoir. This is manifestly the first letter which the prelate wrote to that gentleman, and the whole contents of it are matters of a literary nature.[a] In answer to this letter, Mr. Beauvoir, in one dated the eleventh of December, 1717, O. S. gives the archbishop the information he desired, about the method of subscribing to a new edition of St. Chrysostom, which was at that time in the press at Paris, and then mentions his having dined with Du-Pin, and three other doctors of the Sorbonne, who talked as if the whole kingdom of France was to appeal (in the affair of the Bull *Unigenitus*) to a future general council, and who 'wished for a union with the church of England, as the most effectual means to unite all the western churches.' Mr. Beauvoir adds, that Dr. Du-Pin had desired him to give his duty to the archbishop.[b] Here

[a] The perusal of this letter (which the reader will find among the pieces here subjoined, No. I.) is sufficient to remove the suspicions of the author of the Confessional, who seems inclined to believe, that archbishop Wake was the first mover in the project of uniting the English and Gallican churches. This author, having mentioned Mr. Beauvoir's letter, in which Du-Pin's desire of this union is communicated to the archbishop, asks the following question: 'Can any man be certain that Beauvoir mentioned this merely out of his own head, and without some previous occasion given, in the archbishop's letter to him, for such a conversation with the Sorbonne doctors?' I answer to this question, that every one who reads the archbishop's letter of the 28th of November, to which this letter of Mr. Beauvoir is an answer, may be *very certain* that Dr. Wake's letter did not give him the least occasion for such a conversation, but relates entirely to the Benedictine edition of St. Chrysostom, Martenne's Thesaurus Anecdotorum, and Moreri's Dictionary. 'But, says our author, *there is an &c.* in this copy of Mr. Beauvoir's letter, very suspiciously placed, as if to cover something improper to be disclosed.'* But really if any thing was covered here, it was covered from the archbishop as well as from the public, since the very name, *&c.* that we see in the printed copy of Mr. Beauvoir's letter, stands in the original. Besides, I would be glad to know, what there is in the placing of this, *&c.* that can give rise to suspicion? The passage of Beauvoir's letter runs thus: 'They (the Sorbonne doctors) talked as if the whole kingdom was to appeal to the future general council, &c. They wished for a union with the church of England, as the most effectual means to unite all the Western churches.' It is palpably evident, that the *&c.* here has not the least relation to the union, in question, and gives no sort of reason to *suspect* any thing but the spirit of discontent, which the insolent proceedings of the court of Rome had excited among the French divines.

[b] See the Letters subjoined, No. II.

* The other reflections that the author has there made upon the correspondence between archbishop Wake and the doctors of the Sorbonne are examined in the following note.

we see a first hint, the very first overture that was made relative to a project of union between the English and Gallican churches; and this hint comes *originally* from the doctors of the *Sorbonne*, and is not occasioned by any thing contained in preceding letters from archbishop Wake to Mr. Beauvoir, since the one only letter, which Mr. Beauvoir had hitherto received from that eminent prelate, was entirely taken up in inquiries about some new editions of books that were then publishing at Paris.

Upon this the archbishop wrote a letter to Mr. Beauvoir, in which he makes honourable mention of Du-Pin as an author of merit, and expresses his desire of serving him, with that benevolent politeness which reigns in our learned prelate's letters, and seems to have been a striking line in his amiable character.[a] Dr. Du-Pin improved this favourable occasion of writing to the archbishop a letter of thanks, dated January 31, (February 11, N. S.) 1717-18; in which, toward the conclusion, he intimates his desire of a union between the English and Gallican churches, and observes, that the difference between them, in most points, was not so great as to render a reconciliation impracticable; and that it was his earnest wish, that all Christians should be united in one sheepfold. His words are: 'Unum addam cum bonâ veniâ tuâ, me vehementer optare, ut unionis inter Ecclesias Anglicanam et Gallicanam ineundæ via aliqua inveniri posset: non ita sumus ab invicem in plerisque dissiti, ut non possimus mutuo reconciliari. Atque utinam Christiani omnes essent unum ovile.' The archbishop wrote an answer to this letter, dated February 13-24, 1717-18, in which he asserts, at large, the purity of the church of England, in faith, worship, government, and discipline, and tells his correspondent, that he is persuaded that there are few things in the doctrine and constitution of that church, which even he himself (Du-Pin) would desire to see changed; the original words are: 'Aut ego vehementer fallor, aut in eâ pauca admodum sunt, quæ vel tu—immutanda velles;' and again, 'Sincere judica, quid in hac nostrâ ecclesiâ invenias, quod jure damnari debeat, aut nos atrâ hæreticorum, vel etiam schismaticorum, notâ inurere.' The zeal of the venerable prelate goes still farther; and the moderate sentiments which he observed in Dr. Du-Pin's letter induced him to exhort the French to maintain, if not to enlarge, the rights and privileges of the Gallican church, for which the existing disputes, about the constitution *Unigenitus*, furnished the most favourable occasion. He also expresses his readiness to concur in improving any opportunity, that might be offered by these debates, to form a union that might

[a] This 'handsome mention' of Dr. Du-Pin, made by the archbishop, gives new subject of suspicion to the author of the *Confessional*. He had learned the fact from the article Wake, in the Biographia Britannica; 'but, says he, we are left to guess what this handsome mention was;—had the biographer given us this letter, together with that of November 27, they might probably (it would have been more accurate to have said *possibly*,) have discovered what the biographer did not want we should know, namely, the share Dr. Wake had in forming the project of a union between the two churches.' This is guessing with a witness:—and it is hard to imagine how the boldest calculator of probabilities could conclude from Dr. Wake's *handsome mention* of Dr. Du-Pin, that the former had a *share*, of any kind, in *forming* the project of union now under consideration. For the ingenious guesser happens to be quite mistaken in his conjecture; and I hope to convince him of this, by satisfying his desire. He desires the letter of the 27th (or rather the 28th) of November; I have referred to it in the preceding note, and he may read it at the end of this account. He desires the letter in which handsome mention is made of Du-Pin; and I can assure him, that in that letter there is not a single syllable relative to a union. The passage that regards Dr. Du-Pin is as follows: I am much obliged to you (says Dr. Wake, in his letter to Mr. Beauvoir, dated January 2, 1717-18) for making my name known to Dr. Du-Pin. He is a gentleman by whose labours I have profited these many years; and I do really admire how it is possible for one man to publish so much, and yet so correctly, as he has generally done. I desire my respects to him; and that, if there be any thing here whereby I may be serviceable to him, he will freely command me.' Such was the archbishop's handsome mention of Du-Pin; and it evidently shows that, till then, there never had been any communication between them. Yet these are all the proofs which the author of the Confessional gives of the probability that the archbishop was the first mover in this affair.

But 'his grace accepted the party, a formal treaty commences, and is carried on in a correspondence of some length,' says the author of the Confessional. And I would candidly ask that author, upon what principles of Christianity, reason, or charity, Dr. Wake could have refused to hear the proposals, terms, and sentiments of the Sorbonne doctors, who discovered an inclination to unite with his church? The author of the Confessional says elsewhere, 'that it was, at the best, officious and presumptuous in Dr. Wake to enter into a negotiation of this nature, without authority from the church or the government.' But the truth is, that he entered into no negotiation or treaty on this head; he considered the letters that were written on both sides as a personal correspondence between individuals, who could not commence a negotiation, until they had received the proper powers from their respective sovereigns; and I do think he was greatly in the right to enter into this correspondence, as it seemed very likely, in the *then* circumstances of the Gallican church, to serve the Protestant interest and the cause of reformation. If, indeed, in the course of this correspondence, he had discovered any thing like what Mosheim imputes to him, even a disposition toward a union, founded upon the condition that each of the two churches should retain the greatest part of their respective and peculiar doctrines, I should think his conduct liable to censure. But no such thing appears in his letters, which I have subjoined to this account, that the candid examiner may receive full satisfaction in this affair. Mosheim's mistake is palpable, and the author of the Confessional seems certainly to have been too hasty in adopting it. He alleges, that Dr. Wake might have maintained the justice and orthodoxy of every individual article of the church of England, and yet 'give up some of them for the sake of peace.' But the archbishop expressly declares, in his letters, that he would give up none of them, and that, though he was a friend to peace, he was still a greater friend to truth. The author's reflection, that, without some concessions on the part of the archbishop, the treaty could not have gone a step farther, may be questioned in theory; for treaties are often carried on for a long time without concessions on both sides, or perhaps on either; and the archbishop might hope that Du-Pin, who had yielded several things, would still yield more; but this remark is overturned by the plain fact. Besides, I repeat what I have already insinuated, that this *correspondence* does not deserve the name of a *treaty*.* Proposals were made only on Du-Pin's side; and these proposals were positively rejected by the archbishop, in his letters to Mr. Beauvoir. Nor did he propose any thing in return to either of the Sorbonne doctors, but that they should entirely renounce the authority of the pope, hoping, though perhaps too fancifully, that, when this was done, the two churches might come to an agreement about other matters, as far as was necessary. But the author of the Confessional supposes, that the archbishop must have made some concessions, because the letters on both sides were sent to Rome, and received there as 'so many trophies gained from the enemies of the church.' This supposition, however, is somewhat hasty. Could nothing but concessions from the archbishop make the court of Rome consider those letters in that light? Would they not think it a great triumph, that they had obliged Du-Pin's party to give up the letters as a token of their submission, and defeated the archbishop's design of engaging the Gallican church to assert its liberty, by throwing off the papal yoke? If Dr. Wake made concessions, where are they? And if these were the trophies, why did not the partisans of Rome publish authentic copies of them to the world? Did the author of the Confessional ever hear of a victorious general, who carefully hid under ground the standards he had taken from the enemy? This, indeed, is a new method of dealing with trophies. Our author, however, does not, as yet, quit his hold; he alleges, that the French divines could not have acknowledged the *catholic benevolence* of the archbishop, if he made no concessions to them. This reasoning would be plausible, if charity toward those who err consisted in embracing their errors; but this is a definition of charity, that, I fancy, the ingenious author will give up, upon second thoughts. Dr. Wake's catholic benevolence consisted in his esteem for the merit and learning of his correspondents, in his compassion for their servitude and their errors, in his desire of the reformation and liberty of their church, and his inclination to live in friendship and concord, as far as was possible, with all that bear the Christian name; and this disposition, so suitable to the benevolent genius of Christianity, will always reflect a true and solid glory upon his character as a Christian bishop.

* See post, note [a] and the letters subjoined, No. XI.

be productive of a farther reformation, in which, not only the most rational Protestants, but also a considerable number of the Roman catholic churches, should join with the church of England; 'si exhinc (says the archbishop, speaking of the recent commotions excited by the Constitution) aliquid amplius elici possit ad unionem nobiscum ecclesiasticum ineundam; unde forte nova quædam reformatio exoriatur, in quam non solum ex Protestantibus optimi quique, verum etiam pars magna ecclesiarum Communionis Romano-Catholicæ, unà nobiscum conveniant.'

Hitherto we see, that the expressions of the two learned doctors of the English and Gallican churches, relating to the union under consideration, are of a vague and general nature. When they were thus far advanced in their correspondence, an event happened, which rendered it more close, serious, and interesting, and even brought on some particular mention of preliminary terms, and certain preparatives for a future negotiation. The event I mean, was a discourse delivered, in an extraordinary meeting of the Sorbonne, March 17-28, 1717-18, by Dr. Patrick Piers de Girardin, in which he exhorts the doctors of that society to proceed in their design of revising the doctrines and rules of the church, to separate things necessary from those which are not so, by which they will show the church of England that they do not hold every decision of the pope for an article of faith. The learned orator observes farther (upon what foundation it is difficult to guess,) that the English church may be more easily reconciled than the Greek was; and that the disputes between the Gallican church and the court of Rome, removing the apprehensions of papal tyranny, which terrified the English from the Catholic communion, will lead them back into the bosom of the church, with greater celerity than they formerly fled from it: 'Facient (says he) profecto offensiones, quæ vos inter et senatum Capitolinum videntur intervenisse, ut Angli deposito servitutis metu, in ecclesiæ gremium revolent alacrius quam olim inde, quorundam exosi tyrannidem, avolârunt. Meministis ortas inter Paulum et Barnabam dissensiones animorum tandem eo recidisse, ut singuli propagandæ in diversis regionibus fidei felicius insudaverint sigillatim, quam junctis viribus fortasse insudâssent.' This last sentence (in which Dr. Girardin observes, that Paul and Barnabas probably made more converts in consequence of their separation, than they would have done had they travelled together, and acted in concert,) is not a little remarkable; and, indeed, the whole passage discovers rather a desire of making proselytes, than an inclination to form a coalition founded upon concessions and some reformation on the side of popery. It may, perhaps, be alleged, in opposition to this remark, that prudence required a language of this kind, in the infancy of a project of union, whatever concessions might be offered afterwards to bring about its execution; and this may be true.

After the delivery of this discourse in the Sorbonne, Dr. Du-Pin showed to Girardin archbishop Wake's letter, which was also communicated to cardinal de Noailles, who admired it greatly, as appears from a letter of Dr. Piers de Girardin to Dr. Wake, written, I believe, April 18-29, 1718. Before the arrival of this letter the archbishop had received a second from Dr. Du-Pin, and also a copy of Girardin's discourse. But he does not seem to have entertained any notion, in consequence of all this, that the projected union would go on smoothly. On the contrary, he no sooner received these letters, than he wrote to Mr. Beauvoir (April 15, 1718,) that it was his opinion, that neither the regent nor the cardinal would ever come to a rupture with the court of Rome; and that nothing could be done, in point of doctrine, until this rupture was brought about. He added, that fundamentals should be distinguished from matters of less moment, in which differences or errors might be tolerated. He expresses a curiosity to know the reception which his former letter to Du-Pin had met with; and he wrote again to that ecclesiastic, and also to Girardin (May 1, 1718,) and sent both his letters toward the end of that month.

The doctors of the Sorbonne, whether they were set in motion by the real desire of a union with the English church, or only intended to make use of this union as the means of intimidating the court of Rome, began to form a plan of reconciliation, and to specify the terms upon which they were willing to bring it into execution. Mr. Beauvoir acquaints the archbishop, in July, 1718, that Dr. Du-Pin had made a rough draught of an essay toward a union, which cardinal de Noailles desired to peruse before it was sent to his grace; and that both Du-Pin and Girardin were highly pleased with his grace's letters to them. These letters, however, were written with a truly Protestant spirit; the archbishop insisted, in them, upon the truth and orthodoxy of the articles of the church of England, and did not make any concession, which supposed the least approximation to the peculiar doctrines, or the smallest approbation of the ambitious pretensions of the church of Rome; he observed, on the contrary, that it was now the time for Dr. Du-Pin, and his brethren of the Sorbonne, to declare openly their true sentiments with respect to the superstition and tyranny of that church; that it was the interest of all Christians to unmask that court, and to reduce its authority to its primitive limits; and that, according to the fundamental principle of the Reformation in general, and of the church of England in particular, Jesus Christ is the only founder, source, and head of the church. Accordingly, when Mr. Beauvoir had acquainted the archbishop with Du-Pin's having formed a plan of union, his grace answered in a manner which showed that he looked upon the removal of the Gallican church from the jurisdiction of Rome as an essential preliminary article, without which no negotiation could even be commenced. "To speak freely (says the prelate, in his letter of the 11th of August, to Mr. Beauvoir,) I do not think the regent (the duke of Orleans) yet strong enough in his interest, to adventure at a separation from the court of Rome. Could the regent openly appear in this, the divines would follow, and a scheme might fairly be offered for such a union, as alone is requisite, between the English and Gallican churches. But, till the time comes that the state will enter into such a work, all the rest is mere speculation. It may amuse a few contemplative men of learning and probity, who see the errors of the church, and groan under the tyranny of the court of Rome. It may dispose them secretly to wish well to us, and think charitably of us; but still they must call themselves Catholics, and us Heretics; and, to all outward appearance, say mass, and act so as they have been wont to do. If, under the shelter of Gallican privileges, they can now and then serve

the state by speaking big in the Sorbonne, they will do it heartily: but that is all, if I am not greatly mistaken."

Soon after this the archbishop received Du-Pin's Commonitorium, or advice relating to the method of re-uniting the English and Gallican churches; of the contents of which it will not be improper to give here a compendious account, as it was read in the Sorbonne, and was approved there, and as the concessions it contains, though not sufficient to satisfy a true Protestant, are yet such as one would not expect from a very zealous papist. Dr. Du-Pin, after some reflections, in the tedious preface, on the Reformation, and the present state of the church of England, reduces the controversy between the churches to three heads, viz. articles of faith,—rules and ceremonies of ecclesiastical discipline,—and moral doctrine, or rules of practice; and these he treats, by entering into an examination of the XXXIX articles of the church of England. The first five of these articles he approves. With regard to the VIth, which affirms that the Scripture contains all things necessary to salvation, he expresses himself thus: "This we will readily grant, provided that you do not entirely exclude tradition, which does not exhibit new articles of faith, but confirms and illustrates those which are contained in the sacred writings, and places about them new guards to defend them against gainsayers,[a] &c." He thinks that the apocryphal books will not occasion much difficulty. He is, indeed, of opinion, that "they ought to be deemed *canonical*, as those books concerning which there were doubts for some time;" yet, since they are not in the first or Jewish canon, he will allow them to be called *Deutero-Canonical*. He consents to the Xth article, which relates to free-will, provided that by the word *power* be understood what school-divines call *potentia proxima*, or a direct and immediate power, since, without a *remote* power of doing good works, sin could not be imputed.

With respect to the XIth article, which contains the doctrine of justification, he thus expresses the sentiments of his brethren: "We do not deny that it is by faith alone that we are justified, but we maintain that faith, charity, and good works, are necessary to salvation; and this is acknowledged in the following article.[b]

Concerning the XIIIth article, he observes, "that there will be no dispute, since many divines of both communions embrace the doctrine contained in that article," (viz. that works done before the grace of Christ are not pleasing to God, and have the nature of sin.) He indeed thinks "it very harsh to say, that all those actions are sinful which have not the grace of Christ for their source;" but he considers this rather as a matter of theological discussion than as a term of fraternal communion.[c]

On the XIVth article, relating to works of supererogation (undoubtedly one of the most absurd and pernicious doctrines of the Romish church,) he observes, "that works of supererogation mean only works conducive to salvation, which are not matters of strict precept, but of counsel only; that the word, being new, may be rejected, provided it be owned that the faithful do some such works."

He makes no objections to the XV, XVI, XVII, and XVIIIth articles.

His observation on the XIXth is, that to the definition of the church, the words, *under lawful pastors*, ought to be added; and that though all particular churches, even that of Rome, may err, it is needless to say this in a confession of faith.

He consents to the decision of the XXth article, which refuses to the church the power of ordaining any thing that is contrary to the word of God; but he says, it must be taken for granted, that the church will never do this in matters which overturn essential points of faith, or, to use his own words, 'quæ fidei substantiam evertant.'

It is in consequence of this notion that he remarks on the XXIst article, that general councils, received by the universal church, cannot err; and that, though particular councils may, yet every private man has not a right to reject what he thinks contrary to Scripture.

As to the important points of controversy contained in the XXIId article, he endeavours to mince matters as nicely as he can, to see if he can make the cable pass through the eye of the needle; and for this purpose observes, that souls must be *purged*, *i. e.* purified from all defilement of sin, before they are admitted to celestial bliss; that the church of Rome does not affirm this to be done by fire; that indulgences are only relaxations or remissions of temporal penalties in this life; that the Roman catholics do not worship the cross, or relics, or images, or even saints before their images, but only pay them an external respect, which is not of a religious nature; and that even the external demonstration of respect is a matter of indifference, which may be laid aside or retained without harm.

He approves the XXIIId article; and does not pretend to dispute about the XXIVth, which ordains the celebration of divine worship in the vulgar tongue. He, indeed, excuses the Latin and Greek churches for preserving their ancient languages; but, as great care has been taken that every thing be understood by translations, he allows, that divine service may be performed in the vulgar tongue, where that is customary.

Under the XXVth article he insists that the five Romish sacraments be acknowledged as such, whether instituted immediately by Christ or not.

He approves the XXVIth and XXVIIth articles; and he proposes expressing the part of the XXVIIIth that relates to Transubstantiation (which term he is willing to omit entirely,) in the following manner: "That the bread and wine are really changed into the body and blood of Christ, which last are truly and really received by all, though none but the faithful partake of any benefit from them." This extends also to the XXIXth article.

With regard to the XXXth, he is for mutual toleration, and would have the receiving of the communion in both kinds held indifferent, and liberty left to each church to preserve, or change, or dispense with its customs on certain occasions.

He is less inclined to concessions on the XXXIst article, and maintains that the sacrifice of Christ is not only

[a] The original words are: 'Hoc lubenter admittemus, modo non excludatur traditio, quæ articulos fidei novos non exhibet, sed confirmat et explicat ea, quæ in sacris literis habentur, ac adversus aliter sapientes munit eos novis cautionibus, ita ut non nova dicantur, sed antiqua novè.'

[b] The original words are: 'Fide solâ in Christum nos justificari, quod articulo XImo exponitur, non inficiamur; sed fide, charitate, et adjunctis bonis operibus, quæ omninò necessaria sunt ad salutem, ut articulo sequenti agnoscitur.'

[c] 'De articulo XIIImo nulla lis erit, cum multi theologi in eâdem versentur sententiâ. Durius videtur id dici, eas omnes actiones quæ ex gratiâ Christi non fiunt, esse peccata. Nolim tamen de hâc re disceptari, nisi inter theologos.'

commemorated, but continued, in the eucharist, and that every communicant offers him along with, the priest.

He is not a warm stickler for the celibacy of the clergy, but consents so far to the XXXIId article, as to allow that priests may marry, where the laws of the church do not prohibit it.

In the XXXIIId and XXXIVth articles, he acquiesces without exception.

He suspends his judgment with respect to the XXXVth, as he never perused the homilies mentioned therein.

As to the XXXVIth, he would not have the English ordinations pronounced null, though some of them, perhaps, are so; but thinks that, if a union be made, the English clergy ought to be continued in their offices and benefices, either by right or indulgence, 'sive ex jure, sive ex indulgentiâ ecclesiæ.'

He admits the XXXVIIth, so far as relates to the authority of the civil power; denies all temporal and all immediate spiritual jurisdiction of the pope; but alleges, that, by virtue of his primacy, which moderate (he ought to have said *immoderate*) Church-of-England-men do not deny, he is bound to see that the true faith be maintained; that the canons be observed every where; and, when any thing is done in violation of either, to provide the remedies prescribed for such disorders by the canon laws, 'secundum leges canonicas, ut malum resarciatur, procurare.' As to the rest, he is of opinion, that every church ought to enjoy its own liberties and privileges, which the pope has no right to infringe. He declares against going *too far* (the expression is vague, but the man probably meant well) in the punishment of heretics, against admitting the inquisition into France, and against war without a just cause.

The XXXVIIIth and XXXIXth articles he approves. Moreover, in the discipline and worship of the church of England, he sees nothing amiss and thinks no attempts should be made to discover or prove by whose fault the schism was begun. He farther observes, "that a union between the English and French bishops and clergy may be completed, or at least advanced, without consulting the Roman pontiff, who may be informed of the union as soon as it is accomplished, and may be desired to consent to it; that, if he consents to it, the affair will then be finished; and that, even without his consent, the union shall be valid; that, in case he attempts to terrify by his threats, it will then be expedient to appeal to a general council."[a] He concludes by observing, "that this arduous matter must first be discussed between a few; and, if there be reason to hope that the bishops, on both sides, will agree about the terms of the designed union, that hen application must be made to the civil power, to advance and confirm the work," to which he wishes all success.

It is from the effect which these proposals and terms made upon archbishop Wake, that it will be most natural to form a notion of his sentiments with respect to the church of Rome. It appears evident, from several passages in the writings and letters of this eminent prelate, that he was persuaded that a reformation in the church of Rome could only be made gradually; that it was not probable that they would renounce all their follies at once; but that, if they should once begin to make concessions, thi would set in motion the work of reformation, which, in all likelihood, would receive new accessions of vigour, and go on until a happy change should be effected. This way of thinking might have led the archbishop to give an indulgent reception to these proposals of Du-Pin, which contained some concessions, and might be an introduction to more. And yet we find that he rejected this piece, as insufficient to serve as a basis, or groundwork, to the desired union. On receiving the piece, he immediately perceived that he had not sufficient ground for carrying on this negotiation, without previously consulting his brethren, and obtaining a permission from the king for this purpose. Beside this, he was resolved not to submit either to the direction of Dr. Du-Pin, or to that of the Sorbonne, in relation to what was to be retained, or what was to be given up, in the doctrine and discipline of the two churches; nor to treat with the church of Rome upon any other footing, than that of a perfect equality in point of authority and power. He declared more especially, that he would never comply with the proposals made in Du-Pin's Commonitorium, of which I have now given the contents; observing that, though he was a friend to peace, he was still more a friend to truth: and that, "unless the Roman catholics gave up some of their doctrines and rites," a union with them could never be effected. All this is contained in a letter written by the archbishop to Mr. Beauvoir, on receiving the Commonitorium. This letter is dated August 30, 1718; and the reader will find a copy of it subjoined to this appendix.[b] About a month after, his grace wrote a letter to Dr. Du-Pin, dated October 1, 1718, in which he complains of the tyranny of the pope, exhorts the Gallican doctors to throw off the papal yoke in a national council, since a *general* one is not to be expected; and declares, that this must be the great preliminary and fundamental principle of the projected union, which being settled, a uniformity might be brought about in other matters, or a diversity of sentiments mutually allowed, without any violation of peace or concord. The archbishop commends, in the same letter, the candour and openness that reign in the Commonitorium; entreats Dr. Du-Pin to write to him always upon the same footing, freely, and without disguise or reserve; and tells him he is pleased with several things in that piece, and with nothing more than with the doctor's declaring it as his opinion, that there is not a great difference between their respective sentiments; but adds, that he cannot at present give his sentiments at large concerning that piece.[c]

Dr. Wake seems to have aimed principally, in this correspondence, at bringing about a separation between the Gallican church and the court of Rome. The terms in which the French divines often spoke about the liberties of their church, might give him some hope that this separation would take place, if ever these divines should be countenanced by the civil power of France. But a man of the archbishop's sagacity could not expect that they would enter into a union with any other national church *all at once*. He acted, therefore, with dignity, as well as with prudence, when he declined to explain

[a] 'Unio fieri potest aut saltem promoveri, inconsulto pontifice, qui, factâ unione, de eâ admonebitur, ac suppliciter rogabitur, ut velit ei consentire. Si consentiat, jam peracta res erit: sin abnuat, nihilominus valebit hæc unio. Et si minas intentet, ad concilium generale appellabitur.'

[b] See this Letter, No. III.

[c] See this Letter to Du-Pin, No. V. as also the archbishop's letters Dr. P. Piers de Girardin, No. VI.

himself on the proposals contained in Du-Pin's Commonitorium. To have answered ambiguously, would have been mean; and to have answered explicitly, would have blasted his hopes of separating them from Rome, which separation he desired upon the principles of civil and ecclesiastical liberty, independent of the discussion of theological tenets. The archbishop's sentiments in this matter will still appear farther from the letters he wrote to Mr. Beauvoir, in October, November, and December, 1718, and the January following, of which the proper extracts are here subjoined.[a] It appears from these letters, that Dr. Wake insisted still upon the abolition of the pope's jurisdiction over the Gallican church, and leaving him no more than a primacy of rank and honour, and that merely by ecclesiastical authority, as he was once bishop of the imperial city; to which empty title our prelate seems willing to have consented, provided that it should be attended with no infringement of the independence and privileges of each particular country and church. "Si quam prærogativam" (says the archbishop in his letter to Girardin,[b] after having defied the court of Rome to produce any precept of Christ in favour of the primacy of its bishop) "ecclesiæ concilia sedis imperialis episcopo concesserint (etsi cadente imperio etiam eâ prærogativâ excidisse merito possit censeri) tamen, quod ad me attinet, servatis semper regnorum juribus, ecclesiarum libertatibus, episcoporum dignitate, modo in cæteris conveniatur, per me licet, suo fruatur qualicumque primatu: non ego illi locum primum, non inanem honoris titulum invideo. At in alias ecclesias dominari, &c. hæc nec nos unquam ferre potuimus, nec vos debetis."

It appears farther, from these letters, that any proposals or terms conceived by the archbishop, in relation to this project of union, were of a vague and general nature, and that his views terminated rather in a plan of mutual toleration, than in a scheme for effecting an entire uniformity. The scheme that seemed to his grace the most likely to succeed was, that "the independence of every national church, or any other, and its right to determine all matters that arise within itself, should be acknowledged on both sides; that, for points of doctrine, they should agree as far as possible, in all articles of any moment (as in effect the two churches either already did, or easily might); and, in other matters, that a difference should be allowed until God should bring them to a union in them also."[c] It must be allowed, however, though the expression is still general, that the archbishop was for "purging out of the public offices of the church all such things as hinder a perfect communion in divine service, so that persons coming from one church to the other might join in prayers, and the holy sacrament, and the public service."[d] He was persuaded, that, in the liturgy of the church of England, there was nothing but what the Roman catholics would adopt, except the single rubric relating to the eucharist; and that in the Romish liturgy there was nothing to which Protestants object, but what the more rational Romanists agree might be laid aside, and yet the public offices be not the worse, or more imperfect, for the want of it. He therefore thought it proper to make the demands already mentioned the ground-work of the project of union, at the beginning of the negotiation; not that he meant to stop here, but that, being thus far agreed, they might the more easily go farther, descend to particulars, and render their scheme more perfect by degrees.[e]

The violent measures of the court of Rome against that part of the Gallican church which refused to admit the constitution *Unigenitus* as an ecclesiastical law, made the archbishop imagine that it would be no difficult matter to bring this opposition to an open rupture, and to engage the persons concerned in it to throw off the papal yoke, which seemed to be borne with impatience in France. The despotic bull of Clement XI. dated August 28, 1718, and which begins with the words, *Pastoralis officii*, was a formal act of excommunication, thundered out against all the anti-constitutionists, as the opposers of the bull *Unigenitus* were called; and it exasperated the doctors of the Sorbonne in the highest degree. It is to this that the archbishop alludes, when he says, in his letter to Mr. Beauvoir, dated the 23d of January, 1718,[f] "At present he (the pope) has put them out of his communion. We have withdrawn ourselves from his; both are out of communion with him, and I think it is not material on which side the breach lies." But the wished-for separation from the court of Rome, notwithstanding all the provocations of its pontiff, was still far off. Though, on numberless occasions, the French divines showed very little respect for the papal authority, yet the renouncing it altogether was a step which required deep deliberation, and which, however inclined they might be to it, they could not make, if they were not seconded by the state. But from the state they were not likely to have any countenance. The regent of France was governed by the abbé Du Bois; and Du Bois was aspiring eagerly after a cardinal's cap. This circumstance (not more unimportant that many secret connexions and trivial views that daily influence the course of public events, the transactions of government, and the fate of nations) was sufficient to stop the Sorbonne and its doctors in the midst of their career; and, in effect, it contributed greatly to stop the correspondence of which I have been now giving an account, and to nip the project of union in the bud. The correspondence between the archbishop and the two doctors of the Sorbonne had been carried on with a high degree of secrecy. This secrecy was prudent, as neither of the corresponding parties had been authorised by the civil power to negotiate a union between the two churches;[g] and, on Dr. Wake's part, it was partly owing to his having nobody that he could trust with what he did. He was satisfied (as he says in a letter to Mr. Beauvoir) "that most of the high-church bishops and clergy would readily come into such a design; but these (adds his grace) are not men either to be confided in, or made use of, by me."[h]

The correspondence, however, was divulged; and the project of union engrossed the whole conversation of the

[a] See No. IV, VII, VIII, IX, X. [b] No. VI.
[c] See the pieces subjoined to this appendix, No. VIII.
[d] Ibid.
[e] See No. VIII.
[f] See No. X.
[g] Dr Wake seems to have been sensible of the impropriety of carrying on a negotiation of this nature without the approbation and countenance of government. "I always (says he, in his letter to Mr. Beauvoir, which the reader will find at the end of this Appendix, No. XI.) took it for granted, that no step should be taken toward a union, but with the knowledge, approbation, and even by the authority of civil powers. All, therefore, that has passed hitherto stands clear of any exception as to the civil magistrate. It is only a consultation, in order to find out a way how a union might be made, if a fit occasion should hereafter be offered."
[h] See the letters subjoined, No. IX.

city of Paris. Lord Stanhope and the earl of Stair were congratulated thereupon by some great personages in the royal palace. The duke regent himself and the abbé Du Bois, minister of foreign affairs, and Mr. Joli de Fleury, the attorney-general, gave the line at first, appeared to favour the correspondence and the project, and let things run on to certain lengths. But the Jesuits and Constitutionists sounded the alarm, and overturned the whole scheme, by spreading a report, that the cardinal de Noailles, and his friends the Jansenists, were upon the point of making a coalition with the heretics. Hereupon the regent was intimidated; and Du Bois had an opportunity of appearing a meritorious candidate for a place in the sacred college. Dr. Piers Girardin was sent for to court, was severely reprimanded by Du Bois, and strictly charged, upon pain of being sent to the Bastile, to give up all the letters he had received from the archbishop of Canterbury, as also a copy of all his own. He was forced to obey; and all the letters were immediately sent to Rome, "as so many trophies (says a certain author) gained from the enemies of the church."[a] The archbishop's letters were greatly admired, as striking proofs both of his catholic benevolence and extensive abilities.

Mr. Beauvoir informed the archbishop, by a letter dated February 8, 1719, N. S. that Dr. Du-Pin had been summoned by the abbé Du Bois, to give an account of what had passed between him and Dr. Wake. This step naturally suspended the correspondence, though the archbishop was at a loss, at first, whether he should look upon it as favourable, or detrimental, to the projected union.[b] The letters which he wrote to Mr. Beauvoir and Dr. Du-Pin after this, express the same sentiments which he discovered through the whole of this transaction.[c] The letter to Du-Pin, more especially, is full of a pacific and reconciling spirit, and expresses the archbishop's desire of cultivating fraternal charity with the doctors, and his regret at the ill success of their endeavours toward the projected union. Du-Pin died before this letter, which was retarded by some accident, arrived at Paris.[d] Before the archbishop had heard of his death, he wrote to Mr. Beauvoir, to express his concern, that an account was going to be published of what had passed between the two doctors and himself, and his hope, "that they would keep in generals, as the only way to renew the good design, if occasion should serve, and to prevent themselves trouble from the reflections of their enemies," on account (as the archbishop undoubtedly means) of the concessions they had made, which, though insufficient to satisfy true Protestants, were adapted to exasperate bigoted papists. The prelate adds, in the conclusion of this letter, "I shall be glad to know that your doctors still continue their good opinion of us; for, though we need not the approbation of men on our own account, yet I cannot but wish it as a mean to bring them, if not to a perfect agreement in all things with us, (which is not presently to be expected,) yet to such a union as may put an end to the odious charges against, and consequential aversion of us, as heretics and schismatics, and in truth, make them cease to be so."

Dr. Du-Pin (whom the archbishop very sincerely lamented, as the only man, after Mr. Ravechet, on whom the hopes of a reformation in France seemed to depend) left behind him an account of this famous correspondence. Some time before he died, he showed it to Mr. Beauvoir, and told him, that he intended to communicate it to a very great man (probably the regent.) Mr. Beauvoir observed to the doctor, that one would be led to imagine, from the manner in which this account was drawn up, that the archbishop made the first overtures with respect to the correspondence, and was the first who intimated his desire of the union; whereas it was palpably evident that he (Dr. Du-Pin) had first solicited the one and the other. Du-Pin acknowledged this freely and candidly, and promised to rectify it, but was prevented by death. It does not, however, appear, that his death put a final stop to the correspondence; for we learn by a letter from the archbishop to Mr. Beauvoir, dated August 27, 1719, that Dr. Piers Girardin frequently wrote to his grace. But the opportunity was past; the appellants from the bull *Unigenitus*, or the anti-constitutionists, were divided; the court did not smile at all upon the project, because the regent was afraid of the Spanish party and the Jesuits; and therefore the continuation of this correspondence after Du-Pin's death was without effect.

Let the reader now, after having perused this historical account, judge of the appearance which Dr. Wake makes in this transaction. An impartial reader will certainly draw from this whole correspondence the following conclusions: that archbishop Wake was invited to this correspondence by Dr. Du-Pin, the most moderate of all the Roman catholic divines; that he entered into it with a view to improve one of the most favourable opportunities that could be offered, of withdrawing the church of France from the jurisdiction of the pope; a circumstance which must have immediately weakened the power of the court of Rome, and, in its consequences, offered a fair prospect of a farther reformation in doctrine and worship, as the case happened in the church of England, when it happily threw off the papal yoke;—that he did not give Du-Pin, or any of the doctors of the Sorbonne, the smallest reason to hope that the church of England would give up any one point of belief or practice to the church of France; but insisted, on the contrary, that the latter should make alterations and concessions, in order to be reconciled to the former;—that he never specified the particular alterations, which would be requisite to satisfy the rulers and doctors of the church of England, but only expressed a general desire of a union between the churches, if that were possible, or at least of a mutual toleration; that he never flattered himself that this union could be perfectly accomplished, or that the doctors of the Gallican church would be entirely brought over to the church of England; but thought that every advance made by them, and every concession, must have proved really advantageous to the Protestant cause.

The pacific spirit of Dr. Wake did not only discover itself in his correspondence with the Romish doctors, but in several other transactions in which he was engaged by his constant desire of promoting union and concord among

[a] These *trophies* were the defeat of the moderate part of the Gallican church, and the ruin of their project to break the papal yoke, and unite with the church of England. See above, note, p. 143, where the conclusion which the author of the Confessional has drawn from this expression is shown to be groundless.

[b] See his letter to Mr. Beauvoir, in the pieces subjoined, No. XI. dated February 5 (16,) 1718-19

[c] See No. XI.—XVIII.

[d] See his letter to Mr. Beauvoir, No. XV.

Christians; for it is well known, that he kept up a constant friendly correspondence with the most eminent ministers of the foreign Protestant churches, and showed a fraternal regard to them, notwithstanding the difference of their discipline and government from that of the church of England. In a letter written to the learned le Clerc in 1716, he expresses, in the most cordial terms, his affection for them, and declares positively, that nothing can be farther from his thoughts, than the notions adopted by certain bigoted and furious writers who refuse to embrace the foreign Protestants as their brethren, will not allow to their religious assemblies the denomination of *churches*, and deny the validity of their sacraments. He declares, on the contrary, these churches to be true Christian churches, and expresses a warm desire of their union with the church of England. It will be, perhaps, difficult to find, in any epistolary composition, ancient, or modern, a more elegant simplicity, a more amiable spirit of meekness, moderation, and charity, and a happier strain of that easy and unaffected politeness which draws its expressions from a natural habit of goodness and humanity, than we meet with in this letter.[a] We see this active and benevolent prelate still continuing to interest himself in the welfare of the Protestant churches abroad. In several letters written in the years 1718 and 1719, to the pastors and professors of Geneva and Switzerland, who were then at variance about the doctrines of predestination and grace, and some other abstruse points of metaphysical theology, he recommends earnestly to them a spirit of mutual toleration and forbearance, entreats them particularly to be moderate in their *demands* of subscription to articles of faith, and proposes to them the example of the church of England as worthy of imitation in this respect. In one of these letters, he exhorts the doctors of Geneva not to go too far in explaining the nature, determining the sense, and imposing the belief of doctrines, which the divine wisdom has not thought proper to reveal clearly in the Scriptures, and the ignorance of which is very consistent with a state of salvation; and he recommends the prudence of the church of England, which has expressed these doctrines in such general terms, in its articles, that persons who think very differently about the doctrines may subscribe the articles, without wounding their integrity.[b] His letters to professor Schurer of Bern, and to the excellent and learned John Alphonso Turretin of Geneva, are in the same strain of moderation and charity, and are here subjoined,[c] as every way worthy of attentive perusal. But what is more peculiarly worthy of attention here, is a letter written May 22, 1719,[d] to Mr. Jablonski of Poland, who, from a persuasion of Dr. Wake's great wisdom, discernment, and moderation, had proposed to him the following question, viz. "Whether it was lawful and expedient for the Lutherans to treat of a union with the church of Rome; or whether all negotiations of this kind ought not to be looked upon as dangerous and delusive?" The archbishop's answer to this question contains a happy mixture of Protestant zeal and Christian charity. He gives the strongest cautions to the Polish Lutherans against entering into any treaty of union with the Roman catholics, except on a footing of perfect equality, and in consequence of a previous renunciation, on the part of the latter, of the tyranny, and even of the superiority and jurisdiction of the church of Rome and its pontiff; and as to what concerns points of doctrine, he exhorts them not to sacrifice truth to temporal advantages, or even *to a desire of peace*. It would carry us too far, were we to give a minute account of Dr. Wake's correspondence with the Protestants of Nismes, or of Lithuania and other countries: it may however be affirmed, that no prelate, since the Reformation, had so extensive a correspondence with the Protestants abroad, and none could have a more friendly one.

It does not appear, that the dissenters in England made to the archbishop any proposals relative to a union with the established church, or that he made any proposals to them on that head. The spirit of the times, and the situation of the contending parties, offered little prospect of success to any scheme of that nature. In queen Anne's time, he was only bishop of Lincoln; and the disposition of the house of commons, and of all the Tory part of the nation, was then so unfavourable to the dissenters, that it is not at all likely that any attempt toward re-uniting them to the established church would have passed into a law. And, in the next reign, the face of things was so greatly changed in favour of the dissenters, and their hopes of recovering the rights and privileges, of which they had been deprived, were so sanguine, that it may be well questioned whether they would have accepted the offer of a union, had it been made to them. Be that as it will, one thing is certain, and it is a proof of archbishop Wake's moderate and pacific spirit, that, in 1714, when the spirit of the court and of the triumphant part of the ministry was, with respect to the Whigs in general, and to dissenters in particular, a spirit of enmity and oppression, this worthy prelate had the courage to stand up in opposition to the schism-bill, and to protest against it as a hardship upon the dissenters. This step, which must have blasted his credit at court, and proved detrimental to his private interest, as matters then stood, showed that he had a friendly and sincere regard for the dissenters. It is true, four years after this, when it was proposed to repeal the schism-bill and the act against occasional conformity, both at once, he disapproved this proposal; and this circumstance has been alleged as an objection to the encomiums that have been given to his tender regard for the dissenters, or at least as a proof that he changed his mind; and that Wake, bishop of Lincoln, was more their friend than Wake, archbishop of Canterbury. I do not pretend to justify this change of conduct. It seems to have been, indeed, occasioned by a change of circumstances. The dissenters, in their state of oppression during the ministry of Bolingbroke and his party, were objects of compassion; and those who had sagacity enough to perceive the ultimate object which that ministry had in view in oppressing them, must have interested themselves in their sufferings, and opposed their oppressors, from a regard to the united causes of Protestantism and liberty. In the following reign, their credit rose; and, while this encouraged the wise and moderate men among them to plead with prudence and with justice their right to be delivered from several real grievances, it elated the violent (and violent men there are in all parties even in the cause of moderation) to a high degree. This rendered them

[a] See an extract of it among the pieces subjoined, No. XIX.
[b] See the pieces here subjoined, No. XX.
[c] See these letters, No. XXI, XXII, XXIII.
[d] No. XXV.

formidable to all those who were jealous of [*zealous for*] the power, privileges, and authority, of the established church; and archbishop Wake was probably of this number. He had protested against the shackles that were imposed upon them when they lay under the frowns of government; but apprehending, perhaps, that the removal of these shackles in the day of prosperity would render their motions toward power too rapid, he opposed the abrogation of the very acts which he had before endeavoured to stifle in their birth. In this, however, it must be acknowledged, that the spirit of party mingled too much of its influence with the dictates of prudence; and that prudence, thus accompanied, was not very consistent with Dr. Wake's known principles of equity and moderation. As I was at a loss how to account for this part of the archbishop's conduct, I addressed myself to a learned and worthy clergyman of the church of England, who gave me the following answer: "Archbishop Wake's objection to the repeal of the schism-act was founded on this consideration only, that such a repeal was needless, as no use had been made, or was likely to be made, of that act. It is also highly probable, that he would have consented without hesitation to rescind it, had nothing farther been endeavoured at the same time. But, considering what sort of spirit was then shown by the dissenters and others, it ought not to be a matter of great wonder, if he was afraid that, from the repeal of the other act (viz. that against occasional conformity,) considerable damage might follow to the church over which he presided; and, even supposing his fears to be excessive, or quite groundless, yet certainly they were pardonable in a man who had never done, or designed to do, any thing disagreeable to the dissenters in any other affair, and who, in this, had the concurrence of some of the greatest and wisest of the English lords, and of the earl of Ilay, among the Scotch, though a professed Presbyterian."

However some may judge of this particular incident, I think it will appear from the whole tenor of archbishop Wake's correspondence and transactions with Christian churches of different denominations, that he was a man of a pacific, gentle, and benevolent spirit, and an enemy to the feuds, animosities, and party prejudices, which divide the professors of one holy religion, and by which Christianity is exposed to the assaults of its virulent enemies, and wounded in the house of its pretended friends. To this deserved eulogy, we may add what a learned and worthy divine[a] has said of this eminent prelate, considered as a controversial writer, even, "that his accurate and superior knowledge of the nature of the Romish hierarchy, and of the constitution of the church of England, furnished him with victorious arms, both for the subversion of error and the defence of truth.

AUTHENTIC COPIES OF THE ORIGINAL LETTERS FROM WHICH THE PRECEDING ACCOUNT IS DRAWN.

No. I.

A Letter from Archbishop Wake to Mr. Beauvoir.

Lambeth, Nov. 28, S. V. 1717.

I AM indebted to you for several kind letters, and some small tracts, which I have had the favour to receive from you. The last, which contains an account of the new edition that is going on of Chrysostom, I received yesterday. It will, no doubt, be a very valuable edition; but, as they propose to go on with it, I shall hardly live to see it finished. They do not tell us, to whom here we may go for subscriptions: and it is too much trouble to make returns to Paris. They should, for their own advantage, say, where subscriptions will be taken in London, and where one may call for the several volumes as they come out, and pay for the next that are going on.

Among the account of books you were pleased to send me, there is one with a very promising title, *Thesaurus Anecdotorum*, 5 volumes. I wish I could know what the chief of those anecdotes are; it may be a book very well worth having. I admire they do not disperse some sheets of such works. What they can add to make Moreri's Dictionary so very voluminous, I cannot imagine. I bought it in two exorbitant volumes, and thought it big enough so. While I am writing this, company is come in, so that I am forced to break off; and I can only assure you, that, upon all occasions, you shall find me very sincerely,

Reverend Sir, Your faithful friend,

W. CANT.

N. B. This is the earliest letter in the whole collection; and, by the beginning of it, seems to be the first which the archbishop wrote to Mr. Beauvoir.

No. II.

A Letter from Mr. Beauvoir to Archbishop Wake.

Paris, Dec. 11, 1717, O. S.

My Lord,—I HAD the honour of your grace's letter of the 28th ultimo but Sunday last, and therefore could not answer it sooner. A person is to be appointed to receive subscriptions for the new edition of St. Chrysostom, and deliver the copies. Inclosed is an account of *Thesaurus Anecdotorum*. Dr. Du-Pin, with whom I dined last Monday, and with the Syndic of the Sorbonne and two other doctors, tells me, that what swells Moreri's Dictionary are several additions, and particularly the families of Great Britain. He hath the chief hand in this new edition. They talked as if the whole kingdom was to appeal to the future general council, &c. They wished for a union with the church of England, as the most effectual means to unite all the western churches. Dr. Du-Pin desired me to give his duty to your grace, upon my telling him, that I would send you an arrêt of the parliament of Paris relating to him, and a small tract of his. I have transmitted them to Mr. Prevereau, at Mr. Secretary Addison's office.

No. III.

A Letter from Archbishop Wake to Mr. Beauvoir.

Aug. 30, 1718.

I TOLD you in one of my last letters, how little I expected from the present pretences of a union with us. Since I received the papers you sent me, I am more convinced that I was not mistaken. My task is pretty hard, and I scarce know how to manage myself in this matter. To go any farther than I have done in it, even as a divine only of the church of England, may meet with censure: and, as archbishop of Canterbury, I cannot treat with

---

[a] Dr. William Richardson, master of Emanuel college in Cambridge, and canon of Lincoln. See his noble edition, and his very elegant and judicious continuation of Bishop Godwin's Commentarius de Præsulibus Angliæ, published in 1743, at Cambridge. His words

these gentlemen. I do not think my character at all inferior to that of an archbishop of Paris: on the contrary, without lessening the authority and dignity of the church of England, I must say it is in some respects superior. If the cardinal were in earnest for such a union, it would not be below him to treat with me himself about it. I should then have a sufficient ground to consult with my brethren, and to ask his majesty's leave to correspond with him concerning it. But to go on any farther with these gentlemen, will only expose me to the censure of doing what, in my station, ought not to be done without the king's knowledge; and it would be very odd for me to have an authoritative permission to treat with those who have no manner of authority to treat with me. However, I shall venture at some answer or other to both their letters and papers; and so have done with this affair.

I cannot tell well what to say to Dr. Du-Pin. If he thinks we are to take their direction what to retain, and what to give up, he is utterly mistaken. I am a friend to peace, but more to truth. And they may depend upon it, I shall always account our church to stand upon an equal foot with theirs: and that we are no more to receive laws from them, than we desire to impose any upon them. In short, the church of England is free, is orthodox: she has a plenary authority within herself, and has no need to recur to any other church to direct her what to retain, or what to do. Nor will we, otherwise than in a brotherly way, and in a full equality of right and power, ever consent to have any treaty with that of France. And therefore, if they mean to deal with us, they must lay down this for the foundation, that are to deal with one another upon equal terms. If, consistently with our own establishment, we can agree upon a closer union with one another, well: if not, we are as much, and upon as good grounds, a free independent church, as they are. And, for myself, as archbishop of Canterbury, I have more power, larger privileges, and a greater authority, than any of their archbishops: from which, by the grace of God, I will not depart—no, not for the sake of a union with them.

You see, Sir, what my sense of this matter is; and may perhaps think that I have a little altered my mind since this affair was first set on foot. As to my desire of peace and union with all other Christian churches, I am still the same: but with the doctor's Commonitorium I shall never comply. The matter must be put into another method; and, whatever they think, they must alter some of their doctrines, and practices too, or a union with them can never be effected. Of this, as soon as I have a little more leisure, I shall write my mind as inoffensively as I can to them, but yet freely too.

If any thing is to come of this matter, it will be the shortest method I can take of accomplishing it, to put them in the right way. If nothing (as I believe nothing will be done in it,) 'tis good to leave them under a plain knowledge of what we think of ourselves and our church, and to let them see, that we neither need nor seek the union proposed, but for their sake as well as our own; or rather neither for theirs nor ours; but in order to the promotion of a catholic communion (as far as is possible) among all the true churches of Christ.

I have now plainly opened my mind to you: you will communicate no more of it than is fitting to the two doctors, but keep it as a testimony of my sincerity in this affair; and that I have no design, but what is consistent with the honour and freedom of our English church, and with the security of that true and sound doctrine which is taught in it, and from which no consideration shall ever make me depart.

I am, Reverend Sir,
Your affectionate friend and brother,
W. Cant.

No. IV.

From Archbishop Wake to Mr. Beauvoir.

Oct. 8, 1718.

Whatever be the consequence of our corresponding with the Sorbonne doctors about matters of religion, the present situation of our affairs plainly seems to make it necessary for us so to do. Under this apprehension I have written, though with great difficulty, two letters to your two doctors, which I have sent to the secretary's office, to go with the next packet to my lord Stair. I beg you to enquire after them; they made up together a pretty thick packet, directed to you. In that to Dr. Du-Pin, I have, in answer to two of his MSS., described the method of making bishops in our church. I believe he will be equally both pleased and surprised with it. I wish you could show him the form of consecration, as it stands in the end of your large common prayer-books. The rest of my letters, both to him and Dr. Piers, is a venture which I know not how they will take, to convince them of the necessity of embracing the present opportunity of breaking off from the pope, and going one step farther than they have yet done in their opinion of his authority, so as to leave him only a primacy of place and honour; and that merely by ecclesiastical authority, as he was once bishop of the imperial city. I hope they both show you my letters: they are at this time very long, and upon a nice point. I shall be very glad if you can any way learn how they take the freedom I have used, and what they really think of it. I cannot so much trust to their answers, in which they have more room to conceal their thoughts, and seldom want to overwhelm me with more compliments than I desire, or am well able to bear.

Pray do all you can to search out their real sense of, and motions at the receipt of these two letters; I shall thereby be able the better to judge how far I may venture hereafter to offer any thing to them upon the other points in difference between us; though after all, I still think, if ever a reformation be made, it is the state that must govern the church in it. But this between ourselves.

No. V.

A Letter from Archbishop Wake to Dr. Du-Pin, dated October 1, 1718.

Spectatissimo Viro, eruditorum suæ gentis, si non et sui sæculi principi; D^no^ L. Ell. Du-Pin, Docturi Parisiensi.

Gul. prov. div. Cant. Arch^us^ in omnibus ευφρονεῖν και συμπράττειν.

Diu est, amplissime Domine, ex quo debitor tibi factus sum ob plures tractatus MSS. quos tuo beneficio a dilecto

(p. 167,) are: "Nemo usbiam ecclesiæ Romanæ vel Anglicanæ statum penitiùs cognitum exploratum habuit; et proinde in disputandi arenam prodiit tum ad oppugnandum tum ad propugnandum instructissimus."

mihi in Christo D. Beauvoir accepi. Perlegi diligenter omnes, nec sine fructu: plurima quippe ab iis, cognitu dignissima, vel primùm didici, vel clariùs intellexi; beatamque his difficillimis temporibus censeo ecclesiam Gallicanam, quæ talem sibi in promptu habeat doctorem, in dubiis consiliarium, in juribus suis tuendis advocatum; qui et possit et audeat, non modo contra suos vel erroneos vel perfidos symmystas dignitatem ejus tueri, sed et ipsi summo pontifici (ut olim B. Apostolus Paulus Petro) in faciem resistere, quia reprehensibilis est. Atque utinam hæc quæ jam Romæ aguntur, tandem aliquando omnibus vobis animum darent ad jura vestra penitùs asserenda! Ut deinceps non ex pragmaticis (ut olim) sanctionibus non (ut hoc ferè tempore) ex concordatis, non ex præjudicatis hominum opinionibus, res vestras agatis; sed eâ authoritate quâ decet ecclesiam tam illustris ac præpotentis imperii; quæ nullo jure, vel divino, vel humano, alteri olim aut ecclesiæ aut homini subjicitur; sed ipsa jus habet intra se sua negotia terminandi, et in omnibus, sub rege suo Christianissimo, populum suum commissum propriis suis legibus et sanctionibus gubernandi.

Expergiscimini itaque, viri, eruditi; et quod ratio postulat, nec refragatur religio, strenuè agite. Hoc bonorum subditorum erga regem suum officium. Christianorum erga episcopos suos, heu! nimiùm extraneorum tyrannide oppressos, pietas exigit, flagitat, requirit. Excutite tandem jugum istud, quod nec patres vestri, nec vos ferre potuistis. Hic ad reformationem non prætensam, sed veram, sed justam, sed necessariam ecclesiæ nostræ, primus fuit gradus. Quæ Cæsaris erant, Cæsari reddidimus; quæ Dei, Deo. Coronæ imperiali regni nostri suum suprematum, episcopatui suam ἀξίαν, ecclesiæ suam libertatem restituit, vel eo solùm nomine semper cum honore memorandus, rex Henricus VIII. Hæc omnia sub pedibus conculcaverat idem ille tunc nobis, qui jam vobis inimicus. Sæpiùs authoritas papalis intra certos fines legibus nostris antea fuerat coërcita; et iis quidem legibus, quas siquis hodie inspiceret, impossibile ei videretur eas potuisse, aliquâ vel vi vel astutiâ, perrumpere. Sed idem nobis accidit quod illis, qui dæmoniacum vinculis ligare voluere. Omnia frustrà tentata: nihil perfacere inania legum repagula, contra nescio quos prætextus potestatis divinæ nullis humanis constitutionibus subditæ. Tandem defatigato regno dura necessitas sua jura tuendi oculos omnium aperuit. Proponitur quæstio episcopis ac clero in utriusque provinciæ synodo congregatis, an episcopus Romanus in sacris scripturis habeat aliquam majorem jurisdictionem in regno Angliæ quàm quivis alius externus episcopus? In partem sanam, justam, veram, utriusque concilii suffragia concurrêre. Quod episcopi cum suo clero statuerant, etiam regni academiæ calculo suo approbârunt, rex cum parliamento sancivit; adeoque tandem, quod unicè fieri poterat, sublata penitùs potestas, quam nullæ leges, nulla jura, vel civilia vel ecclesiastica, intra debitos fines unquam poterant continere. En nobis promptum ac paratum exemplum; quod sequi vobis gloriosum, nec minus posteris vestris utile fuerit! Quo solo pacem, absque veritatis dispendio, tueri valeatis, ac irridere bruta de Vaticano fulmina, quæ jumdudum ostenditis vobis non ultra terrori esse, utpote à sacris scripturis edoctis, quod *maledictio absque causâ prolata non superveniet.*—Prov. xxvi. 2

State ergo in l bertate quâ Christus vos donaverit. Frustra ad concilium generale nunquam convocandum res vestras refertis. Frustra decretorum vim suspendere curatis, quæ ab initio injusta, erronea, ac absurda, ac plane nulla erant. Non talibus subsidiis vobis opus est. Regiâ permissione, authoritate suâ a Christo commissâ, archiepiscopi et episcopi vestri in concilium nationale coëant: academiarum, cleri, ac præcipuè utrorumque principis theologicæ facultatis Parisiensis, concilium atque auxilium sibi assumant: sic muniti quod æquum et justum fuerit decernant: quod decreverint etiam civili authoritate firmandum curent: nec patiantur factiosos homines aliò res vestras vocare, aut ad judicem appellare qui nullam in vos authoritatem exposcere debeat, aut, si exposcat, meritò a vobis recusari et poterit et debuerit.

Ignoscas, vir πολυμαθέστατε, indignationi dicam an amori meo, si forte aliquanto ultrà modum commoveri videar ab iis quæ vobis his proximis annis acciderint. Veritatem Christi omni quâ possum animi devotione colo. Hanc vos tuemini: pro hac censuras pontificias subiistis, et porrò ferre parati estis.

Ille, qui se pro summo ac ferè unico Christi vicario venditat, veritatem ejus sub pedibus proterit, conculcat. Justitiam veneror: ac proinde vos injustè, ac planè tyrannicè, si non oppressos, at petitos, at comminatos; at ideo solum non penitùs obrutos, subversos prostratos, qui a Deus furori ejus obicem posuit, nec permiserit vos in ipsius manus incidere; non possum non vindicare, et contra violentum oppressorem, meum qualecunque suffragium ferre.

Jura ac libertates inclyti regni, celeberrimæ ecclesiæ, præstantissimi cleri cum honore intueor. Hæc papa reprobat, contemnit; et, dum sic alios tractat, merito se aliis castigandum, certè intra justos fines coëcendum, exhibet. Siquid ei potestatis supra alios episcopos Christus commiserit, proferantur tabulæ; jus evincatur; cedere non recusamus.

Siquam prærogativam ecclesiæ concilia sedis imperialis episcopo concesserint (etsi cadente imperio, etiam eâ prærogativâ excidisse merito possit censeri;) tamen quod ad me attinet, servatis semper regnorum juribus, ecclesiarum libertatibus, episcoporum dignitate, modo in cæteris conveniatur, per me licet, suo fruatur, qualicunque primatu: non ego illi locum primum, non inanem honoris titulum invideo. At in alias ecclesias dominari; episcopatum, cujus partem Christus unicuique episcopo in solidum reliquit, tantum non in solidum sibi soli vindicare; siquis ejus injustæ tyrannidi sese opposuerit, cœlum ac terram in illius perniciem commovere; hæc nec nos unquam ferre potuimus, nec vos debetis. In hoc pacis fundamento si inter nos semel conveniatur, in cæteris aut idem sentiemus omnes, aut facilè alii aliis dissentiendi libertatem absque pacis jacturâ concedemus.

Sed abripit calamum meum nescio quis Ἐνθουσιασμὸς, dum de vestris injuriis nimiùm sum solicitus; et forte liberiùs quàm par esset de his rebus ad te scripsisse videbor.

Ego verò uti ea omnia, quæ tu in tuo commonitorio, exaraveris, etiam illa in quibus ab invicem dissentimus, grato animo accipio; ita ut apertè, ut candidè, et absque omni fuco porrò ad me scribere pergas, eâque παῤῥησίᾳ quâ amicum cum amico agere deceat, imprimis a te peto; eo te mihi amiciorem fore existimans, quo simpliciùs quo planiùs, quicquid censueris, liberè dixeris.

Nec de commonitorio tuo amplius aliquid hoc tempore reponam; in quo cum plurima placeant, tum id imprimis,

quod etiam tuo judicio, non adeo longe ab invicem distemus, quin si de fraternâ unione ineundâ publicâ aliquando authoritate deliberari contigerit, via facile inveniri poterit ad pacem inter nos stabiliendam, salvâ utrinque ecclesiæ catholicæ fide ac veritate.

Quod ad alteros tuos tractatus de constitutione episcoporum in ecclesiis vacantibus, siquidem papa, legitimè requisitus, facultates suas personis a rege nominatis obstinate pernegaverit; in iis sane reperio quod non tuâ eruditione et judicio sit; quare, ne prorsus ἀσυμβολος discedam, ordinem tibi breviter delineabo constituendi episcopos in hâc reformatâ nostrâ ecclesiâ.

Tu judicabis, an aliquid magis canonicè vel excogitari vel statui potuerit.

No. VI.

A Letter from Archbishop Wake to Dr. P. Piers Girardin, written in October 1718.

Præstantissimo Viro, consummatissimo Theologo D^no^ Patricio Piers de Girardin, sacræ Facultatis Parisiensis Theologiæ Doctori.
Gul. prov. div. Cant. Arch^e^. Gratiam, Pacem, ac Salutem in Domino.

Post prolixiores epistolas eruditissimo confratri tuo D^no^ D^ri^ Du-Pin hoc ipso tempore exaratas; quasque ego paulo minûs tuas quàm illius existimari, velim; faciliùs a te veniam impetrabo, vir spectatissime, si aliquanto brevius ad te rescribam; et in illis quidem animi mei vel amori vel indignationi liberè indulsi; eâque simplicitate, quâ decet Christianum, et maxime episcopum, quid vobis, meâ saltem sententiâ, factu opus sit, apertè exposui. Siquid, vel tuo vel illius judicio, asperius quàm par esset a me exciderit, cum vestri causâ adeo commotus fuerim, facile id homini tam benevolè erga vos animato, uti spero condonabitis: unaque reminiscemini, nullam unquam vobis stabilem inter vos pacem, aut catholicam cum aliis unionem, haberi posse, dum aliquid ultrà merum honoris primatum ac πρωεδρίαν pontifici Romano tribuitis. Hoc nos per aliquot sæcula experti sumus; vos jam sentire debetis, qui, nescio quo insano ipsius beneficio, adeo commodam occasionem nacti estis, non tam ab illius decretis appellandi, quàm ab ipsius dominio ac potestate vos penitûs subducendi. Ipse vos pro schismaticis habet; qualem vos eum censere debetis. Ipse a vestrâ communione se suosque separandos publicè denunciat. Quid vobis in hoc casu faciendum? Liceat mihi veteris illius Cæsareæ episcopi Firmilani verbis respondere; sic olim Stephanum papam acriter quidem, sed non ideo minus juste, castigavit: *Vide quâ imperitiâ reprehendere audeas eos qui contra mendacium pro veritate nituntur. Peccatum verò quàm magnum tibi exaggerâsti, quando te a tot gregibus scidisti: excidisti enim te ipsum, noli te fallere; siquidem ille est vere schismaticus qui se a communione ecclesiasticâ unitatis apostatam fecerit. Dum enim putas omnes a te abstineri posse, solum te ab omnibus abstinuisti.* Cypr. Op. Epist. 75.

Agite ergo, viri eruditi, et quo vos divina providentia vocat, libenter sequimini. Clemens papa vos abdicavit; a suâ et suorum communione repulit, rejecit. Vos illius authoritati renunciate. Cathedræ Petri, quæ in omnibus catholicis ecclesiis conservatur, adhærete: etiam nostram ne refugiatis communionem; quibuscum si non in omnibus omninò doctrinæ Christianæ capitibus conveniatis, at in præcipuis, at in fundamentalibus, at in omnibus articulis fidei ad salutem necessariis, planè concentitis; etiam in cæteris, uti speramus, brevi concensuri. Nobis certè eo minus vos vel hæreticos vel schismaticos fore confidite, quod à papâ ejecti pro hæreticis et schismaticis Romæ æstimemini. Sed contrahenda vela, nec indulgendum huic meo pro vobis zelo, etsi sit secundùm scientiam. Prudentibus loquor; vos ipsi, quod dico, judicate.

Ad literas tuas, præstantissime Domine, redeo; in quibus uti tuum de mediocritate meâ judicium, magis ex affectu erga me tuo, quàm secundùm merita mea prolatum gratanter accipio, ita in eo te nunquam falli patiar, quod me pacis ecclesiasticæ amantissimum credas, omniaque illi consequendæ danda putem, præter veritatem. Quantum ad illam promovendam tu jamjam contuleris, ex sex illis propositionibus quas tuis inseruisti literis, gratus agnosco: ac nisi ambitiosè magis quàm hominem privatum deceat, me fracturum existimarem, etiam eruditissimis illis confratribus tuis doctoribus Sorbonicis, quibus priores meas literas communicâsti, easdem per te gratias referrem. Sanè facultas vestra Parisiensis, uti maximum in his rebus pondus meritò habere debeat, sive numerum, sive dignitatem, sive denique eruditionem suorum membrorum spectemus; ita a vobis exordium sumere debebit unio illa inter nos tantopere desiderata, siquidem eam aliquando iniri voluerit Deus.

Interim gratulor vobis post illustrissimum card. Noail lium, alterum illum ecclesiæ Gallicanæ, fidei catholicæ, columnam et ornamentum, procuratorem regium D. D. Joly de Fleury; quem virum ego non jam primum ex tuis literis debito prosequi honore didici, verum etiam ob ea quæ vestri causâ his proximis annis publicè egerit, anteà suspicere, et penè venerari, consueveram. Sub his ducibus, quid non sperandum in publicum vestrum ac catholicæ ecclesiæ commodum? Intonet de Vaticano pontifex Romanus; fremant inter vos ipsos conjurata turba, Romanæ curiæ servi magis quàm suæ Galliæ fideles subditi. His præsidiis ab eorum injuriis tuti, vanas eorum iras contemnere valeatis.

Ego vero, uti omnia vobis publicè fausta ac felicia precor, ita tibi, spectatissime vir, me semper addictissimum fore promitto. De quo quicquid aliàs senseris, id saltem ut de me credas jure postulo; me sincerè veritatem Christi et amare et quærere, et, nisi omninò me fallat animus, etiam assecutum esse Nulli. Christiano inimicus antehac aut fui aut deinceps sum futurus: sic de erroribus eorum, qui a me dissident, judico, ut semper errantes Deo judicandos relinquam. Homo sum, errare possum; sic verò animatus audacter dicam, hæreticus esse nolo. Te verò, siquidem id permittas, fratrem; sin id minus placeat, saltem id indulgebis, ut me verè et ex animo profitear, excellentissime Domine, tui amantissimum.

W. C.

No. VII.

Extract of a Letter from Archbishop Wake to Mr. Beauvoir.

Nov. 6, O. S. 1718.

Your last letter gives me some trouble, but more curiosity. I little thought, when I wrote to your two doctors, that my letters should have been read, much less copies of them given to any such great persons as you mention. I write in haste, as you know, and trust no amanuensis to copy for me, because I will not be liable to be betrayed. And upon a review of my foul, and only copy of them, since I had your account from Paris, I find some things

might have been more accurately expressed, had I taken more time to correct my style. But I wish that may be the worst exception against them: I fear the freedom I took in exhorting them to do somewhat in earnest, upon so fair a provocation, with regard to the papal authority, though excused as well as I could, will hardly go down so effectually as I could wish with them. This raises my curiosity to know truly and expressly how that part of my letters operated on both your doctors; which by a wary observation, you may in good measure gather from their discourse. I cannot tell whether they showed my letters to you; if they did, I am sure you will think I did not mince the matter with them in that particular.

Of your two doctors, Dr. Piers seems the more polite: he writes elegantly both for style and matter, and has the free air, even as to the business of a union. Yet I do not despair of Dr. Du-Pin, whom, thirty years ago, in his collection of tracts relating to church discipline, I did not think far from the kingdom of God.

No. VIII.

Extract of a Letter from Archbishop Wake to Mr. Beauvoir.

Nov. 18, 1718.

At present, my more particular curiosity leads me to know the sentiments of the leading men in France with regard to the court of Rome; from which, if we could once divide the Gallican church, a reformation in other matters would follow of course. The scheme that seems to me most likely to prevail, is, to agree in the independence (as to all matters of authority) of every national church on any others; and in their right to determine all matters that arise within themselves; and, for points of doctrine, to agree, as far as possible, in all articles of any moment (as in effect we either already do, or easily may;) and, for other matters, to allow a difference, till God shall bring us to a union in those also. One only thing should be provided for, to purge out of the public offices of the church such things as hinder a perfect communion in the service of the church, that so, whenever any come from us to them, or from them to us, we may all join together in prayers and the holy sacraments with each other. In our liturgy there is nothing but what they allow, save the single rubric relating to the eucharist; in theirs nothing but what they agree may be laid aside, and yet the public offices be never the worse or more imperfect for want of it. Such a scheme as this, I take to be a more proper ground of peace, at the beginning, than to go to more particulars; if in such a foundation we could once agree, the rest would be more easily built upon it. If you find occasion, and that it may be of use, you may extract this object, and offer it to their consideration, as what you take to be my sense in the begining of ă treaty; not that I think we shall stop here, but that, being thus far agreed, we shall them ore easily go into a greater perfection hereafter. I desire you to observe, as much as you can, when it is I may the most properly write to the doctors. I took the subject of the pope's authority in my last, as arising naturally from the present state of their affairs, and as the first thing to be settled in order to a union. How my freedom in that respect has been received, I desire you freely to communicate.

No. IX.

Extract of a Letter from Archbishop Wake to Mr. Beauvoir.

Dec. 2, O. S. 1718.

I am glad the two doctors seem to receive my last letters so well. The truth is, that while they manage as they do with the court of Rome, nothing will be done to any purpose. And all ends in trifling at the last. We honestly deny the pope all authority over us: they pretend, in words, to allow him so much as is consistent with what they call their Gallican privileges; but let him ever so little use it contrary to their good liking, they protest against it, appeal to a general council, and then mind him as little as we can do. In earnest, I think we treat his holiness not only with more sincerity, but more respect than they: for, to own a power, and yet keep a reserve to obey that power only so far, and in such cases as we make ourselves judges of, is a greater affront, than honestly to confess that we deny the power, and, for that reason, refuse to obey it. But my design was partly to bring them to this, and partly to see how they would bear, at least the proposal, of totally breaking off from the court and bishop of Rome.

What you can observe, or discover more of their inclinations in this particular, will be of good use; especially if it could be found out what the court would do, and how far that may be likely to countenance the clergy in such a separation. In the mean time, it cannot be amiss to cultivate a friendship with the leading men of that side, who may in time be made use of to the good work of reforming in earnest the Gallican church. I am a little unhappy that I have none here I yet dare trust with what I do; though I am satisfied most of our high church bishops and clergy would readily come into such a design. But these are not men either to be confided in, or made use of, by

Your assured friend,

W. Cant.

P. S. Did cardinal de Noailles know what authority the archbishop of Canterbury has gotten by the reformation, and how much a greater man he is now than when he was the pope's *legatus natus*, it might encourage him to follow so good a pattern, and be assured (in that case) he would lose nothing by sending back his cardinal's cap to Rome. I doubt your doctors know little of these matters.

No. X.

Extract of a Letter from Archbishop Wake to Mr. Beauvoir.

Jan. 23, O. S. 1718.

When you see my letter (for I conclude the doctor will show it you,) you may do well to bring on the discourse of our episcopal rights and privileges in England, and particularly of the prerogatives of the archbishop of Canterbury, which, I believe, are greater than those of the archbishop of Rheims, or of all the archbishops in France. This may raise in them a curiosity to know more of this matter, which if they desire, I will take the first little leisure I have to give them a more particular account of it. We must deal with men in their own way, if we mean to do any good with them. They have been

used to a pompous ministry, and, like the Jews heretofore, would despise the Messiah himself if he should come in a poor and low estate to them. And therefore, though, for myself, I account all temporal grandeur as nothing, and am afraid it has rather hurt the church of Christ, and the true spirit of piety and religion, than done any real service to either; yet it may be the means of disposing these gentlemen to a more favourable thought of, and inclination towards a reformation; to convince them that they may return to the truth of Christianity, and leave the corruptions of Rome, without losing any honour, any power, that a servant of Christ would desire to be troubled withal. Had the first reformers in France yielded to this scheme, as we in England showed them an example, the whole Gallican church had come in to them, and been at this day as we are now: we must therefore hit off the blot which they made, and satisfy their ambition so far as to show them that they may reform, without giving up either their authority or revenues, and be still as great, but much better bishops, under our circumstances, than under their own.

As to the pope's authority, I take the difference to be only this; that we may all agree (without troubling ourselves with the reason) to allow him a primacy of order in the episcopal college. They would have it thought necessary to hold communion with him, and allow him a little canonical authority over them, as long as he will leave them to prescribe the bounds of it. We fairly say we know of no authority he has in our realm; but for actual submission to him, they as little mind it as we do.

At present he has put them out of his communion; we have withdrawn ourselves from his; both are out of communion with him, and I think it is not material on which side the breach lies.

No. XI.

A Letter from Archbishop Wake to Mr. Beauvoir.

Feb. 5, 1718–19, O. S.

I DO not doubt that mine of the 18th of January, with the two inclosed for my lord Stair and Dr. Du-Pin, are before this come safe to you. I should not be sorry if, upon this late transaction between the doctor and ministry, you have kept it in your hands, and not delivered it to him. I had just begun a letter to Dr. Piers, but have thrown aside what I writ of it, since I received your last; and must beg the favour of you to make my excuse to him, with the tenders of my hearty service, till I see a little more what the meaning of this present inquisition is. I am not so unacquainted with the finesses of courts, as not to apprehend, that what is now done may be as well in favour of the doctor's attempt, as against it. If the *procureur-general* be indeed well affected to it, he might take this method, not only to his own security, but to bring the affair under a deliberation, and give a handle to those whom it chiefly concerns, to discover their sentiments of it. But the matter may be also put to another use, and nobody can answer that it shall not be so: and till I see what is the meaning of this sudden turn, I shall write no more letters for the French ministry to examine, but content myself to have done enough already to men who cannot keep their own counsel, and live in a country where even the private correspondence of learned men with one another must be brought to a public inquiry, and be made the subject of a state inquisition. I am not aware, that in any of my letters there is one line that can give a just offence to the court. I always took it for granted, that no step should be taken toward a union, but with the knowledge and approbation, and even by the authority of civil powers; and indeed if I am in the right, that nothing can be done to any purpose in this case but by throwing off the pope's authority, as the first step to be made in order to it, it is impossible for any such attempt to be made by any power less than the king's. All therefore that has passed hitherto, stands clear of any just exception as to the civil magistrate; it is only a consultation, in order to find out a way how a union might be made, if a fit occasion should hereafter be offered for the doing of it. Yet still I do not like to have my letters exposed in such a manner, though satisfied there is nothing to be excepted against in them; and think I shall be kind to the doctors themselves, to suspend, at least for a while, my farther troubling of them. I hope you will endeavour, by some or other of your friends, to find out the meaning of this motion; from whom it came; how far it has gone; what was the occasion of it; and what is like to be the consequence of it; what the abbé Du-Bois says of my letters, and how they are received by him and the other ministers. I shall soon discover whether any notice has been taken of it to our ministry; and I should think, if the abbé spoke to your lord about it, he would acquaint you with it.

No. XII.

Extract of a Letter from Archbishop Wake to Mr. Beauvoir.

Feb. 24, 1718.

I DO not at all wonder that the cardinals Rohan and Bissi should do all they can to blacken the good cardinal de Noailles, and in him the party of the Anti-Constitutionists, but especially the Sorbonne, their most weighty and learned adversaries; and I am sensible that such a complaint is not only the most proper to do this, but to put the court itself under some difficulties, which way soever it acts upon it. But I am still the more curious to learn, if it were possible, not only the proceedings of the ministry above board hereupon, but their private thoughts and opinions about it. I am under no concern upon my own account, farther than that I would be unwilling to have my letters scanned by so many great men, which will scarcely bear the judgment of my very friends. You must do me the favour to get out of your doctors what will be most obliging to them, whether to continue to write to them, or to be silent for a while, till we see what will be the effect of this inquiry. In the mean time, it grows every day plainer what I said from the beginning, that no reformation can be made but by the authority, and with the concurrence of the court; and that all we divines have to do, is to use our interest to gain them to it, and to have a plan ready to offer to them, if they would be prevailed upon to come into it.

I am at present engaged in two or three other transactions of moment to the foreign protestants, which take up abundance of my time; God knows what will be the

effect of it. Nevertheless, if I can in any way help to promote this, though I am at present without any help, alone, in this project, I shall do my utmost, both to keep up my poor little interest with the two doctors and their friends, and to concert proper methods with them about it. The surest way will be, to begin as well, and to go as far as we can, in settling a friendly correspondence one with another; to agree to own each other as true brethren, and members of the catholic Christian church; to agree to communicate in every thing we can with one another (which, on their side, is very easy, there being nothing in our offices, in any degree, contrary to their own principles;) and would they purge out of theirs what is contrary to ours, we might join in the public service with them, and yet leave one another in the free liberty of believing transubstantiation or not, so long as we did not require any thing to be done by either in pursuance of that opinion. The Lutherans do this very thing; many of them communicate not only in prayers, but in the communion with us; and we never inquire whether they believe consubstantiation, or even pay any worship to Christ as present with the elements, so long as their outward actions are the same with our own, and they give no offence to any with their opinions.

P. S. Since this last accident, and the public noise of a union at Paris, I have spoken something more of it to my friends here, who, I begin to hope, will fall in with it. I own a correspondence, but say not a tittle how far, or in what way, I have proceeded, more than that letters have passed, which can no longer be a secret. I have never shown one of my own or the doctors to any body.

No. XIII.

Extract of a Letter from Archbishop Wake to Mr. Beauvoir.

March 16, S. V. 1718.

I THANK you for your account of what passed between Mons. Hop and you, relating to the project of a union: I doubt that gentleman will not be pleased with it; because, indeed, the Gallican church will never unite with any church that has not an orderly episcopacy in it. I am very sorry my poor letters are made so public. The next thing will be, that either the imprudence of our friends, or the malice of our enemies, will print them; and then I shall have censures enough for them, perhaps some reflections printed upon them, or answers made to them; but this shall not engage me in any defence of them, or in taking any farther notice of them. I beg you to keep those I have written to yourself from all view; for I have no copies of them, and I wrote them as I do my other ordinary letters, without any great thought or consideration, more than what my subject (as I was writing) led me in that instant to. This is the liberty to be taken with a friend, where one is sure what he writes shall go no farther; but, for the same reason will require the strictest suppression from any other view. I cannot yet guess what this turn means, nor how it will end: I wish your doctors could give you some farther light into it.

P. S. I entreat you never to forget me to the two good doctors, whom I love and honour: keep up the little interest I have with them. As soon as ever the present turn is over, I will write to Dr. Girardin. I hope my letters will not always be carried as criminals before the secretary of state, though I am persuaded he bears no ill-will to me.

No. XIV.

Extract of a Letter from Archbishop Wake to Mr. Beauvoir.

April 29, 1718.

I AM much concerned to hear that Dr. Du-Pin decays so fast: I feared by his last letter that he was sinking apace. Pray, is there any good print of him taken these last years? for I have one that was made when he was a young man. I am sorry Dr. Piers grows faint-hearted: I never thought any thing could be done as to a reformation in France, without the authority of the court; but I was in hopes the regent and others might have found their account in such an attempt; and then the good disposition of the bishops, clergy, and Sorbonne, with the parliament of Paris, would have given a great deal of spirit and expedition to it. I have done what was proper for me in that matter: I can now go no farther, till the abbot Du-Bois is better disposed; yet I shall still be pleased to keep up a little esteem between those gentlemen, which will do *us* some good, if it does not do *them* any service. I am apt to think, the good old man (Du-Pin) does not think us far from the kingdom of heaven. I have with this sent a letter of friendship to Dr. Piers, which you will be so kind as to send him, with my kind respects.

No. XV.

Extract of a Letter from Archbishop Wake to Dr. Du-Pin, dated Lambeth, May 1, 1719.

N. B. Du-Pin was dead before it arrived at Paris.

SPERAVERAM equidem tuâ auctoritate, constantiâ, eruditione, pietate, moderatione, quæ omnia adeò in te perfecta esse noscuntur, ut vix in aliis singula, præclari aliquid ad Dei gloriam, ecclesiæque Gallicanæ utilitatem, per fici potuisse. Crediderim advenisse tempus, in quo, excusso Romanæ tyrannidis jugo, unà nobiscum in eandem communionem coalesceretis. In dogmatibus, prout à te candidè proponuntur, non admodùm dissentimus: in regimine ecclesiastico minus: in fundamentalibus, sive doctrinam sive disciplinam spectemus, vix omninò. Quàm facilis erat ab his initiis ad concordiam progressus, modò animos haberemus ad pacem compositos! Sed hoc principibus seculi non arridet, unionis inimicis etiam plurimum displicet: neque nobis fortè dabit Deus esse tam felicibus, ut ad hujusmodi unionem nostram qualemcunque operam conferamus. Relinquamus hoc illi, in cujus manu sunt rerum omnium tempora et occasiones. Sufficiat voluisse aliquid in tam insigni opere, fortè et semina in terram projecisse, quæ fructum tandem multiplicem proferant. Interim, quod nemo nobis denegare possit, nos invicem ut fratres, ut ejusdem mystici corporis membra, amplectamur.

No. XVI.

Extract of a Letter from Archbishop Wake to Mr. Beauvoir.

Feb. 9, S. V. 1719-20.

I HEARTILY wish there were either spirit or inclination enough in the Sorbonne to go on with our friend the abbé's project: but the fire decays, men's inclinations

cool: the court will do nothing, and you are very sensible, that without the court nothing can be done in any such affair. Nevertheless, their good opinion of the church of England should be kept up as much as possible; we should encourage them all we can to account of us as of brethren, who have only thrown off, what they are weary of, the tyranny of the court of Rome, without any change in any fundamental article, either of the doctrine or government of the Catholic church; and upon this ground I shall be ready to continue a brotherly correspondence with any of their great men, provided it be done with such caution, as may not expose my letters to be made prisoners to a secretary of state,—a thing which can never become my character, and may carry an ill aspect, even in our own court, till the thing be rightly understood.

No. XVII.

Extract of a Letter from the Archbishop to Mr. Beauvoir.

March 31, 1720.

I THANK you for your account of the present state of the French church. It is a very odd one indeed, but will settle into an agreement at last. When once the appellants begin to break, the court will drive all the *obstinate* (as they will call them; I should name them, the *honest* men, of courage and constancy) to a compliance.

No. XVIII.

Extract of a Letter from the Archbishop to Mr. Beauvoir.

April 19, O. S. 1720.

I PERCEIVE, by some late letters from him (Piers Girardin,) that he begins to despair of the business of the constitution. He has reason: the cardinal de Noailles is ensnared, and has gone too far to retire. The new archbishop of Cambray will be a cardinal; and this affair of the constitution must procure the *calot* for him. The regent himself is afraid of the Spanish party, and the Jesuits; and he will gain, or at least appease them. For all these reasons, the doctrine of the church, and the Gallican liberties, must be abandoned; and, on the slight pretence of a comm'. of no esteem with the opposite party, an accommodation will certainly be made; and those who will not voluntarily go, shall be driven into it. If our poor friend be one of those who must hereby suffer, why may he not consider of a retreat hither, and, since he cannot yet bring on a union with the two churches, unite himself with ours, from which I am sure his principles, and I believe his inclinations, are not greatly distant? But this must be managed very tenderly, and rather by a kind of rallying, than a direct proposal of it. If he inclines to it, he will easily understand your meaning; if not, 'tis best not to go on far with him in a matter in which you will have no good success.

No. XIX.

xtract of a Letter from Archbishop Wake to Mr. le Clerc.

April, 1719.

NOVUM Testamentum Gallicum, notis tuis feliciter ornatum, totum, nec sine fructu, perlegi. Præfatione tuâ eidem præfixâ mirificè affectus sum; legi, relegi, quin et sæpiùs deinceps repetam. Ita me in ipso præsertim ejus initio commovit, ut veræ pietatis in eâ relucentem spiritum nunquam satis laudare possim, vel animo meo satis altè imprimere.

Et quamvis in annotationibus tuis quædam liberiùs dicta occurrant, quæ non æque omnibus placeant, neque mihi ipsi ubique satisfaciant; fero tamen, et vel in ipso tuo a communi sententiâ discessu aliquid mihi invenire videor, quod ignoscere magis quàm acerbiùs reprehendere debeam, multo minùs inclementiùs damnare. Libertatem prophetandi, modo pia ac sobria sit, cum charitate ac mansuetudine conjuncta, nec contra analogiam fidei semel sanctis traditæ, adeò non vituperandam, ut etiam probandam, censeam. De rebus adiaphoris cum nemine contendendum puto. Ecclesias reformatas, etsi in aliquibus a nostrâ Anglicanâ dissentientes, libenter amplector. Optarem equidem regimen episcopale benè temperatum, et ab omni injustâ dominatione sejunctum, quale apud nos obtinet, et, siquid ego in his rebus sapiam, ab ipso apostolorum ævo in ecclesiâ receptum fuerit, et ab iis omnibus fuisset retentum; nec despero quin aliquando restitutum, si non ipse videam, at posteri videbunt. Interim absit ut ego tam ferrei pectoris sim, ut ob ejusmodi defectum (sic mihi absque omni invidiâ appellare liceat) aliquas earum a communione nostrâ abscindendas credam; aut, cum quibusdam furiosis inter nos scriptoribus, eas nulla vera ac valida sacramenta habere, adeòque vix Christianos esse pronuntiem. Unionem arctiorem inter omnes reformatos procurare quovis pretio vellem. Hæc si in regimine ecclesiastico ac publicis ecclesiarum officiis obtineri potuit; aut ego plurimum fallor, aut id solum brevi conduceret ad animorum inter eos unionem conciliandam, et viam sterneret ad plenam in omnibus majoris momenti dogmatibus concordiam stabiliendam. Quantum hoc ad religionis nostræ securitatem conduceret; quantum etiam ad pseudo-catholicorum Romanensium conversionem, cæcus sit qui non videat.—Sed abripuit me longius quàm par esset hæc semper mihi dulcis de pace ac unione ecclesiarum reformatarum cogitatio,—&c.

No. XX.

Archbishop Wake's letter to the pastors and professors of Geneva.

8th April, 1719.

QUAMVIS literis vestris nihil mihi gratius potuit afferri, non tamen absque summo dolore, vix oculis siccis, eas perlegi; neque credo quenquam esse tam ferrei pectoris, qui ad ea mala quæ in illis referentur non perhorrescat, mireturque talia ab hominibus erga homines, a popularibus erga populares suos, a Christianis denique erga Christianos, idque (quod fidem omnem exuperare valeat) etiam religionis causâ, fieri et perpetrari.

Vos interim, venerandi viri, quod vestri erat officii, sedulo præstitistis. Delegatos ecclesiarum Hungaricarum amicè accepistis. Querimoniam eorum, eâ quâ par erat charitate atque sympathiâ fraternâ audivistis; nullâque morâ adhibitâ, ad remedium malis ipsorum inveniendum omnes vestras cogitationes convertistis. Per illustres magistratus vestros, cæteros reformatæ religionis principes atque senatores, ad persecutiones horum fratrum vestrorum seriò considerandas, excitavistis, et ut suam authoritatem interponerent ad sedandas eorum oppressiones enixissimè obsecrâstis.

Denique, nequid vel minimi ponderis desideretur quo

studium vestrum in hoc tam insigni charitatis opere exequendo ostendatis, etiam meâ qualicunque operâ uti voluistis, ad animum augustissimi regis nostri commovendum, ne in hâc tam gravi suâ necessitate afflictis Christi servis deesset.

O amorem vere Christianum! et qualem deceat ejusdem corporis membra erga se invicem habere! Dignum profecto et vobis, et eximio illo vestro congressu, opus; ut quo præcipuè tempore convenistis ad laudes Dei celebrandas, qui per duo jam secula religionem reformatam vobis incolumem servaverit, eodem etiam illam ipsam religionem evangelicam in aliis regionibus oppressam, concussam, ac tantum non extremum quasi spiritum trahentem, sublevetis et si fieri possit, in integrum restituatis.

Ego vero, fratres charissimi, et propriâ voluntate motus, et vestro tam illustri exemplo impulsus, adeo eodem vobiscum ardore accendor, ut nihil non tentandum putem, quo vestris tam piis, tam justis, tamque benignis conatibus optatum successum compararem.

Imprimis igitur nobilem virum comitem Sunderlandiæ primarium regis ministrum sedulò adivi: literas vestras illi communicavi; petii, oravi, ut in hâc re suam mihi operam utque auxilium concedere vellet; utque simul regiam majestatem adiremus; non quod de ipsius promptâ voluntate dubitarem, sed ut quæ in hâc causâ facienda essent, eo majori vigore atque promptitudine perficerentur. Successit, ferè ultrà spem, conatis noster. Utriusque ecclesiæ tum Hungaricæ tum vicinæ Vallensis, oppressiones regi, eo quo par erat affectu, exposuimus. Favorem ejus atque authoritatem apud Cæsarem regemque Sardiniæ obnixè imploravimus, ut ab his tam injustis vexationibus, eorum jussu et mandatis, liberentur. Et præcipuè quod ad Pedemontanas ecclesias attinet etiam adhortati sumus, ut jure suo a rege Sardiniæ postularet, ut pacta in his quæ religionis exercitium concernent, earum gratiâ inita, meliori fide in posterum observentur. Annuit votis nostris rex serenissimus; neque dubito quin legatis suis jamdudum præceperit, ut omnem quam possunt operam suo nomine impendant, quo ab istis adeo iniquis oppressionibus utriusque ecclesiæ membra liberentur. Orandus Deus ut tanti principis conatibus, in hâc tam justâ, tam piâ, tam religioni Christianæ proficuâ interpellatione, aspirare dignetur, et oppressis suis servis exoptatam requiem tandem concedere, pro immensâ suâ misericordiâ, velit.

Interim, dum hæc feliciter, uti spero, peraguntur, ignoscite, fratres dilectissimi, si majoris quidem laboris atque difficultatis, sed longè maximi omnibus commodi, inceptum, vobis proponam; in quo et sæpe alias et hoc tempore complures primariæ dignitatis viri summo studio allaborant; et quod ab omnibus, quibus puritas Evangelii reipsa cordi sit, unà secum allaborandum sperant. Jamdudum sentitis quo mea tendit adhortatio; ad unionem nimirum inter omnes quæ ubique sunt ecclesias, quæ his ultimis seculis a communione, seu veriùs tyrannide pontificis Romani, sese subduxerunt, sedulò promovendam. Quin hoc fieri possit, si quidem animum ad concordiam promptum omnes attulerimus, nullatenus dubitandum est: quin fieri debeat, nemo prudens negaverit, &c. &c.

Vos interim, F. C. hoc agite, ut saltum inter vos ipsos pax atque concordia inviolabiliter conserventur. Summo quippe dolore, anno præterito, accepi dissensiones inter vos ortas fuisse, de capitulis aliquot circa doctrinam de gratiâ universali, aliisque quæstionibus longè difficillimis, in quibus optimi viri et doctissimi theologi idem per omnia haudquaquam sentiunt. Angit hoc sanè, idque non mediocriter, animum meum. Et quamvis nollem vobis videri ἀλλοτριοεπισκοπεῖν, aut in alienam (quod aiunt) messem falcem meam immittere; permittite tamen ut in spiritu charitatis, eoque quo erga vos feror amore fraterno, vos obsecrem, et in Domino obtester, ut in hujusmodi rebus, quatenus id fieri possit, idem sentiatis omnes; quod si id non assequi veleatis, ut saltem sic alii alios feratis, ut nullum sit inter vos schisma, nullus querimoniæ aliquorum adversus alios locus; ut non nimium curiosi sitis in iis determinandis quæ Deus non admodum clarè revelaverit, quæque absque salutis dispendio tutò nesciri poterint; quæ sapientissimi prædecessores nostri, in omnibus suis confessionibus, cautè tractanda censuerunt, eâque moderatione, ut universi in iis subscribendis consentirent; et à quorum prudenti cautelâ sicubi posteà discessum fuerit, contentiones, lites inimicitiæ, aliaque infinita incommoda, protinus subsecuta sunt.

In his disquisitionibus Lutherani â reformatis dissident; nec reformati ipsi prorsus inter se conveniunt. Ecclesia Anglicana optimo consilio, exemplo ab omnibus imitando, nullius conscientiæ, his in rebus, jugum imponit. Quæ de illis in articulis suis statuerit, talia sunt, ut ab omnibus ex æquo admittantur. His contenta, nec ipsa aliquid amplius requirit curiosiùs statuere. Hinc summa inter nos pax cum sobriâ sentiendi libertate conjuncta. Utinam et vobis, iisdem conditionibus, concordia stabiliatur, utque veteri confessione vestrâ Helveticâ contenti, neque alicui permitteretis aliter docere, neque ab aliquo quidpiam profitendum requireretis ultrâ id quod ab initio requisitum fuerit; cum tamen summi illi viri Calvinus et Beza (ut de aliis taceatur) secus de his articulis sentirent, quàm alii plures; quos tamen non solùm tolerandos, sed et pro fratribus habendos ritè ac sapienter judicârunt.

Hoc vobis non modò pacem inter vos ipsos conciliabit, verùm etiam concordiam cum aliis ecclesiis reformatis sartam tectam tuebitur. Absque hujusmodi temperamine, unio illa cum Protestantibus, tantopere desiderata, nullo modo iniri poterit; vos, igitur, seriò hæc, ut par est, considerate: nec a nobis, a plerisque aliis reformatis, etiam a vestris antecessoribus, novis ac durioribus impositionibus secedite, &c.

N. B. The former part of this letter, which relates to the intercession of archbishop Wake in behalf of the Hungarian and Piedmontese churches, has never been hitherto published. The latter part, beginning with these words, "Interim dum hæc feliciter peraguntur, ignoscite," &c. was inserted, by Professor Turretin of Geneva, in his work entitled, Nubes Testium. The words "Interim dum hæc," &c. were, from an ignorance of their connexion with what goes before, supposed by some learned men to relate to the projected union between the English and Gallican churches; and Kiorning, who says in his Dissertation de Consecrationibus Episcoporum Anglorum, that Dr. Wake communicated this project to the divines of Geneva, fell into this mistake, and probably drew Dr. Mosheim after him.

No. XXI.

Extract from Archbishop Wake's Letter to Professor Schurer, of Bern, July 1718.

De Anglià nostrâ te peramanter et sentire et scribere plurimùm gaudeo. Quanquam enim non adeò cæcus

sim patriæ meæ amator, ut non plurima hîc videam quæ vel penitûs sublata vel in meliûs mutata quovis pretio vellem, tamen aliqua etiam in hac temporum fæce occurrere, optimis etiam seculis digna, et quæ ipsa primæva ecclesia Christiana probare, ne dicam et laudare, potuisset, et tu æquissimè agnoscis et nos nobis gratulamur.

No. XXII.

To Professor Turretin, July 1718.

Speaking of Bishop Davenant's opinion as agreeable to his own.

Utinam sic sentiremus omnes, et, fundamentalibus religionis articulis semper salvis, nihil ultrà ab aliquo subscribendum requireremus, quod bonorum hominum conscientiis oneri esse potest, certè ecclesiæ utilitatem parûm promovebit.—Ut enim de hâc ecclesiarum reformatarum utilitate paucis dicam; primum earum stabilimentum in hoc consistere, ut omnes sese, quantùm fieri possit, contra papalem potentiam ac tyrannidem tueantur, nemini credo dubium esse posse. Ut in hunc finem quàm arctissimè inter se uniantur, et in idem corpus coalescant, adeò ut siquid alicui ex iis ecclesiæ damni aut detrimenti à communi hoste fuerit illatum, id ab omnibus tanquàm suum haberetur, concedi etiam necesse est.

Ut denique pax et concordia cujuslibet ecclesiæ reformatæ inter suos, ac cum aliis omnibus ejusmodi ecclesiis conserventur; unicuique viro bono, sed præsertim ecclesiarum illarum magistratibus atque ministris, totis viribus enitendum esse, adeò clarè apparet, ut nullâ probatione firmiori indigeat.

Afterwards:

Quid in hâc re aliud faciendum restat, nisi ut tuâ et amicorum tuorum auctoritate primò facultas vestra theologica, magistratus, ministri, cives Genevenses, deinde eorum exemplo atque hortatu reliqua etiam fœderis Helvetici membra reformata, omnem lapidem moveant, ut pacem ecclesiis Bernensibus restituant? Neque id ego sic fieri vellem, ut non simul et religionis veritati et doctrinæ puritati consulatur. Subscribant ministri, professores, theologi, confessioni vestræ veteri anno* [ ] editæ: prohibeantur, sub quâvis-libet pœnâ, ne ullam in concionibus, scriptis, thesibus, prælectionibus, sententiam publicè tueantur illi confessioni quovis modo contrariam. Id solum caveatur, ne multiplicentur hujusmodi subscriptiones absque necessitate; neque strictè nimis inquiratur in privatas hominum eruditorum sententias; modo suis opinionibus frui pacificè velint, et neque docendo, neque disputando, neque scribendo, à publicâ confessione secedere, aut errores suos (si tamen errores reverà fuerint) in scandalum cujus-vis, multò magis ecclesiæ aut reipublicæ divulgare.—Habes, vir spectatissime, sententiam meam.

No. XXIII.

Extract from a Letter of Archbishop Wake to Professor Schurer, July 1719.

Quæ de formulâ Consensûs mihi narras, abundè placent, qui, uti nolim laqueum absque causâ injici conscientiis bonorum atque eruditorum hominum, ita neque fræna laxanda censeo quibuscunque novatoribus ad pacem publicè turbandam, eaque vel scribenda vel docenda, quæ viris piis jure scandalum præbeant, quæque confessioni vestræ olim stabilitæ falsitatis notam injuriâ inurere videantur. Intra hos igitur limites si steterint magistratus vestri, neque aliquid amplius a Lausannensibus requirant, nisi ut hoc demûm fine formulæ consensûs subscribant; sperandum est nullum schisma, eâ de causâ, inter vos exoriturum. Pacem publicam tueri, etiam in rebus ad fidem spectantibus, magistratus Christianus et potest et debet. Conscientiis hominum credenda imponere, nisi in rebus claris et perspicuis, et ad salutem omninò necessariis, nec potest, nec debet. Quod si contra faciat, subditis tamen semper licebit ad apostolorum exemplar, si quidem aliquid falsi, aut incertæ veritatis, iis subscribendum injunxerint, obedire Deo potiûs quàm hominibus.

* The date of the confession of faith is omitted in the archbishop's letter.

No. XXIV.

Extracts from Archbishop Wake's Letter to Professor Turretin, in answer to one from him, dated December 1, 1718.

Res Bernensium ecclesiasticas nondum penitûs tranquillas esse et doleo et miror; eòque magis, quod hisce temporibus hæ de decretis divinis altercationes ubique ferè alibi ad exitum sint perductæ. Quæ mea sit de iis sententia, nec adhuc cuiquam apertè declaravi, neque, ut deinceps patefaciam, facilè me patiar induci. Hoc apud nos, tum ex mandatis regiis, tum ex diu servatâ (utinam semper servandâ) consuetudine fixum est atque stabilitum, neque à quoquam exquirere quid de his rebus sentiat, modo articulis religionis, publicâ auctoritate constitutis, subscribat; neque in concionibus aut etiam disputationibus theologicis, aliquid amplius de iis determinare, quam quod illi articuli expressè statuant, et ab omnibus ad ministerii munus admittendis profitendum requirant.

Then follows an historical narrative of the rise, and occasion, and censure of the Lambeth articles; as also of the rise and progress of Arminianism under the reigns of James I. and Charles I., and of the subsiding of all disputes of that kind under Charles II.——He then subjoins,

Et quidem illud imprimis observatu dignum æstimo, quàm moderatè, quàm prudenter, in hâc tam difficili disquisitione, optimi illi viri, martyres ac confessores Christi constantissimi, quos Divina Providentia ad reformandam hanc nostram ecclesiam seligere dignatus est, se gesserunt. Non illi curiositati cujusvis aliquid indulgendum putârunt; non vanis et incertis hominum hypothesibus de decretis divinis alicujus fidem alligare fas esse consuerunt. Sciebant quàm inscrutabilia sint consilia Dei, et quanto intervallo omnes nostras cogitationes exuperent. Ideòque non religiosè minûs quàm sapienter inter justos terminos sese continuerunt; neque in necessariis ad fidem nostram de hisce mysteriis stabiliendam deficientes; neque in non-necessariis determinandis officiosi; unde fortè pro verâ fide errorem, pro pace discordiam, pro fraternâ unione ac charitate divisionem, odia, inimicitias in ecclesiam Christi inducere poterant.

Hæc fuit eorum simplicitas verè evangelica; pietate non minûs quàm sapientiâ commendabilis; còque magis suspicienda, ac ferè pro divinâ habenda, quod tot annorum experientiâ reperta sit non solûm optimam fuisse pacis ac concordiæ regulam, verûm etiam unicum contra schismata et divisiones remedium.

HISTORY

OF THE

CHRISTIAN CHURCH

DURING

THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY;

FORMING

A CONTINUATION OF DR. MOSHEIM'S WORK.

INTRODUCTION.

THE generality of readers, more intent on the consideration of modern affairs than on the contemplation of ancient occurrences, are induced to expect, from historic writers, a much more copious detail of recent than of early transactions. The expectation is natural and reasonable, and it is therefore readily gratified by historians. But, like other rules, this also may be allowed to have an exception. In modern times, the affairs of the church move in a more regular course, and are conducted with far greater tranquillity, than in earlier periods; and hence a narrative of such occurrences may prove less interesting than the ecclesiastical history of many preceding ages, and may consequently require a less minute detail and less frequent reflection.

Dr. Mosheim, in all probability, if he had lived to the close of the eighteenth century, would have given an elaborate and ample sequel to his valuable history;* but the writer who has undertaken to continue that work has neither the leisure nor the inclination to expatiate upon the subject. It would not, perhaps, be very difficult for him to fill volumes with a specification of the religious and ecclesiastical affairs of the last century: but he does not conceive that such diffusion is necessary, and he hopes that a concise statement, with incidental remarks, will content his readers.

Those who wish for a copious history of the Christian church during that period, must wait for the exertions of some erudite and able divine, who may have time and patience for the accomplishment of the task.

C. COOTE.

* Such a conclusion may be drawn from what he says at the beginning of his sketch of that century:' Sæculi, quod vivimus, historia Christiana voluminis, non paginarum paucarum, materies est, suumque inter posteros scriptorem ingenuum et æquum expectat;'—a passage which may be thus translated: The history of the Christian church, during the the century in which we live, is the proper subject of a considerable volume, rather than of only a few pages; and it demands from posterity a writer who will pay due attention to it,—a liberal, impartial, and judicious author.

HISTORY OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH,

DURING

THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY.

CHAPTER I.

History of the Romish Church, during the Eighteenth Century.

THE continued attacks of the Protestants upon the church of Rome had forced the outworks, and weakened the barriers of that establishment: but it still presented a bold front to its assailants, and numbered among its votaries the major part of the inhabitants of Europe. Its greatness was impaired, but not subverted; and it had an imposing, if not a very formidable aspect. The pope's power of interdiction and excommunication had ceased to fill nations with dismay. Some of the potentates of his communion addressed him in a tone which many of his predecessors would not have endured; harassed him with various pretensions, and encroached upon that authority which he deemed legitimate and even divine. Notwithstanding these assaults, he retained some degree of power and a considerable portion of influence, and was supported in the dignity of supreme pontiff by the greatest princes of the continent.

The prelate who occupied this high station at the commencement of that century of which we are now treating, was Clement XI. or John Francis Albani, who, having acquired reputation by his skill in the management of affairs, and being also of a spirited character, had been unanimously chosen by the conclave at a time when the political horizon of Europe threatened a storm. He rejected the offered tiara with a greater appearance of sincerity than that which an English divine usually displays when he says, on the offer of a bishopric, *nolo episcopari;* but his scruples and objections were removed by the arguments, representations, and importunities of the cardinals.

He made a good beginning of administration. He redressed some grievances, discountenanced vice and criminality of every kind, performed acts of beneficence, gave an example of devotional regularity, and filled vacant offices and preferments with men of merit. He then directed his attention to politics, and testified a desire of preventing a war between the king of France and the emperor, on the subject of the Spanish succession. He wrote a letter to each of those princes, exhorting them to accommodate all disputes without rushing into hostilities. They received his advice with professions of respect for his character, but did not suffer it to regulate their conduct. Ambition still inflamed the aged Louis: his thirst of dominion still urged him to send forth his legions, and *wantonly* (for a lust of power was no *sufficient motive*) to shed the blood of his unoffending fellow creatures. Leopold professed an equal regard for religion, but was equally uninfluenced by justice or humanity.

With respect to the religious principles of these royal sons of the church, we may observe, that they were not animated by true piety, or a genuine spirit of religion. They may have believed the doctrines of Christianity; or, perhaps, they merely affected to give credit to the faith which they found established in their dominions. They attended mass with decorous regularity, witnessed ceremonial observances with a serious and devout aspect, and promoted among their subjects a religious uniformity. But they did not endeavour, like true Christians, to correct their evil propensities, amend their hearts, or reform their lives. They did not study to preserve "peace upon earth;" they did not cherish "good will towards men." Their religion in (the language applied by a respectable historian[a] to William the Conqueror ("prompted them to endow monasteries, but at the same time allowed them to pillage kingdoms: it threw them on their knees before a relic or a cross, but suffered them unrestrained to trample upon the liberties and the rights of mankind."

We have no concern with the war into which the rival princes entered, as it is unconnected with the history of the church. It arose from temporal motives, and referred to grand political objects. Both princes promised that, if the war should extend to Italy, the papal territories should remain uninjured and unmolested: but this promise was violated, on the part of Leopold, by the irruption of an Austrian detachment into the province of Ferrara. Clement having bitterly complained of this conduct, the troops retired: but, as they again encroached, he ordered an army to be levied. Louis, and his grandson the new king of Spain, earnestly requested his holiness to enter into an alliance with them, promising great advantages not only to the holy see, but to the pontiff himself, as the price of his condescension. He had no wish to take part with either of the contending families, and therefore refused to accede to the confederacy. A report was propagated of his assent to the offered terms; and it derived strength from the appearance of the duke of Berwick at Rome; but that nobleman was merely sent from France by the royal exile, James II., to congratulate Albani on his elevation to the papal throne.

Unable to check the rage of war, the pope soothed his anxiety, and gratified his religious zeal, by promoting the diffusion of the catholic faith. He even expressed a wish that he could visit the remotest parts of the globe for that pious and salutary purpose, and lamented his inability of accomplishing his desire. Contracting his views he contented himself with sending legates into various regions, particularly into Persia, India, and China, to support and extend the interests of Christianity: but the success of these heralds of the Gospel did not correspond with the wishes of the religious world. We are informed, how-

[a] George Lord Lyttleton.

ever, that his entreaties and expostulations procured, for the catholics of Thrace, Armenia, and Syria, a respite from Mohammedan persecution, and an allowance of the free exercise of their religion.[a] This freedom, however, was occasionally interrupted and disturbed by the brutality of furious infidels, and the animosity of barbarian zealots.

The legate upon whom he chiefly depended, for the success of the eastern mission, was Maillard de Tournon, who was ready to encounter every danger in the cause of Christianity. This missionary visited India and China with a weak and declining frame, but with a heart full of pious zeal. He introduced himself to the Chinese emperor at Pekin; was politely received, and complimented with various presents; and was gratified with permission to preach the Gospel, and expound the doctrines of the catholic faith. The imperial potentate, however, did not mean that this permission should so far operate, as to authorise the legate and his associates to oppose the prevalence of popular institutions and ceremonies, sanctioned by long practice. Unwilling to make any concessions to the prejudices of paganism, Tournon loudly exclaimed against the idolatrous usages of the Chinese, and sharply reproved the ministers of state and of religion, for suffering the continuance of such degrading absurdities. By this freedom he gave great offence to the court; and he was even accused of treason against the emperor. Defying the odium which he considered as unmerited, he proceeded in his pious career, until he was banished from the capital, in 1707, and sent to the island of Macao, where he was imprisoned with five of his fellow missionaries. Admiring his undaunted zeal, the pope elevated him to the dignity of a cardinal; an honour which he declared he would not accept, if he should be expected to relinquish his mission; for he was prepared to suffer every inconvenience, and undergo every species of persecution, in the discharge of Christian duties. When the governor of the Philippine islands offered to facilitate his escape, he peremptorily refused to quit his prison. He died, not without suspicion of poison, after he had been confined above three years. The mission was continued after his death; but it did not promise to be successful, as the prejudices of the Chinese were too firmly fixed to be easily eradicated.[b]

Clement, in the mean time, continued to observe, with an anxious eye, the commotions of Europe. When the emperor had proclaimed his son (the archduke Charles) king of Spain, his holiness refused to acknowledge the young prince in that capacity. A new invasion of Ferrara followed; but the Austrians did not venture to make a conquest of that territory, as Leopold was unwilling to inflict any serious injury on the pontiff. As soon as Joseph became emperor, he manifested a stronger inclination than his father had evinced, to thwart and harass the head of the church. He restricted the papal authority in point of presentation to benefices; seized Comacchio, and claimed Parma and Placentia as imperial fiefs. His troops levied contributions in the ecclesiastical state, and alarmed the timid inhabitants. At length, however, he consented to an accommodation,[c] and ceased to be a refractory son of the church.

A revival of the contest between the Jansenists and the Jesuits had for some time conspired with politics and war to disturb the tranquillity of the court of Rome.[d] M. Du-Pin had published, in 1703, a Case of Conscience, in which (according to the pope's letter to the king of France) various errors already condemned were revived, and the heretical tenets of Jansenius defended; and for this offence he was banished from Paris into the province of Bretagne. Forty doctors of the Sorbonne, whose names appeared among the signatures of approbation that accompanied the *Case*, were desired to submit to the will of the pontiff; and many of them recanted, while others denied that they had given assent to the book. For the more effectual repression of Jansenism, a new apostolical constitution was issued in 1705, condemning such errors with menaces of papal indignation. The archbishop of Sebaste, vicar of the holy see in Holland, was removed from his employment for a supposed collusion with the Jansenists; and these sectaries were again subjected to ecclesiastical censure in 1708, when the pope condemned the Moral Reflections of their celebrated associate, Quesnel, upon the New Testament. This theologian answered the damnatory bull with a spirit which inflamed the contest. The partisans of Rome called for a new and more explicit condemnation of the Reflections; and the king of France, prejudiced against a sect which the Jesuits represented as even more dangerous to the church than that of the Huguenots, earnestly solicited the promulgation of a rigourous edict. Hence arose that decree which was addressed to the whole catholic world, but which more particularly demanded the attention and observance of the Gallican church.[e]

The Anti-Jansenist ordinance, as it commenced with the terms *Unigenitus Dei Filius*, was quickly known throughout Christendom by the appellation of the bull *Unigenitus*. Alleging and lamenting the inefficacy of the former condemnation of Quesnel's book, the pontiff was determined, he said, to apply a stronger remedy to the growing disease. Some catholic truths, he allowed, were mingled with the mass of corrupt doctrine: but, as the insidious and seductive manner in which the errors were brought forward, had occasioned a neglect of the sound portion of the work, it was necessary to separate the tares from the wheat. He and his counsellors, therefore, had extracted a hundred and one propositions from the book; and these he now condemned as false, captious, scandalous, pernicious, rash, seditious, impious, blasphemous, schismatic, and heretical. Not content with censuring these passages, he subjoined a prohibition of the whole performance, and cautioned the people, on pain of excommunication, against the perusal of any vindication or defence of it, which had been, or might be, offered to the public.

This bull, perhaps, the good sense of Clement would have forborne to promulgate, if the zeal of the bigoted and domineering Louis had not overawed or perverted the pontiff; though it may with equal plausibility be supposed, that the pope's zeal was sufficient for the object, without any solicitation whatever. The Jansenists, per-

[a] Guarnacci, Vit. et Res Gest. Pontificum Romanorum et Cardinalium, usque ad Clementem XII. tom. ii. p. 7.

[b] Guarnacci, Vit. Pontif. et Cardin. tom. ii. p. 143, 144.

[c] In the year 1708.

[d] For an account of the rise of this controversy, and of the doctrines propagated by Jansenius, see Dr. Mosheim's fifth volume, cent. xvii. sect. ii. part i. chap. i.

[e] Guarnacci, Vit. Pontif. et Cardin. tom. ii. p. 11, 18, 19.—Histoire de France, sous le Regne de Louis XIV. par M. de Larrey, tom. iii.—This bull made its appearance on the 8th of September, 1713, N. S.

secuted by that intolerant prince for disregarding the new papal *constitution*, expected less rigorous treatment when Philip duke of Orleans became regent of France. The cardinal de Noailles, who had warmly supported their cause, was introduced into the cabinet: those who had been banished were recalled: the resolutions which the Sorbonne had adopted in favour of the bull, were annulled, as the effect of constraint; and the conduct of the court of Rome was publicly and acrimoniously condemned. The pope remonstrated against these proceedings, and urged the propriety of submitting to the holy see: but the Jansenists called for a general council, calculated to heal the disorders of the church. The Jesuits denied the necessity of such a convocation, and complained of the arrogance of the demand. The regent at length began to listen to the persuasions of the bigoted party, and menaced the opposers of the bull with his resentment. He banished M. Ravechet, syndic of the Sorbonne, into Roussillon; but he would not consent to the deposition of that resolute academic, who died in the midst of these disputes. An assembly of prelates, convoked by Philip, in vain endeavoured to reconcile the parties; and twenty commissioners, nominated for the same purpose, were not more successful in their exertions. The parliament of Paris took cognizance of the affair, in consequence of an appeal from some priests whom the archbishop of Rheims had excommunicated for their opposition to the will of his holiness. The spiritual sentence was declared null and void, and the prelate who had pronounced it was condemned in costs and damages. The Jansenists now became more bold in their attacks, until the regent, alleging the inutility of these disputes, imposed silence by a royal declaration.[a]

An edict which confounded the advocates of truth and of sound doctrine with misguided zealots, displeased both parties. The pope accused the regent of insincerity and injustice, and of enmity to that church which he was bound to protect. To the cardinal de Noailles he sent a letter, mingling expostulations with entreaty, which did not subdue the firmness of that prelate. The cardinal's appeal from the bull or "constitution of the holy father to the pope better advised, and to a future general council," was condemned by the court of inquisition at Rome as a scandalous libel; and its circulation and perusal were strictly prohibited. A papal brief afterwards appeared,[b] commanding all Christians throughout the world to withhold their favour and regard from the opposers of the constitution, and threatening these unworthy sons of the church, in case of prolonged contumacy, with a forfeiture of all ecclesiastical privileges. This brief, exciting the indignation of the Parisian parliament, was suppressed by an *arrêt*.

In the progress of the contest, the pope's adherents strengthened their party; and the Jansenist leaders assumed a more conciliatory tone. The cardinal declared his readiness to accept the constitution, according to his own explanation of it; and, with this qualification, he condemned the work of Quesnel. Some of the clergy disapproved the explanations, as being almost equally objectionable with the bull itself; and, on the other hand, the chief promoters of that act or decree insisted on an absolute and unreserved submission to its obvious import. Many of the French bishops condescended to explain it, in the hope of removing the scruples of the conscientious Jansenists; but the pope, while he commended the zeal and good intentions of those prelates, denied the necessity of their exertions, as the wisdom and authority of the head of the church, who was allowed to dictate to the faithful, did not require, from any of its members, explanatory aid or argumentative enforcement.

The pope ultimately prevailed in the contest. The regent resolved to gratify the majority of the higher clergy by giving the sanction of the court to the papal edict, after it had been for seven years an object of dispute. It was ordained,[c] that the constitution *Unigenitus*, received by the bishops, should be observed by all orders of people in the French dominions; that no university or incorporated society, and no individual of any description whatever, should speak, write, maintain or teach, directly or indirectly, any thing repugnant to the ordinance, or to the explanations given of it by the dignitaries of the Gallican church; that all appeals and proceedings against it should be deemed void; and that the courts of parliament, and all judges, should assist the prelates in the execution of spiritual censures. The parliament of Paris at first refused to register this decree, which, said some of its members, not only derogated from the dignity of the crown, but militated against the rights of the subject, and the liberties of the Gallican church; but it was confirmed by the great council, and promulgated as an operative law. Even the cardinal de Noailles at length acquiesced in it; and a parliamentary registration was procured by menaces of removal or of exile.[d]

The exertions of the cardinal Du-Bois were of signal service in subduing the spirit of the principal Jansenists, and, after the registration of the edict, he made occasional use of *lettres de cachet* against refractory individuals, and revived the oath introduced by Louis XIV. which all candidates for holy orders, and for academical degrees, were obliged to take, importing that the five propositions of Jansenius, respecting grace and free will, were justly condemned.

Clement was highly pleased at this accommodation; but his joy was allayed by the consideration of his declining health. He died in the spring of the following year, at the age of seventy-one years, during twenty of which he had occupied the pontifical throne. His catholic biographer ascribes to him an acute understanding and a tenacious memory, an unwearied zeal in the pursuit of learning, a firmness of mind united with benevolence of disposition and courtesy of manners, and a freedom from anger and resentment.[e]

His secretary, cardinal Paulucci, would have been chosen to succeed him, if the intrigues of the Austrian faction had not baffled the views of the Italian members of the conclave, whose advantage in point of number yielded to imperial tyranny. After a vacancy of seven weeks, the pontifical chair was filled with Michael Angelo Conti, son of the duke of Poli, who assumed the designation of Innocent XIII. Being in a weak state of health

[a] October 7, 1717, N. S.—Guarnacci, Vit. Pontificum et Cardin. tom. ii. p. 21, 22.
[b] Dated August 28, 1718.
[c] August 4, 1720.
[d] Memoires de la Regence.
[e] Guarnacci Vit. Pontificum et Cardinalium, tom. ii. p. 36.

at the time of his election, he did not long preside over the church, his government not being extended by Providence to the end even of the third year.

It was one of the first cares of this pontiff to accommodate the dispute respecting the investiture of the kingdom of Naples. The emperor and the king of Spain had in vain solicited that favour from the late pope: but it was now granted to the former prince, on the acknowledgement of tributary subjection to the holy see. Another object of Innocent's attention was the maintenance of the papal claim to the sovereignty of Parma and Placentia; but he did not, in that respect, succeed to his wish. In the mean time he exercised his authority at Rome with mildness, and sometimes with that severity which appeared to be necessary. To other parts of Christendom he also extended his care and vigilance: and Spain, in particular, felt his corrective hand. Observing with serious concern, and indeed with strong disgust, the dissolute manners both of the clergy and laity in that country, he issued an admonitory and threatening edict for the repression of irregular, disorderly, and vicious practices. He had no doubt of the religious zeal and decorous behaviour of his catholic majesty,[a] but lamented, on this occasion, the insufficient influence even of royal example.[b]

Amidst the cares of spiritual and temporal government, Innocent found his health seriously declining. Hydropic symptoms alarmed him; and other disorders conspired to put an end to his life, in the spring of the year 1724, at the age of 68. Few pontiffs were ever more popular among their temporal subjects than Innocent XIII., whose death, therefore, was sincerely lamented. His successor was cardinal Vincent Orsini (eldest son of the duke of Gravina,) who, having an early sense of piety, had rejected the offer of a splendid marriage, renounced a rich inheritance in favour of a younger brother, and entered into the clerical order, in which he distinguished himself by his indefatigable zeal as a preacher, by his rigid attention to all points of duty, and his scrupulous avoidance of every species of luxury and excess.

The beginning of the pontificate of Benedict XIII.—for so the new pope was styled—was marked by an edict against luxury and fantastic extravagance in dress; and, that he might not seem to attend more to *minutiæ* than to objects of importance, he took every opportunity of recommending a strict regard to moral and social duties, and a steady practice of Christian virtues. His exhortations and injunctions had some effect: but, when one head of the *hydra* of vice was striken off, another instantly grew in its place. If the wishes of Benedict, however, were not answered, he consoled himself by reflecting that he had done his duty. That consciousness will always impart pleasure to a pious mind. It will soothe the Christian moralist amidst the evils of life, and at the approach of death.

It was in the first year of his government that the affair of Thorn occurred, which, while it contributed to the supposed advantage of the catholic church by injuring the protestant interest in Poland, wounded the feelings of the pontiff, who lamented and reprobated the cruelty that attended the triumph of the Romanists on that occasion. Some Lutherans neglecting or refusing to kneel at a procession of the host, a student of the Jesuits' college reproached and even struck them, and some other zealots of that seminary afterwards insulted the peaceful inhabitants. The aggressor being apprehended and confined, his comrades demanded and obtained his release: but they were not suffered to rescue another who had been seized by the city-guard. Enraged at this disappointment, they committed various outrages; and, in retaliation, the college was attacked and plundered by the populace. The president of the city, on pretence of his connivance at this tumult on the part of the people, was decapitated by order of a Polish tribunal: nine other citizens were subjected to the same fate; and the privileges of the Lutheran inhabitants were arbitrarily annulled. This barbarity disgusted those catholics who had any sense of humanity, and excited the indignation of every protestant community. The Jesuits, however, maintained, that they had only inflicted due chastisement on their insolent adversaries, who had entered into a nefarious conspiracy against their catholic fellow-citizens; and the king of Poland boasted, in the same spirit of bigotry, that he had vindicated, by the punishment of profane heretics, the honour and dignity of true religion. That prince seemed to think that he had sufficiently blended mercy with justice, by sparing the lives of the vice-president and some other citizens who had been condemned. The Jesuits had, at this time, too great an influence at the court of Warsaw; and they rarely exerted that influence in the cause of justice or of humanity.

The more humane and benevolent pontiff consoled himself, amidst these sanguinary deeds, by a bloodless triumph of that religion which he superintended. We allude to the Jubilee of the year 1725, which he opened with great solemnity, and which gladdened the faithful with the confident hopes of a plenary remission of their sins. He afterwards held a provincial council in the Lateran church, chiefly for a reform of the conduct of the clergy; and the assembly voted for an enforcement of some decrees that had been enacted by the council of Trent, but which had fallen into disuse. On another occasion, he rose above the bigotry of his predecessors, by expressing a wish for the diffusion of scriptural knowledge; and, with that view, he permitted the people in general to peruse the sacred volume, and encouraged the multiplication of copies in the modern languages. This permission displeased the rigid catholics; but it was approved by a majority of the members of that church. Benedict, about the same time, testified his devotion to the Muses, by publicly decorating Perfetti, a Tuscan poet, with a crown of laurel.

A grand scheme of religious comprehension was formed by this respectable ruler of the church. It was of no less magnitude than the union of the four communities that divided Christendom. He proposed, that four councils should be holden at different places at the same time, each consisting of a certain number of representatives of the Romish, Greek, Lutheran, and Calvinist churches, with a president of one or other church in each assembly; that the mass should be so altered as not to be repugnant to the feelings of the three last denominations of Christians; that unpleasing or obnoxious doctrines should be mutually softened, and various concessions reciprocally made. A scheme of this kind can only be expected to be successful, when the greater part of the professors of each religion

[a] Philip V.

[b] Guarnacci, Vit. Pontif. tom. ii. p. 384, 385.

have relinquished all remains of cool animosity, overweening conceit, and contemptuous illiberality, and when they have learned to distinguish properly between essential objects and immaterial points. Such a state of mind has never yet been observed to influence the members of different sects, assembled for deliberation and discussion; and we may easily conclude, that, if the four councils had met, and the result of their separate meetings had been submitted to the consideration of a general assembly, the desired union would not have taken place. The scheme, indeed, was not prosecuted by the pontiff who entertained it; and the churches in question are still divided.

However disposed was his holiness to remain upon amicable terms with the catholic princes, he could not easily avoid all occasions of dispute. A contest had long subsisted with the court of Turin, upon three grounds,—the right of patronage, the extent of jurisdiction, and the sovereignty of different towns. The king of Sardinia asserted his pretensions with a high tone; and the prudence of Benedict suggested the propriety of compliance, not indeed in every particular, but in most of the litigated points. An allowance of the general right of royal presentation to bishoprics and other preferments, a considerable diminution of the papal fees, and a precise settlement of jurisdiction, allayed the displeasure of Victor Amadeus; and an agreement was signed in the year 1727. An accommodation was not so easily adjusted with the king of Portugal, who, not being gratified with regard to the appointment of a priest whom he recommended as a candidate for the dignity of cardinal, recalled his ambassador from Rome, ordered the papal nuncio to quit his realm, and permitted the patriarch of Lisbon to grant dispensations, and decide those points and causes which had usually been subject to the pope's determination. Benedict left the settlement of this dispute to his successor: but he found an opportunity of effecting an accommodation with the emperor, on the subject of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and discipline in the Neapolitan realm; a reconciliation which he purchased by relinquishing some of the rights of the holy see.[a]

In the devotional and ritual concerns of the church, this pontiff approved the *office* of Gregory VII. and ordered it to be read and observed in every church dependent on the Romish hierarchy. The laity, in France and other countries, were not very willing to comply with the order: but Benedict, in this point, insisted upon their obedience and submission. If the sovereigns of those states had interfered on this occasion, he would probably have given up the point.

Indefatigable in his apostolical duties, he continued to pray and preach, attend to all pontifical and sacerdotal functions, and direct the conduct of subordinate prelates and ministers of the church. He frequently visited the poor, and not only gave them spiritual comfort, but relieved them by his bounty; selling for that purpose the presents which he received. He habituated himself to the plainest fare, and lived in the most frugal manner, like a hermit in his cell, that he might more liberally bestow upon others the blessings of fortune. But it is to be lamented, that, from inattention to his political duty, he suffered cardinal Coscia, an unprincipled Neapolitan, to pursue a shameful course of rapine and extortion.[b] Yet he died[c] without losing his popularity, in the eighty-second year of his age, and the sixth of his pontificate.

Clement XII., of the Corsini family, was chosen, after a long contest, to succeed the mild and humble Benedict. He quickly reformed some abuses, which had crept into the administration of the Roman state, and then directed his attention to foreign affairs. In the canton of Lucerne, in Switzerland, the laic magistracy of the chief town had presumed to take cognisance of the delinquency of ecclesiastics, and had disobeyed the injunctions of the papal nuncio, who had therefore retired into the territory of Uri. The pope now adjusted the dispute, and defined the jurisdiction, without any material derogation from the dignity of the holy see. Casting an eye upon Germany, he checked in the catholic states the practice of pluralism, and only in some cases allowed the same person to hold two bishoprics, but never three. In the Saxon electorate, he strenuously promoted the return of the protestants to catholicism, which some were inclined to embrace, in imitation of their sovereign Augustus: but these converts were not very numerous. Not neglecting France, he opposed by new edicts the progress of Jansenism in that realm. Being disgusted at the conduct of the Spaniards, who had seized the dutchy of Parma without acknowledging his claim of sovereignty over it, he at first refused to bestow a cardinal's hat upon a Spanish prince, who was then too young to be canonically invested with so important a dignity: but, moved by the importunities of his catholic majesty, he suffered the prince to enjoy the title, and to be administrator of the temporalities, assigning the spiritual jurisdiction to the archbishop of Larissa. A new cause of offence soon arose; for the Spaniards had the audacity to enlist the pope's subjects, and the cruelty to commit outrages upon those who resisted such unwarrantable acts. Philip, however, soothed the irritated feelings of Clement, from whom he procured, for his son don Carlos, the investiture of Naples and Sicily. With the court of Lisbon the pontiff had previously secured a reconciliation, by complying with the request of Joseph: but he was not so acquiescent toward the king of Sardinia; for he annulled the convention which that prince had obtained from Benedict, alleging that it was too favourable to the civil and temporal power.[d]

This pontiff was a man of respectable abilities; had a regard for justice; was cautious and prudent, yet not destitute of spirit; economical, without being meanly parsimonious; easy of access, without rendering himself indecorously familiar. He had a taste for the polite arts, and was an encourager of literary merit. Dying in his eighty-eight year,[e] he was succeeded by Prosper Laurence Lambertini, archbishop of Bologna, who entered upon his high office under the designation of Benedict XIV.

---

[a] Guarnacci, Vit. Pontif. t. ii. p. 417—22.—Hist. de Portugal, t. iii.

[b] So we are informed by the baron de Polnitz; and the assertion is not disputed by the impartial. Guarnacci, without stating any particulars of the cardinal's misconduct and criminality, says, that he greatly increased his fortune, and governed the pope's dominions at his discretion. Clement XII. punished him with a long imprisonment, subjected him to a heavy fine, and deprived him of the archbishopric of Benevento.

[c] On the 21st of February, 1730.—He ought to be mentioned as an author; for many sermons, some accounts of the proceedings of synods, a commentary upon the book of Exodus, and sacred epigrams, have been published as his productions. His literary merit, however, is not of the highest kind.

[d] Guarnacci, tom. ii. p. 579, 580, &c.

[e] In February, 1740.

Lambertini had acquired the character of religious moderation, and the fame of learning; and, during a pontificate of eighteen years, he acted in general with prudence and propriety. He did not profess himself a politician, or claim the merit of activity and address in the important concerns of temporal government: yet he was not so negligent or remiss as his patron, the thirteenth Benedict. His chief minister was cardinal Valenti, who was at once a *virtuoso* and a man of business.

In the administration of the church, Benedict XIV. was mild and conciliatory, rather than rigid or severe. He was aware of the relaxed morality of the clergy in the catholic states: but, however he might wish to check their licentiousness, he did not take any strong or violent measures for that purpose. He was disposed to promote a union or accommodation between the Roman see, and the Greek and protestant churches; and, if he could have succeeded by concession or compromise, he would have reconciled all religious differences among Christian communities: but that was a task which exceeded his powers of exertion, and which, indeed, no man can expect to accomplish. He was censured by many of the Romanists for attempting to diminish the number of festivals, and to abolish some ceremonies which appeared to him to be useless, improper, or absurd;[a] and he also gave offence by the occasional levity of his conversation, which, however, was unaccompanied with immorality or profligacy.

With the catholic courts he had no violent disputes. During the war in which the French were opposed to the house of Austria, he seemed inclined to favour the former; but he endeavoured to avoid giving offence to either of the rival families. He carried on a negotiation, for some years, with Ferdinand, king of Spain, on a subject which had frequently been a cause of altercation. His catholic majesty claimed the right of presentation to all the benefices in his ample dominions; but he at length consented to the disposal of fifty-two of the number by the pontiff, on condition that they should be given to Spaniards alone, and that no pensions should be exacted from the occupants. By the compact then adjusted,[b] the revenues of vacant benefices were left to a clergyman named by the king, not to the rapacity of a committee of papal agents; and, in some other respects, the receipts of the apostolical chamber were considerably diminished.

At the solicitation of those princes who were displeased at the intrigues, and offended at the mal-practices of the Jesuits, Benedict promised to exert his authority for the reform of that order; and the bull which he issued for this purpose was one of the last acts of his life. He died in 1758, when he had attained the age of eighty-three years. He was an erudite and able theologian, as his numerous works evince; a liberal patron of learning and the elegant arts; a lively companion, a benevolent and friendly man. Cardinal Rezzonico, bishop of Padua, who succeeded him as Clement XIII., had a greater reputation for piety, and was more zealous for the high claims of the church: but he was not so generally esteemed as his amiable predecessor.

The doctrines of the Romish church, at this period, remained in the same state in which they had long subsisted. The worship of the Virgin Mary, the tenet of transubstantiation, the idea of purgatory, the propriety of invoking saints, the right and power of absolution, and other parts of the catholic creed, were still retained, and still had considerable influence. The pageantry of procession, the multitude of ceremonies, and the forms of worship, were nearly the same as they had been in the preceding century; and the church-government and discipline were not materially altered. But the majority of the people entertained less exalted ideas of the pope's supremacy, and preferred the authority of general councils. The catholic sovereigns were more enlightened, and more disposed to tolerate other religions; and the ecclesiastics themselves were less bigoted, and more indulgent to the supposed errors of those who differed from them.

While the affairs of the church were in this predicament, the conduct of the Jesuits, and the proceedings against that society, drew the public attention more particularly to ecclesiastical concerns. The rise and progress of that celebrated fraternity, and the chief incidents of its history, have been well related by Dr. Mosheim; and, in our *continuation* of his work,[c] we have given a concise (but, we hope, a satisfactory) account of that renewal of contest, with the advocates of Jansenism, which distinguished the pontificate of Clement XI. The effect was, in appearance, favourable to the Jesuits: yet they impaired their interest by the violent proceedings of their party against the Jansenists. After a long interval of comparative tranquillity, the animosities of contest were revived by the refusal of sacramental favours to dying persons, who were supposed to be attached to the Jansenian heresy.

But, before we enter into any detail upon this subject, it may not be improper to advert to the progress of that infidel philosophy, which had no inconsiderable effect in promoting the ruin of the Jesuits. Bayle, and other writers in the reign of Louis XIV., had propagated a freedom of opinion on religious topics, which had shaken the faith of many readers; and Voltaire, following more openly a similar course, had disseminated an anti-christian spirit, which menaced the establishment with peril. Diderot and d'Alembert, who, in 1751, sent the *Encyclopédie* into the world, insinuated scepticism and impiety in the midst of scientific discussions; and free-thinking became so prevalent, as to alarm the clergy, and call forth their zeal in the defence of an endangered church. The Jesuits, nursed in priest-craft, and devoted to the holy see, were peculiarly exposed to these profane attacks. Their arts and intrigues were developed, and their selfish policy was reprobated with pointed severity. Their Jansenist opponents, at the same time, were not spared, as they had too much religion to be in favour with sceptics.

The archbishop of Paris was a friend to the Jesuits; and, therefore, when he was desired by the court to allay, by his high authority, the dispute between them and the Jansenists, he replied, that it was customary to withhold

[a] He had prepared bulls for these purposes: but the monks excited such a clamour on the occasion, that he did not carry them into effect. *Voyages en différens Pays de l'Europe.*——Haye, 1777; lettre 15.

It has been affirmed, that he abolished *autos da fe* in Portugal, at the he desire of king Joseph; and, if he had, such a suppression would nave been honourable to his memory: but the assertion appears to be untrue.

[b] In the year 1753.

[c] This term has been used, as being, upon the whole, the most applicable: but, in some parts, it is a *supplement*, rather than a *sequel*. For instance, in addition to Dr. Mosheim's sketch of the contest between the church and the Jansenists in the reign of Louis XIV., and under the following regency, we have given a more detailed account of the proceedings on that occasion.

the sacraments of the church from such as could not produce certificates of confession, signed by an orthodox priest; a refusal which had been originally introduced with a view of stigmatizing the Huguenots. The parliament of Paris fined a priest for having repeatedly evinced this kind of bigotry, and issued an ordinance, in 1752, prohibiting all acts tending to schism, and all refusal of sacraments on pretence of non-adherence to the bull *Unigenitus*. The king wavered between the parties, and hoped to keep them so well poised, that no serious inconvenience would ensue from the ferment: but he did not steadily preserve the balance; and both the church and state were convulsed.

The archbishop of Paris took the lead, as a supporter of the cause of orthodoxy against the encroachments of Jansenism; and he exhorted the court to oppose with vigour the presumptuous magistrates who countenanced that heresy. Louis, however, by the advice of the chancellor Lamoignon, adopted the expedient of an arbitration, and appointed delegates of both parties, to accommodate the dispute; a measure which only inflamed mutual acrimony. The parliament persisted in prosecuting such priests as withheld the sacraments; and, when the king commanded a discontinuance of these processes, an animated remonstrance was voted by the magistrates. He punished their disobedience by dispersion and exile, and instituted temporary tribunals to act in their stead. But the clamours of the public soon induced him to recall them; and an ordinance was then registered, for a cessation of all religious disputes.[a]

The tranquillity which ensued was of short continuance. The archbishop was banished from the capital for reviving the dispute, and some inferior ecclesiastics of his party were more rigorously punished. The clergy sat in council for several months, in 1755, without terminating the schism. They addressed a letter to pope Benedict, who, in an indecisive answer, seemed to leave the settlement of the affair to his most Christian majesty. The embarrassed monarch, after various temporising measures, held a bed of justice, in which he peremptorily ordered all his subjects to pay respect and submission to the bull, without considering it, however, as a rule of faith, although the bishops, in the late council, had declared that it bore that character. By another ordinance, he regulated the meetings and altered the constitution of the magistracy; and two courts of the parliament immediately resigned their functions in disgust.

The Jesuits were highly pleased at the spirit which the king evinced on this occasion; but, while they exulted in the depression of the parliament, they did not foresee that their own ruin was approaching. The intrigues of the members of that order in Portugal had induced Joseph, sovereign of that realm, to watch them closely, and to make such reformative arrangements as disgusted the fraternity. Hence, when his life was threatened by a conspiracy, from which he had a narrow escape,[b] it was found that many Jesuits were concerned in the nefarious plot, particularly father Gabriel de Malagrida, whom the court, however, out of regard to the church, did not put to death as a traitor, but as a heretic. The incensed monarch now suppressed the colleges of the Jesuits; and, to restrain the future attempts of ecclesiastics against the state, he insisted upon a grant (from the pope) of perpetual jurisdiction over the whole clerical body in cases of treason and sedition. Clement promised to accede to the demand, if a prelate nominated by him or any of his successors should preside on such occasions: but he afterwards consented that the king should name a bishop for these trials.[c]

No intercession in behalf of the Portuguese Jesuits could soften the inflexibility of Joseph, who, in addition to the guilt of the late conspiracy, accused them of a usurpation of sovereign power in South America, alleging that they had concurred with their Spanish brethren in tyrannising over the natives of Paraguay, whom they had tutored to take arms against him and his catholic majesty. On account of their various enormities, all the members of the fraternity were declared outlaws, in 1759, and banished from the dominions of Portugal; and other courts were invited to follow the rigorous example.

In the meanwhile, the Parisian parliament, so hostile to the Jesuits, procured from the court a full re-establishment; and, at the same time, the clerical exiles were recalled. The magistracy now resumed the proceedings against the withholders of the sacramental favours, and waited for an opportunity of wreaking signal vengeance upon the sons of Loyola. Their commercial rapacity furnished the desired opportunity. Two merchants whom they were bound to supply with articles of traffic, stopped payment on the seizure of those goods by British cruisers; and the Jesuits did not take prompt or adequate measures to avert the shock. Numerous creditors appeared against them; and the cause was referred, at their desire, to the grand chamber of the parliament. They disavowed the imputed agency of Father de la Valette, the manager of their trade, whose offence against the church, by engaging in commerce, only concerned himself: but it was maintained against them, that their superior, or general, superintended their trade, as well as other concerns, and directed the conduct of the agent. The judges insisted upon seeing the constitutions of the society; and an exposure was consequently made of the devoted submission of all the members to a foreign head, and of their dangerous maxims in politics and morality. It also appeared that they did not constitute a regular religious order, as the intended contract between them and the state had never been completed: their fraternity had been merely tolerated, not adopted. Their enemies took advantage of these circumstances, and represented in so strong a light the danger of keeping such men imbodied, that the king resolved to suppress the society; not, however, before the general had refused to submit to a plan of regulation, proposed by the French court. The parliament ordained, on the 6th of August, 1762, that the Jesuits of France should no longer wear the habit of the society, live in community, or obey the orders of foreign directors. Their partisans loudly exclaimed against an edict which they considered as extremely severe and unjust, because those whom it affected were not heard in their own defence, and were condemned upon false reports, for misrepresented doctrines and unproved delinquency. The opinion of the lawfulness of regicide in certain cases, they said, seemed to be the chief offence of the fraternity; but it ought first to be proved that this

[a] Vie Privée de Louis XV. [b] In September 1758. [c] Historia de Portugal, Lisb. 1802; tom. iv. p. 22. 27.

was justly imputable to the Jesuits, who, as their enemies knew, had no concern in Damien's attempt to assassinate the French king, and were also entirely innocent with regard to other crimes of the same nature, of which they had been malignantly accused.[a]

A regular edict of suppression was delayed for some years: but it was at length registered, on the 7th of December, 1764, and promulgated by the royal authority. The parliaments of Normandy and Bretagne followed, with little hesitation, the example of the Parisian magistracy; but other parliaments were not fully convinced of the justice or expediency of the measure. The pope was shocked at the profane audacity of a court that could act with such determined hostility against a holy society: but his bull, for the reinstatement of the fraternity, was suppressed in France by an *arrêt* of parliament, and was declared inoperative in Portugal by the king's express command.

The king of Spain was not more friendly to the Jesuits than Louis or Joseph. He was disgusted at their intriguing spirit, and resolved, not merely to humble them, but to annihilate their power in his dominions. He seized their temporalities in 1767, and banished them, as dangerous subjects, from every part of Spain and its dependencies. His son Ferdinand also freed the kingdom of Naples and the island of Sicily from the obnoxious fraternity. A great number of these exiles were admitted into the Roman territories, and some other parts of Italy; and many found protection among Protestants. The duke of Parma, soon afterwards, commanded all members of the order to retire from his dominions; and he, at the same time, hazarded an open rupture with the see of Rome, by abolishing the papal jurisdiction in Parma and Placentia. His holiness declared the duke's ordinance to that effect null and void, and menaced its promulgator with the thunders of the church. Being supported by the majority of the catholic princes, the duke persisted in his purpose; and the pontiff was equally resolute. With a view of intimidating him into a revocation of his brief, the French king dispossessed him of Avignon; and some portions of his Italian territory were seized by his Neapolitan majesty. His spiritual authority and his revenues were diminished by the duke of Modena; and the Venetians, of whose republic he was born a subject, assailed him with similar hostilities. Mortified at this treatment, yet unwilling to yield, he was observed to decline gradually in his health. Uneasiness and chagrin hastening the effect of age, he died in his seventy-sixth year,[b] with the character of a pious and well-meaning prelate, who was, however, more influenced by the zeal of bigotry than by common sense or wisdom. He ought to have been content with maintaining the doctrine and worship of the church, without obstinately upholding papal usurpations.

The enemies of the Jesuits had in vain solicited the dissolution of that order, while Clement XIII. filled the papal chair: but they conceived strong hopes of success, when a prelate of a more philosophical character was chosen pontiff. This was a Franciscan monk named Francis Laurence Ganganelli, who thought proper to assume the name of his immediate predecessor.

Instead of concilitating the new pope, the king of France declared that he would retain Avignon and its dependencies: but he condescended to offer a sum of money for a dereliction of them on the part of his holiness. The king of Naples also insisted upon the cession of the district which he had seized, and concurred with Louis in urging Clement to suppress that society which was so odious to the Christian world; but the importunities of these princes, aided by the influence of Spain and Portugal, were for some years unsuccessful. Clement XIV. felt the difficulties of his situation, and demanded time for mature reflection. He conceived it to be his duty to patronise and support a religious order, if its utility to the church or to society overbalanced its demerits; and, at the same time, he wished to avoid a rupture with those courts which had evidently the power, and seemingly the inclination, to inflict serious wounds on the papacy.

In taking a survey of Europe, he found *few* of its sovereigns inclined to support him against the house of Bourbon: we may rather say, that *none* would authoritatively interpose in his behalf. Yet he would not tamely or too readily yield to dictatorial demands. He apprehended that one concession, on his part, would lead to new requisitions; and he knew that a facility of compliance would only serve to encourage domineering insolence. Amidst these reflections, delay did not seem likely to be injurious; and, if he should be obliged to submit, a protraction of the evil day would at least save appearances, even in the eyes of the zealous advocates of papal supremacy. In this, and in other affairs of moment, he resolved to think for himself, rather than follow the example of those pontiffs who had resigned their own judgments to the influence and authority of the cardinals. Many members of the sacred college were displeased at his want of confidence in men of their rank and merit; but he disregarded their murmurs, and declared that he would not be governed. It was, he thought, better for a sovereign to be in a great measure, his own minister and negotiator, than to suffer others, as is too frequently the practice, to act for him at their discretion. With a *volto sciolto*, he deemed it expedient for a prince to have *pensieri stretti*; not from a mean spirit of hypocrisy or dissimulation, but from a politic desire of concealing those views and schemes of which an unfair advantage might be taken.

The Jesuits affected to believe (and probably many of them really thought,) that Clement would not dare to suppress their order. But, in the fifth year of his pontificate, he resolved, in defiance of all the clamours and menaces of the zealots, to disembody the fraternity, and amalgamate its members with the unprivileged mass of society. He declared it to be his opinion, that the order had ceased to answer the ends of its institution, and that the members, by the impropriety of their conduct, their loose casuistry, and their mischievous arts, had forfeited all claim to farther encouragement. A bull for the annihilation of the society was therefore promulgated;[c] its colleges were seized, and its revenues confiscated. Lorenzo Ricci, the refractory general of the order, was sent to the castle of St. Angelo, and died in confinement.

Pleased at the ruin of the Jesuits, the French court complimented Ganganelli on the justice and expediency of his edict, and restored the Venaissin to the holy see.

[a] Vie Privée de Louis XV.

[b] In February, 1769.

[c] On the 21st of July, 1773.

The other remonstrating courts also adjusted their disputes with the pontiff; who, having thus settled the great point which had long engaged his attention, might be expected to feel little anxiety after the decision which he had so deliberately adopted. But, perhaps, he seriously apprehended the effects of the secret resentment of the ex-Jesuits, who could not look with a favourable eye upon the enemy of their order. However that may be, he died in the autumn of the following year, at the age of sixty-eight. It was supposed that he had been poisoned; but this suspicion has not been verified.

Of all the priests who for some centuries had filled the papal throne, Ganganelli seems to have been, if we except Benedict XIV., the most unprejudiced, candid, and liberal. He did not devote his chief attention to the selfish interests of the see of Rome; nor did he treat other religious establishments with supercilious arrogance, studied contempt, or marked reprobation. His moderation entailed upon him the censures of the rigid and severe, who alleged that he was too lukewarm and indifferent in religious concerns to be a proper defender of the fortress of catholicism, which required for its support the most strenuous exertions of active zeal. He was even accused of being a well-wisher to Protestantism; a heavy charge against the head of that church to which the protestants were determined foes; but this charge amounted to no more, in effect, than that he was not a bigot to popery. His treatment of the Jesuits exposed him to censures still more severe, and to all the rancour of malignity; but, in acting against that order, he only complied with the wishes of the most enlightened members of the grand community of Christendom, and justly dissolved a most immoral and unprincipled society. The time was opportune for such dissolution; the clamours which it excited soon spent their force; and a phalanx, once potent and formidable had not the power of withstanding the energies of papal hostility; energies that were undoubtedly declining, but which, in the present case, were supported by the chief catholic princes and states.

The government of the church was now consigned to John Angelo Braschi, who had been created cardinal by Ganganelli, and was regarded as a moderate man, rather than a bigot or zealot. He was more indebted for his election to the clashing of parties, than to the peculiar favour or interest of any one faction. He was less popular, at the time of his elevation, than his predecessor; and his partiality and indulgence to his nephews did not tend to increase his popularity. Having a graceful person and a pleasing countenance, he was fond of show and parade, and took every opportunity of exhibiting himself to the public. In capacity and eloquence he was not deficient; but he had no extraordinary vigour of mind.

When he had superseded the vulgar name of John by the pontifical appellation of Pius *the Sixth*, some of those who were not inclined to think favourably of his disposition or his abilities, applied to him a reproachful verse, predicting the ruin of Rome under a *Sextus*.[a] His friends, on the other hand, ridiculed this gloomy prophecy, and boasted of his ability, and the goodness of his heart and character. He commenced his administration with acts of benevolence and charity, with the selection of deserving men for various offices, and the removal or discouragement of some individuals who had misbehaved. He also formed the resolution of undertaking a work calculated for national benefit—the draining of the Pontine marshes. A bank was instituted to receive subscriptions for this purpose; but, after much labour and expense, the work was only effected in part. For what was done, however, Pius deserved thanks and praise.

After the suppression of the order of Jesuits, many who had belonged to the fraternity found protection in the dominions of the Prussian monarch, who intimated to the new pope, that he would not pay the least regard to the edict. His holiness replied, that he was bound to enforce the bull promulgated by his predecessor; but he at the same time declared, according to Frederic's agent Ciofani, that he would not treat the body of ex-Jesuits, then residing in the territories of that prince, as an irregular establishment. At the instigation, however, of the ministers of France and Spain, he afterwards required that the habit of the dissolved order should no longer be worn in the territories of Frederic, and that none of the ex-Jesuits should either preach, or administer the eucharist or other sacraments. The monarch, adverting to the ability which the Jesuits had displayed in the task of education, wished them to remain as a society for that purpose, in those provinces[b] in which his catholic subjects were numerous; and, when Pius conceded this point, the king agreed to the requisitions of the pontiff.[c]

The Jesuits were also protected by the empress of Russia; and from the bishop of Mohiloff, who, bred a Calvinist, had become a catholic, and who domineered over the church in Poland, they experienced peculiar favour and patronage. He was so eager to re-establish their society, that he gave public permission to a body of ex-Jesuits, assembled in the province of White Russia, to take probationary candidates for the privileges of their order. He pretended that Pius had allowed him so to exercise his authority: but this assertion was disclaimed by the pontiff, and probability favours the denial. When the Spanish court remonstrated with the empress on the subject, she maintained her pretensions and those of the prelate whom she protected, and declared that she would not submit to dictation from any court whatever. She afterwards authorised her Jesuit subjects to choose a vicar-general, who should enjoy all the former privileges of the institution; and, in defiance of all the enemies of the Jesuits, she continued to favour the members of an order proscribed and stigmatised by the catholic princes. While she disapproved the conduct of many who had been enrolled among the sons of Loyola, she said that the general demerits of the society did not appear to her to be so atrocious, as to justify its dissolution, or the severities which had preceded and followed that act.[d]

In France, the cause of Jesuitism was still abetted by many of the dignified clergy; but they were not so open in expressing their wishes for the restoration of the order, as they were in counteracting the claims of the Huguenots, whom the government had ceased to persecute. Some, who hated the Jesuits, joined this party in opposing the protestants, and also in reprobating the licentiousness of infidels. In an assembly holden in the year 1765,

[a] "Semper sub Sextis perdita Roma fuit."
[b] Particularly Silesia.
[c] Memoires Hist. et Philosophiques sur Pie VI. et son Pontificat, ch. iii.
[d] Memoires Hist. et Philos. sur Pie VI. chap iv.

an animated remonstrance had been voted by the prelates against the new philosophy. They conjured the king to take vigorous measures for the repression of that profane boldness, that impious freedom, which vilified whatever had for ages been deemed sacred among mankind, and aimed at the subversion of all holy and venerable institutions. If he should be tame or passive at so alarming a crisis, the most portentous mischief, they said, might be apprehended. They accused the protestants of being deeply concerned in these practices, and blamed his majesty for not enforcing the laws against those presumptuous sectaries. In the year 1770, the progress of infidelity gave occasion for another remonstrance, in which the assembled clergy pointed out various works of the new philosophers, as objects of condemnation,[a] and called for the exertion of all the powers of government in the defence and support of religion, morality, and good order. An assembly of bishops, in 1772, renewed the attack upon the new philosophy; but their fulminations were ineffective; and the contagion continued to spread.

Louis XVI., who had a stronger sense of religion than his predecessor, lamented the prevalence of scepticism: yet he sometimes gave his confidence to men who were known to be infidels. Alarmed at the ministerial influence of Turgot, the clergy, in a council which they held in the year 1775, agreed to such a remonstrance as the danger of the church seemed to require. They represented to the young monarch, in strong terms, the alarming progress of infidelity and atheism, the illegal boldness of the protestants, (who had dared even to erect churches,) the flagrant licentiousness of the press, and the prevalence of a restless and inquisitive spirit, which threatened to unhinge society. Louis promised to attend to these complaints; but he did not take any measures of remedial efficacy. When he was influenced by free-thinking ministers, he was taught to believe that it was not necessary to interfere; and, when he was under other guides, he was too irresolute to act with vigour. To govern a nation so impetuous and volatile as the French, at a time when freedom of thought began to prevail, a prince of more energetic character was requisite. Sometimes, indeed, he was peremptory; but he was not consistently firm or steadily resolute. He acquiesced in measures which in his heart he disapproved; and he neglected the enforcement of those which he conceived to be just, expedient, and salutary. Under his sway, infidelity and faction alarmingly gained ground; and by assisting the American colonists, he increased the agitations of his realm.

Even in Spain and Portugal, though in a much less degree than in France, freedom of thought, in the affairs of religion, began to diffuse itself among the higher and middle classes. The vigilance of the government, however, prevented it from being dangerous. In the extensive territories of the house of Austria, a similar freedom was repressed by the spirit of Maria Theresa, whose bigotry, at the same time, prompted her to infringe the rights of her protestant subjects.[b] Her son, the emperor Joseph, was himself a free-thinker, while he professed an adherence to the doctrines of the Romish church. This prince might justly be called the imperial projector. Many of his *whims*, like those of the ingenious but profligate duke of Buckingham, "died in thinking:" others were matured into *schemes*. With his political plans we have no concern on this occasion: it is only requisite that we should take notice of his regulations in the affairs of the church. He would not, he said, impeach the established doctrines; but he had a strong inclination to abridge the papal power in his dominions; and, with him, an inclination was soon converted into an act. Pius, being acquainted with the freedom of Joseph's sentiments, apprehended an attack from that enterprising innovator; and his fears were not visionary; for the emperor, in 1781, began with imposing restrictions upon the operation of bulls and rescripts sent from Rome. This ordinance was followed by an exemption of monasteries from all obedience to the chiefs of the different orders at Rome; a measure which the partisans of the pope, as might be expected, reprobated in warm terms. The generals of the orders desired the subalterns to maintain with spirit the constitutions of their establishments; but they were overawed into submission by the firmness of the emperor, who also released all the colleges of missionaries from their dependance on the papal court. He farther displeased the pontiff by ordering that no money should be sent into foreign countries for masses; that no dignity should be solicited at Rome without his permission; that pilgrimages should be discontinued; and that the number of images and ornaments in churches should be diminished. The disgust felt by Pius at this conduct, was not allayed by the liberal edict of Joseph,[c] granting full toleration to all the protestants in his dominions, as well as to all members of the Greek church; and the dissolution of a great number of monasteries, with the conversion of the buildings into colleges, hospitals, or barracks, increased the indignation of the vicar of St. Peter[d].

Thus harassed and (as he thought) insulted, Pius resolved to visit the emperor, who, among other demands, had insisted upon presenting, in future, to all vacant bishoprics and benefices in the Milanese and Mantuan territories. The pope remonstrated against this profane encroachment upon his supposeed right of patronage; but he was persuaded by some of his counsellors to promise acquiescence in this point, if Joseph would engage to desist from his career of reform. This was an engagement which none who knew that potentate could expect from him; and, with regard to the intended visit, he declared that it would be wholly fruitless, although, in a private letter to Pius, he had hinted that all dispute might be better accommodated in such a way than by mere correspondence. His holiness, to the surprise of all, repaired to Vienna, in the hope of warding off a storm which blew with increasing violence. Joseph, in one of his interviews with his spiritual father, claimed the right of altering the ecclesiastical government in his own territories, while he suffered the catholic doctrines to remain unimpaired. The pontiff, finding expostulation useless, returned to Rome, and suffered the storm to rage. He

[a] These were, among other publications, Christianity Unveiled, God and Men, the System of Nature, Sacred Contagion, and Hell Destroyed; which the parliament ordered to be publicly committed to the flames.

[b] "Under the virtuous Theresa," the protestants of Hungary (says Dr. Townson) "were not less vexed than under the profligate prince, who was taught, that his deviations from virtue might be made up for by zeal to the true church."

[c] Promulgated on the 13th of October, 1781.

[d] Mémoires Hist. et Philos. sur Pie VI. chap. xi.—Coxe's Hist. of the House of Austria, vol. ii. chap. xlv.

probably thought, that Joseph was little better than a heretic, however he might pretend to doctrinal purity; and, on the other hand, the emperor imputed to the pope the narrowness of bigotry, and a want of philosophic liberality of sentiment.

The continuance of Joseph's reformative measures no longer surprised the pope, who had now witnessed the inflexibility of that prince's character. The see of Rome lost the presentation to bishoprics in Lombardy and other Austrian dependencies: its nuncios were deprived of their power and jurisdiction in Germany; and, by these and other attacks, the lustre of the papacy was visibly eclipsed.

Other catholic sovereigns, even those who had acquired the reputation of piety, did not scruple to assail that fabric which was thus weakened. Unfortunately for the cause of the papacy, there seemed to be a general disposition, during the pontificate of Pius, to diminish the authority of the see over which he presided. The court of Madrid assumed a greater degree of religious freedom than it had been accustomed to exercise; claimed rights nearly equal to those which the Gallican church had long maintained; reduced the inquisition to a state of passive subserviency; and made a farther diminution of the papal demands of revenue. Even the bigoted court of Lisbon entertained ideas of reform. The queen was a devout catholic, superstitiously faithful to the doctrines and attached to the ceremonies of popery: but she suffered her son, the prince of Brazil, to lead her into anti-papal measures. Some publications which had been introduced by the emperor into the schools at Vienna, were translated into the language of Portugal, and ordered to be studied, for the promotion of free inquiry, in several new seminaries founded in that realm. Questions tending to weaken the fabric of papal supremacy, to abridge the power of the clerical body, and even to recommend toleration of various religions, were authoritatively proposed for discussion in the universities; and the press was permitted to aid the progress of such argumentation, although it was not allowed to impugn the peculiar doctrines of catholicism. No persons were suffered to devote themselves to monastic confinement, without the particular sanction of the sovereign. Even after the death of the prince, the court continued to encroach on the claims of the pope and the immunities of the church. The courts of Naples and Florence took greater liberties in this respect than that of Lisbon. A considerable number of monasteries were suppressed by the king and the grand duke: bishoprics and rich benefices were granted without consulting his holiness with regard to the individuals proper to occupy them; and contributions to the Roman treasury were abolished or restricted. The republic of Venice dissolved some conventual foundations, and applied their revenues to better purposes than the support of superstitious indolence. The duke of Modena put an end to the horrors of the inquisition in his dominions, and treated with less respect the general authority of the pontiff[a]. These incidents and transactions occurred at different times: but they are here mentioned together, to preserve a continuity of subject. They tend to show the reduced state of the papacy at the period in question: but it may be observed, that, for its total extinction, Europe was not then prepared.

The pope could only resist these assaults by remonstrances, to which the reforming courts paid no regard. He was fully sensible of the decline of his influence, but concealed his chagrin under the appearance of composure. With the pomp of ceremony, and with ritual formalities, he amused himself and his people, while his authority was exposed to rude shocks. He also attended to the improvement of the museum, which had been formed at Rome by Benedict XIV., and which Ganganelli had considerably augmented.

The catholic princes, in general, not only annihilated, or materially reduced, the papal authority over their subjects, but suffered public opinion so far to operate, as to check the arbitrary use of their own authority: and the protestant governments also relaxed, in some degree, the rigours of power. Much, however, remained to be done for the purposes of popular benefit; for, even in Great Britain, the land of boasted freedom, the government was rather a combination of monarchy and aristocracy, than a proper mixture of those two kinds of polity with democracy.

While almost every nation in Europe seemed to be gradually advancing to a melioration of its government, and to a greater freedom of inquiry, the French unfortunately took the lead, and obscured the rising prospect by senseless precipitancy and by absurd innovations. They overturned former establishments before they had concerted or devised rational plans of substitution: they indulged in all the wildness of theory and all the licentiousness of caprice. The most outrageous cruelty was mingled with their political fanaticism; and the effects were calamitous and deplorable.

A revolution like that which convulsed France, could not be expected to prove favourable to the interests of religion. Men who were inclined to cherish a boundless freedom of opinion, and who boasted of their being wholly uninfluenced by the wisdom of former times, were not likely to feel any high degree of respect for that system of religion which had long prevailed. Not content with ridiculing and reprobating the Romish ritual and establishment, they spoke contemptuously of all other creeds; and a neglect of religion became the order of the day. The Constituent Assembly, however, amidst all its innovations, made provision for the continuance of public worship; and the catholic religion was still the predominant system. The papal interest, indeed, was materially affected by the change of government. The vote against the payment of fees to the pope, the order for the suppression of monasteries, the seizure of all the possessions of the church as the property of the nation, and the entire subjection of the clergy to the civil power, struck at the vitals of the court of Rome. Pius, incensed at these proceedings, seemed ready to hurl the thunderbolts of pontifical vengeance upon the audacious and profane revolutionists; but prudence checked his arm. He apprehended that his menaces and edicts would be disregarded, and might only serve to provoke embittered hostilities. In the mean time, he endeavoured to secure the friendship of those princes whose power might afford him some protection amidst the revolutionary storm.

The bishops and priests, who acted under the new constitution of France, were not regarded as true members of the *Romish* church, by the clergy of the old school, however observant they might be of the *catholic* creed.

[a] Mémoires sur Pie VI. chap. xviii. xix. xxii.

The pope sent a brief to the king, condemning the new arrangements; but Louis was constrained to acquiesce in these and other innovations. Only three of the former bishops retained their stations: all the other prelates became non-jurors, and, with the majority of parochial ministers, were deprived of their preferments. The legislative assembly, affecting to be alarmed at the intrigues of the clerical non-jurors, menaced them with imprisonment or exile. Many of their number emigrated in the sequel; and many were assassinated by the populace.

Under the sway of the democratic convention, so little attention was paid to religion, that it seemed to be in danger of being wholly absorbed by worldly politics. The assembly did not, indeed, expressly vote for its extinction in the new republic; but contented itself with encouraging the surrender of letter of priesthood, and the open renunciation of all religious sentiments. At length, however, Robespierre pretended to be shocked at the growing spirit of atheism, and moved for the promulgation of a decree, favourable to the cause of religion. By this ordinance, a periodical festival was instituted in honour of the Creator of the world, or the Supreme Being; the propriety of public worship was allowed; and the immortality of the soul was recommended to universal belief. The clergy of the old school, however, were still harassed, and in danger of exile or confinement, until the legislature, in the year 1797, released them from the oaths with which their consciences were offended, and merely required them to promise submission to the government. Two years before this concession was obtained, five bishops had ventured to address a circular letter to the clergy; in which they affirmed, that religion, in the altered government of their country, had no longer a political foundation; that the connexion was dissolved between the church and the state; that the former still expected justice and protection from the latter; but, being left to itself, was obliged to take measures for the establishment of doctrinal uniformity and general regularity of discipline. They recognized the pope as the head of the church, and acknowledged the doctrines of catholicism, as interpreted and explained by Bossuet, the celebrated bishop of Meaux.[a]

Before the end of the same year, another letter was addressed to the friends of the church, proposing ten metropolitan churches for the whole republic, and a bishopric for each department; recommending a popular election both of prelates and parochial ministers; disowning the authority of apostolical vicars, or papal delegates, and advising the peremptory rejection of all bulls or briefs from Rome, unless it should fully appear that they were consonant with the ordinances and the spirit of the Gallican church.[b]

When a sufficient time had been allowed for the operation of these letters, and for the private influence of clerical exhortations, an ecclesiastical council met in the French metropolis,[c] consisting of thirty-eight prelates, and fifty-three representatives of the inferior clergy. The members agreed to a profession of faith, founded on the creed promulgated, in 1560, by pope Pius IV.;[d] but they were not so bigoted to this faith, as to give license or encouragement to the perpetration of any acts of violence under the pretence of defending it. However the church might be called *militant*, "it knew and authorized no other *arms* (they said) than prayer and the word of God." The country, they added, might be lawfully defended by the people, with the arm of flesh; and the clergy were desired to inculcate the propriety and justice of such patriotic hostilities: but the church ought only to defend itself by spiritual arms. Episcopacy was declared to be essential to the proper government of the church; but royalty, of which that system was the usual accompaniment among Christian nations, did not meet with so favourable a testimony; for it was enjoined that royalty should be the object of determined hatred, because a proper knowledge of national interest strongly condemned that form of government; and it was affirmed, that the exaction of an oath, against the revival of such an obnoxious system in France, was by no means repugnant to the laws of the Gospel.[e]

The proceedings of this assembly were closed by an order for the communication of its decrees to the pope, who was, at the same time, earnestly solicited to convoke a general council. But his holiness declined a compliance with this request, being probably of opinion that the political convulsions of the times precluded ecclesiastical accommodation and religious union.

Amidst these arrangements, the pontiff remained at Rome, in a state of suspense and anxiety. He had already surrendered three provinces to French invaders; and he had not power to defend the rest of his territories. A republic being formed at Rome, in the year 1798, he retired into Tuscany; and, when that dutchy was also revolutionized, he was sent as a prisoner of war into Dauphiné. Harassed, insulted, and oppressed, he died at Briançon,[f] in the eighty-second year of his age.

CHAPTER II.

History of the Greek Church, and of the Christian Communities in Asia and Africa.

If we did not know that trifles (such is the weakness of man!) frequently produce serious animosities and permanent divisions, we might be surprised at the long dissension between the Greek and Romish churches. At the time of their separation, both communities agreed in the essentials of Christianity; and they ought to have contented themselves with that agreement, without expecting their fellow-Christians to concur with them in every trivial notion or fantastic opinion, in every idle ceremony, or in all circumstances of exterior worship. But, forgetting the obligations of brotherly love, they continued at variance for ages; and they are still sufficiently estranged from each other, to render the idea of a union visionary and hopeless.

The Greek church, at the beginning of the century, extended from the Red Sea to the Frozen Ocean, and from the Adriatic to the Caspian. The patriarch of Constantinople was, nominally, the head of this church; but his authority was not co-extensive with the similarity of doctrine. He held a monthly synod in that city, with

[a] See Mosheim's History, cent. xvii. sect. ii. part i. chap. i.
[b] Lettre Encyclique de plusieurs Evêques de France, à leurs Frères, et aux Eglises vacantes, 1795.
[c] On the 15th of August, 1797.
[d] See Mosheim, cent. xvi. sect. iii. part i. chap. i.
[e] Canons et Décrets du Concile national de France, tenu à Paris, en l'An de l'Ere Chretienne 1797; mis en ordre par les Evêques réunis à Paris.
[f] In April, 1799.

the metropolitans of Antioch and Jerusalem, and twelve other prelates. In these councils he had no decisive authority: the influence of the majority, the intrigues of the more artful members, and sometimes reason or argument, decided the questions. He did not retain that effective supremacy which some of his predecessors enjoyed over the patriarchs of Egypt, Syria, and Palestine: in the extensive regions subject to the Russian despot, he had not even the shadow of power; and, between the eastern boundaries of Asia Minor and the Caspian, his jurisdiction was not honoured with regard or acquiescence. Living also under the government of an infidel prince, to whom every form of Christianity was odious, he was, in fact, a slave to an arbitrary barbarian.

In the provinces of European Turkey, the members of the Greek church were, and are still, very numerous, notwithstanding the discouragement given to population by the tyranny of the government. Almost every successive Grand Seignior thought it his duty to oppress them, that he might evince his zeal as a defender of the Moslem faith. Mustafa III. was more lenient to them than many of his predecessors; but, even under his administration, they were insulted and plundered by his Turkish subjects, and maltreated in every mode of capricious tyranny. Their hierarchy, however, was suffered to subsist; and they were allowed to transmit to their posterity their favourite doctrines.

Frequent attempts were made by the zealous catholics, in the course of the century, to draw the Greeks into the Romish communion, not by concessions on the part of the former, but by derelictions of opinion on the part of the latter. In consequence of these endeavours, a schism was maintained in various parts of Greece and Asia Minor, and the number of proselytes to the papal church became considerable. The Mainotes, in the Morea, withstood the arts of the Romish missionaries more vigorously, even to the end of the century, than the generality of the Greeks. They assured the intruders, that they were strongly attached to the system of their own church, as opposed to that of the Romanists, whose head they considered as an unchristian schismatic, for having corrupted the purity of the true faith. They particularly condemned the prohibition of the marriage of priests, and ridiculed the issuing of bulls for the pretended rescue of souls from purgatory. They then had only one bishop; and he, like the priests, had no regular allowance, but received occasional contributions for particular masses, and cultivated the soil, or performed other labours, to procure the necessaries of life. The ecclesiastics, in general, led exemplary lives, and thus deserved that respect with which the laity treated them; and such was their spirit, that they were the first to take arms in defence of their country.[a]

The schism of which we have spoken was very prevalent in Syria. At Aleppo, the northern capital of that province, the Christian church, about the middle of the century, was in a state of deplorable division.

The orthodox Greeks, or those who adhered to the old system, were less numerous than the followers of the Latin church; but, having greater interest at the Porte, they kept the bishopric in their hands. They were more rigid in the observance of fasts than the opposite party: yet the latter attended more to that point of supposed duty than the generality of Roman catholics. The Armenians were still more scrupulous in this respect; and some, it is said, would rather perish for want of proper sustenance during illness, than solicit a dispensation from the rigours of abstinence. Like the Greeks, they were divided into orthodox and schismatic Christians. The advantage of number was on the side of the former; but the others had the superiority in point of opulence. The Maronites continued to be attached to the Romish church, retaining, however, some doctrinal and ritual differences. They had a higher opinion of the sanctity or the convenience of a monastic life than the other Christians of Aleppo; but they had no monasteries in that city. The priests of these three communities were in general so poor, that those who had families were obliged to have recourse to some branch of temporal business for the augmentation of their income.[b]

The state of the Greek church, in point of doctrine and practice, may be thus briefly exhibited. Its chief sacraments are baptism and the Lord's supper. To the former, which is deemed necessary to salvation, is annexed the *chrism*, or unction; and the child is dipped under water three times, in allusion to the Trinity. In the eucharist, three liturgies are used; but the ordinary one is that of St. Chrysostom. This sacrament is administered, even to the laity, in both kinds; and children are allowed to receive it. Transubstantiation is not a decided doctrine in this church. It is apparently maintained in one of the public confessions of faith; but the words used in the service itself[c] seem merely to imply, that the supposed change is an act of the mind, not a physical conversion of the sacramental elements into the body and blood of Christ.

The Romish notion of purgatory is denied by the votaries of this church: but they offer up prayers for those who have been removed from the world, and therefore seem to think that the soul has some place of residence from the day of death to the final judgment. They invoke a multitude of saints, and even burn incense to them. Next to Christ, the Virgin Mary and the twelve apostles are particularly honoured. Works of supererogation are disallowed. Faith and good works united are deemed requisite to produce justification.

Confession is practised, but not considered as a sacrament. It is enjoined four times in the year: but, in general, it is performed only once in that time. The penitents, however, are not required, as in the church of Rome, to make a full disclosure of all their sins, or to give a minute detail of circumstances.

Marriage is regarded as a very important object, yet not as an indissoluble obligation. Three offices or services are used in its celebration; namely, that of betrothing, crowning the individuals, and dissolving the crowns.[d] All the clergy, except bishops and monks, are allowed to enter into this union. Beyond a third time, all renewals of marriage are forbidden; and even second marriages

[a] Voyage de Dimo et Nicolo Stephanopoli en Grece, pendant les Annees 1797 et 1798; chap. xxxix.

[b] Natural History of Aleppo, by Alex. Russell, M. D. vol. ii. chap. ii.

[c] The prayer is, that God the Father would send down his Holy Spirit to sanctify the elements, and make them the body and blood of Christ, for pardon, grace, and salvation, to all who devoutly receive them.

[d] The idea of dissolving the crowns may seem ominous; but it is the ceremony which indicates that the marriage is concluded.

are discountenanced. No solemnizations of matrimony are permitted during the fasts, which are usually kept with great strictness.

The ecclesiastical body consists of five orders, if readers and sub-deacons be reckoned among the number: the others are, deacons, presbyters, and bishops. The ordination of the highest class is a very impressive ceremony. It terminates with a prayer from the officiating archbishop, that Christ will render the new prelate an imitator of himself, the true shepherd; that he will make him a teacher of infants, a leader of the blind, a light to those who walk in darkness; that he may shine in the world, and at last receive the great reward prepared for those who boldly contend in the cause of the Gospel, and persevere in the service of God.

Although the head of this church has lost his controlling authority over the ecclesiastical establishment of Russia, he still has the gratification of reflecting, that the *doctrinal* prevalence of the system which he superintends, includes that great empire. The Russian clergy had long enjoyed important immunities; and, although these were in some measure abridged by Peter the Great, the order still can boast of considerable privileges. Among these we may mention an exemption from taxes; and we may add, that ecclesiastics are so far favoured in a judicial process, as not to be amenable before a temporal judge, unless commissaries of their own order be assessors at the trial. Before the year 1791, the commandant or chief magistrate of a district used to send to the bishop, on every new occasion, for commissaries; but, since that time, clerical deputies have been regularly and permanently appointed for that function, by a general order of the holy synod.[a]

Under this synod, in the reign of Catharine II., were thirty-one *eparchies*, or spiritual governments. That council in 1789, was composed of two metropolitans, three archbishops, two bishops, a regular and a secular protopope, or chief priest, an archimandrite, or abbot, and some inferior officers. To each eparchy belonged a consistory, formed of an archimandrite, some priors, and secular clergy. The titles of metropolitan and archbishop were not attached to a particular see, but were distinctions merely personal.

The *roskolniki*, or schismatics, as those were called who objected to the prevailing system, which they said, involved various corruptions of the doctrine and discipline of the ancient Greek church, were not only discountenanced, but were sometimes cruelly oppressed, before the time of Catharine. Many of them were put to death by the unchristian barbarity of the clergy; and it is particularly recorded, that, in the year 1722, whole families of those unfortunate sectaries, unwilling to submit to the emperor's demand of a renunciation of their opinions, enclosed themselves in barns, and perished in the flames kindled by their own hands. At the time of this persecution the chief ecclesiastical adviser of Peter, was Theophanes, bishop of Pleskoff, afterwards archbishop of Novogorod, whose liberality of mind, however, must have rendered him averse to the murder of reputed heretics. This prelate distinguished himself by writing against the multiplication of ceremonies, the practice of idolatry, the rigours of monastic seclusion, and the various absurdities of superstition; and, while he exhorted the people to be content with praying, singing pslams, and reading the Scriptures, he advised the clergy to preach sermons of practical utility, rather than of doctrinal refinement.[b]

This schism has continued to our times. Catharine treated the sectaries with lenity; and we do not find that they have been persecuted since her decease. Her chief attacks, in point of persecution, were directed against the abettors and advocates of democracy, and her son Paul, in that respect, followed her example.

The Russian plebeians and peasants are remarkable for superstition. Many absurdities are related of them in that particular: but it will be sufficient to mention the practice of having about the person, or in the apartments of a house, representations of saints (called *gods*) painted on boards. These pictures are viewed with an air of high respect and reverence; and, on entering a room, persons bow to them, and repeatedly cross themselves. Even many of the opulent have these little idols in their possession, and court the favour of these imaginary gods.

Among the multiplicity of tribes subject to the Russian emperor, are many Mohammedan and Pagan communities. The former are indulged with a toleration of their worship; and missionaries are employed to convert the latter, without dragooning them into the adoption of Christianity.

In Armenia, the majority of the people are still Christians, of the Monophysite sect. They appear to be more addicted to fasting than the professors of any other religion whatever; for it is said, that they have one hundred and fifty-six fast-days in the year. Their festivals also amount to a surprising number: but it is not true, that all the days in the year are appropriated to one or other of those opposite observances. Many of the natives of Armenia are dispersed over the different countries of the East, being tolerated as sectaries, and encouraged as traders. The Georgians were accustomed to steer between the doctrines and practices of the Greeks and Armenians: but, as they are now subject to the sway of the Russian emperor, they lean more to the former system.

The Nestorians, whose leading opinion is contrary to that of the Monophysites,[c] are scattered over a great part of Asia. It has been disputed, whether the Christians who inhabit the Malabar coast are really Nestorians. Dr. Buchanan denies that they are of that sect; but Mr. Wrede maintains that they are. The probability is, that the members of many of the churches upon that coast are of the Nestorian persuasion, while others have become Jacobites or Monophysites. However that may be, these congregations are far from being respectable, the members being in a state of ignorance and misery.

That species of Christianity which had been introduced into China, was tolerated for many years by the emperor Kang-hi: but in the year 1716, he was persuaded by his pagan ministers to revive two edicts against the Christians. By one of these ordinances, they were prohibited from building churches, and making converts; and, by the other, no missionaries were suffered to preach, unless they were furnished with an imperial patent, specifying their

[a] Tooke's View of the Russian Empire, vol. ii.

[b] Historico-Geographical Description of Russia, Siberia, and Great Tartary, by Philip John von Strahlenberg, chap. viii.—The Catechism prepared by this prelate was stamped with the approbation of the holy synod, and published in the year 1766. A summary of Christian Divinity, compiled by Plato, archbishop of Moscow, was about the same time recommended to general use.

[c] See Mosheim's History, cent. v. part ii. chap. v. sect. ix. xxii.

native country, the religious order to which they belonged, the time of their arrival in China, and their engagement not to return to Europe. They remained in this state of depression until the death of Kang-hi, in 1722; and then, instead of being relieved from it, they were subjected to farther restrictions. Young-ching, the new emperor, banished or imprisoned some of the princes of his family, and many grandees, for their favourable dispositions toward Christianity, and ordered the missionaries and their associates to be driven from the provinces into the city of Canton. Ten years afterward, they were sent to the isle of Macao; and all attempts of Christians to re-enter the empire were forbidden by the jealousy of the court. The churches were demolished or secularized; and the natives who had embraced catholicism, were compelled to renounce it, or conceal their obnoxious opinions.

The religion of Jesus can boast of very few triumphs in Africa. The Christianity of Congo, or of Zanguebar is unworthy of mention: but, in our religious progress, we must take notice of Egypt and Abyssinia.

The Copts, or the descendants of the primitive Christians of Egypt, persist in their attachment to the Monophysite doctrine. Their priests are ignorant and uninformed; but the people treat them with great respect. Monastic seclusion is very common among this sect, and great austerities are practised by many of the monks and nuns. Beside a Coptic patriarch, there is a Greek patriarch in Egypt; but the church which he rules is in a declining state.

Christianity flourishes more in Abyssinia than in Egypt, because the sovereign is himself a Christian. The hopes of restoring the Romish worship in that empire were entertained by pope Innocent XII., who was encouraged in his views for that purpose by Louis XIV. The Jesuits were eager to obtain the honour of this employment; and Poncet, a French apothecary, was sent from Cairo by the consul Maillet, with Brevedent, a respectable member of the former fraternity. The latter died in Abyssinia; but M. Poncet was introduced to the king (Yasous I.,) whom, however, he did not find willing to become a convert, or to suffer his people to re-embrace catholicism. M. du Roule was afterwards deputed to the same court: but he had scarcely reached Sennaar, in 1704, when he was murdered by the natives, at the instigation of the Franciscans, who were disgusted at seeing the Abyssinian mission in the hands of the Jesuits. Ousts, who usurped the throne in 1709, was well affected to the Romish system, and secretly communed with those Franciscans who yet remained in the country: but he did not attempt to influence the consciences of his people. David, who succeeded him in 1714, ordered three of those strangers to be apprehended; and, being condemned as heretics in an assembly of the clergy, they were stoned to death.[a]

Another convocation followed, which led to intestine commotions. A new *abuna* or metropolitan announced to the clergy his idea of the consubstantiality of Christ; an opinion contrary to that which had been proclaimed at the gate of the palace.[b] The ecclesiastics of his party, elate with their supposed triumph, insulted the emperor and his court by songs and shouts; for which offence, above a hundred of them were instantly massacred by a body of pagan soldiers, and the streets of the capital were filled with slaughter. During several subsequent reigns, the affairs of the Abyssinian church were not so important as to claim our notice. With regard to the embassy prepared by pope Benedict XIV. for the purpose of effecting a reconciliation with that church, it may suffice to observe, that it was an abortive attempt.

The state of this church, during the eighteenth century, was less corrupt and degenerate than the Jesuit missionaries represented it. It was said, that a repetition of baptism was annually administered to all adults; but this assertion has been disproved, or, at least, strongly denied. It was also imputed to the priests that they gave the eucharist improperly. They do not, indeed, make use of words so fully expressive of a belief in transubstantiation, as those of the Romish ecclesiastics: but that point reflects not the least discredit upon them.

When Mr. Bruce visited Abyssinia, he was surprised at the extraordinary number of churches in that empire. These were erected near running water, for the convenience of those ablutions which the people practised according to the Levitical law. The walls were almost covered with pictures of saints or other representations; but no figures embossed or in *relievo* were exhibited; for they considered the use of these as a species of idolatry. Each parish had an arch-priest, who superintended both its spiritual and secular concerns. The priests and deacons were allowed to marry; but the monks, who occupied huts near the churches, were required to live in a state of celibacy. The reading of Scripture, and recitation of homilies of the fathers, formed, beside the eucharist, the chief portions of divine service.

CHAPTER III.

History of the Ecclesiastical Communities of the Lutherans and Calvinists.

A SENSE of religion seems to be impressed on the minds of all nations, even the most rude and uncivilized: but, as it appeals less to the external senses than to the mind and the heart, its nature renders it peculiarly liable to dispute. The attributes of the Deity, the mode in which he governs the world, and interferes in the concerns of mortals, give occasion for varieties of sentiment, among those who are unwilling to suppose that God ever revealed his will to mankind; and, even where revelation is believed and fully admitted, many doubts arise, and diverse opinions are entertained and defended. Persons who agree in essential points, differ in those of less moment, and contend, as *pro aris et focis*, with all the vehemence of animosity, and all the bitterness of zeal. Hence, among the opposers of popery, who, in one sense, maintained a common cause, various sects were formed, and various controversies occurred. The followers of Luther were hostile to those of Calvin: the disciples of Arminius also disagreed with the partisans of the Genevan reformer.

The Lutherans and Calvinists continued, at the beginning of the eighteenth century, to compose the most numerous protestant establishments of the European conti-

[a] Bruce's Travels to discover the Source of the Nile, book iv.

[b] The abuna represented Christ as being "one God, of the Father alone, united to a body perfectly human, consubstantial with ours, and by that union becoming the Messiah." The emperor maintained, that the Redeemer was "perfect God and perfect man, by the union one Christ, whose body was composed of a precious substance called *oanery*, not consubstantial with ours, or derived from his mother." Neither of these opinions will be deemed strictly orthodox by sound divines.

nent. The former still flourished in the northern kingdoms, and in different parts of Germany; while the latter enjoyed their religion in many of the free towns of that empire, and under the protection of several of its princes, and also retained their influence in some of the cantons of Switzerland.

Frederic, elector of Brandenburg, who became king of Prussia in the first year of the century, was more disposed to favour the Calvinists than the Lutherans; and the *reformed* took advantage of this circumstance to establish ministers of their persuasion in places where the Lutherans had hitherto exercised the chief sway. The king, however, would not suffer the animosities of the two parties to proceed to the violence of outrage; and he was not unwilling to tolerate Catholics and Jews in his dominions.[a]

Reflecting on the affairs of religion, this prince was of opinion that a union of his protestant subjects would be conducive to the happiness of his people, and reflect credit on his reign; and he was encouraged in this desirable object, by the doctors Ursinus and Jablonski. The former, though a Calvinist, had accepted from his majesty the episcopal title; and the latter was the first chaplain at court, and also superintendant of the protestant church in Poland. These ecclesiastics suggested, that one of the first steps to be taken in this business, should be the publication of the liturgy of the church of England in a German dress; and, when this translation was completed, Ursinus wrote to the archbishop of Canterbury, (Dr. Tenison,) to request his advice with regard to the proceedings best calculated for the attainment of the desired uniformity. By some negligence or mistake, the letter did not reach the primate, though it was said that he had received it, and refused to answer it. When he was informed of the scheme by a friend of Dr. Ursinus, he did not give it the least encouragement; alleging that a reported declaration of the university of Helmstadt, in the case of the queen of Spain, allowing in certain circumstances a dereliction of the protestant religion, had given him too unfavourable an opinion of the protestant churches of Germany, to permit him conscientiously to correspond with any of them.[b]

The reason alleged by the English prelate may be pronounced inadequate and unsatisfactory. For the supposed opinion of one protestant university, he condemned the whole reformed body of Germany, and declined assisting in a measure that promised benefit to the protestant cause, as well as credit to the church over which he presided.

This discouragement did not prevent a renewal of the attempt after the lapse of a few years. Jablonski, in 1710, submitted the affair to the consideration of Dr. Sharp, archbishop of York, who was pleased at the application, and promised his zealous aid in promoting the pious views of his Prussian majesty. Queen Anne adopted the scheme, and ordered lord Raby, her representative at Berlin, to treat upon the subject with the baron von Printzen, the chief counsellor of Frederic in ecclesiastical concerns. Several conferences ensued; and the affair seemed to be in a favourable train. Bonnet, the Prussian minister at London, was assured by secretary Saint-John, that the court and clergy in general were very well disposed to expedite religious union; and his communication to the king invigorated the zeal of the cabinet of Berlin. Jablonski was now ordered to compose a regular plan of ecclesiastical comprehension and reform. He had already entered with some minuteness into the considerations of public worship and church government: and, after ulterior deliberation, he presented to the baron a plan for the establishment of episcopacy in the Prussian dominions. Mr. Ayerst, chaplain to lord Raby, proposed that the court of Hanover should be requested to join in the scheme, at least in the liturgical part of it; and Leibnitz intimated to that divine, that the princess Sophia would probably permit an English chaplain to officiate at her court, if queen Anne would defray the expense of his support.[c]

When the general attention was called to the diplomatic deliberations at Utrecht, the concerns of religious union were neglected, being deemed by politicians comparatively insignificant. The zeal of Frederic declined; and, although he assigned a fund for the maintenance and theological education of some of his subjects at the English universities, he took no farther measures in the scheme of comprehension. He did not, indeed, live to see the conclusion of the treaty of Utrecht: the archbishop of York, and his royal mistress, also died in the following year; and the scheme was then not merely neglected, but abandoned.

Frederic William, who obtained the crown in the year 1713, contented himself with promoting peace among his subjects of different religions, without requiring uniformity of worship; and he not only maintained toleration in his own territories, but endeavoured to secure to the protestants, in other parts of Germany, that free exercise of their religion, which had been granted by the treaty of Westphalia. Considering him as one of the champions of their cause, they requested his interposition when they were ill treated by their religious adversaries.

The influence of the French court had procured the insertion of a clause in the treaty of Ryswick, importing that the catholic religion, in the places given back by France, should be continued in the same state in which it subsisted at the time of restitution. When the diet took the affair into consideration, the protestant members refused to concur in this clause; but their remonstrances did not prevail on the emperor to withhold that confirmation of the treaty which the Romanists desired. In the negotiations which followed the war for the Spanish succession, the claims of the protestants were neglected, and the clause was not repealed. They were even ill-treated by the elector Palatine, who deprived them of many of their public places of worship; and, as the courts of Berlin and Hanover made reprisals on the catholics, the latter were still farther inflamed into acts of intolerance, illiberality, and outrage. A convention, indeed, was signed between the contending parties, for an observance of the treaty of Westphalia; and an imperial edict was issued in the year 1720, for the redress of those grievances of which the protestants complained in the Palatinate; but both the agreement and the edict were disregarded.[d]

---

[a] Mémoires pour servir à l'Histoire de la Maison de Brandebourg, par le Roi de Prusse.

[b] Relation des Mesures qui furent prises dans les Années 1711, 1712, et 1713, pour introduire la Liturgie Anglicane dans le Roiaume de Prusse et dans l'Electorat d'Hanovre. Londres, 4to. 1767.

[c] Ibid. p. 15—37.

[d] Coxe's History of the house of Austria, vol. ii. chap. vii. and x.

In Sweden and Denmark, the Lutherans continued to predominate, and the established church was under their government. In the former of those realms, clerical representatives composed a part of the states or national council: but, in the latter, the clergy had no share of political power; and the superintendants, who acted in lieu of bishops, were required by the rulers of the state to propagate the doctrine of passive obedience. Charles XI. of Sweden, and his son the adventurous warrior, kept the states so far in subjection, that neither the clergy nor the laity dared to exercise the authority which the constitution allowed them: but, when Ulrica became queen, they recovered their power, and even extended it beyond the bounds of moderation, reducing the royal authority within very narrow limits. The queen's husband, the prince of Hesse-Cassel, renounced Calvinism to please the clergy, who were almost as unwilling to coalesce with the *reformed* church, as with catholics. It was not without great difficulty that he prevailed upon the diet to grant toleration to the Calvinists. In the year 1741, an edict was issued, by which those sectaries, and also the members of the church of England, were allowed to erect churches, and enjoy a full freedom of worship, in all the maritime towns, except Carlscrone. The Danish government likewise condescended to grant a partial toleration to the Calvinistic protestants; but the people still viewed them with an unfavourable eye.

The Lutherans lived in greater harmony with the Calvinists, (or rather in less discord,) in the electorates of Brandenburg and Hanover, than in most of the German principalities, or in either of the northern kingdoms. The Hanoverian clergy, in particular, seemed to indicate a stronger desire of fraternal union, than the ecclesiastics of other states. In the bishopric of Osnaburg, the protestants were on better terms with the catholics than in many other parts of Germany, because the sovereignty was alternately enjoyed by a Lutheran and a Romanist. In Saxony, when the elector had become a catholic, the majority of the people retained their attachment to Lutheranism, and would not suffer him to obstruct their profession of that faith. In a part of that electorate, a protestant sect, neither absolutely devoted to the Lutheran nor to the Calvinistic creed, yet professing a regard for the former system, established itself in the year 1722. When the Hussite sect seemed only to be remembered in history, and the catholics supposed it to be extinct, a party of religionists who honoured the memory of the Bohemian reformer, and entertained similar sentiments, appeared in Moravia; but could not obtain, from the Austrian government, the favour of toleration. Count Zinzendorff, admiring their zeal, and expecting, in some degree, to influence their opinions, invited them into Upper Lusatia: and the village of *Herrenhut*,[a] erected under his auspices, soon rose into a considerable Moravian settlement. As he had been educated in the Lutheran persuasion, he exhorted them to join that church: but they preferred a retention of their own principles to an entire association with any other church. He was allowed to style himself guardian of the fraternity, and at length became its bishop. Disputes which arose among the members were repressed by his authority, and rules of discipline and conduct were framed under his eye. Their ministers did not deny the doctrine of the Trinity, but directed their immediate adoration to Jesus Christ. They affirmed that a Christian might ensure salvation by grace arising from a lively faith, without the absolute necessity of good works: yet the Brethren, in their conduct, by no means neglected morality. Although they professed to consider their church as an episcopal establishment, they did not suffer the bishops to exercise any jurisdiction in the first instance; for all authority originated in their grand synod, which consisted not only of bishops, but also of elders, and of deputies from every congregation. Subordinate to that assembly, were the meetings of elders, both general and particular. When questions had been fully discussed by the assembled brethren, they were frequently decided by lot, which was regarded as an appeal to the Deity.

The zeal of the United Brethren gradually diffused their system over various parts of Germany, and also introduced it into Great Britain and the United Provinces. It likewise made some progress in the northern states. In Livonia, the success of its promoters at first excited the jealousy of the Russian government; and two of the brethren were committed to prison: but the court afterwards consented to tolerate the sect.

The missionary enterprises of this fraternity were prosecuted with indefatigable ardour. In the icy regions of Greenland and Labrador, and in the glowing climate of the West Indies, the labours of conversion were cheerfully sustained. The inveterate prejudices of the Hindoos were softened by the earnest appeals of the Brethren; and the brutish barbarism of the Hottentots yielded to the force of pious persuasion.[b]

With regard to the religion of the United Provinces, we may observe, that Calvinism still enjoyed the honour of being the established church, and the canons of the council of Dordrecht remained in force: but the tenets of Arminius were preferred to those of Calvin by a great number of people, in every class of society. Anabaptists, Lutherans, and other protestant sects, were freely tolerated; and the government connived at the practice of the catholic worship, long before it was regularly permitted. With respect to the form of the establishment, we may add, that each Calvinist congregation, beside one or more ministers, had deacons and elders: each deputed a minister and an elder to the classes; and each class sent deputies to the synod of the province.

In the progress of the century, religious zeal declined among the Dutch: public worship was less frequently attended; and education was less impregnated with a Christian spirit. If the theological faculty at any of the universities, the members of a class or a synod, condemned particular publications as repugnant to the established creed, or hostile to religion in general, many exclaimed against the bigotry and intolerance of these censors: but the rulers of the republic thought proper to support the decisions of the church, and ministers were sometimes deposed, for betraying, in the pulpit or with their pens, the interests of Calvinism or of Christianity. For the defence and support of that religion, the Teylerian society

[a] Signifying the guard or watch of the Lord.

[b] The Moravians do not appear to deserve the severe censures thrown out against them by Dr. Maclaine, in a note that is justly stigmatised by Dr Haweis as *impure* and *malignant*, and which, indeed, must excite the disgust of every chaste and candid reader.—See the note on page 649 of the present volume for this specimen of vulgar calumny, which could not reasonably have been expected from the translator of Mosheim.

was formed at the Hague in 1786; and some judicious publications have arisen from the rewards offered out of the endowment.

Among the subjects of France, notwithstanding the revocation of the edict of Nantes, and the consequent exile or destruction of many thousand families of conscientious protestants, Calvinism was not extinct. There was great danger in professing it under a bigoted government: yet a considerable number retained a strong attachment to its doctrines. The inhabitants of the Cevennes mountains, and of the Vivarais, in particular, were zealous in the cause; and their zeal was invigorated by the eloquence of several bold Huguenots, who had returned from exile to preach their favourite doctrines. The inhuman violence of a Romish priest added fuel to the flame. The people rose against this oppressor, put him to death, and sacrificed other catholics to their revenge. Troops were sent to restore order by summary process: the insurgents retired before them, but were not over-awed into submission. The cruel punishments to which the soldiery subjected the captive malcontents, produced severe retaliation; and the increasing numbers of the latter so alarmed the court, that three marechals were successively sent to subdue them. Villars at length prevailed upon Cavalier, a young baker, who had assumed the command over them, to enter into a treaty in their name; and it was agreed, in the year 1704, that a general amnesty should be granted to the party; and that this leader, and four regiments of the protestants, should serve in the French army as foreign subsidiaries, enjoying the free exercise of their religion.[a] Cavalier was afterwards introduced at court; but, thinking himself in danger amidst the catholics, and finding that he could not procure so many followers in his new plan as he expected, he retired from France. Roland, a Calvinist who disdained submission, now acted t the head of a body of insurgents; but he soon lost his life, and many of the Huguenots of Languedoc quitted France, while the generality of those who remained, ceased to profess openly the tenets which had embroiled them with the Romanists. Some commotions occasionally ensued, from the violent proceedings of the catholics, against those who were known to be (or suspected of being) still attached to Calvinism; and, for a long course of years, the flame was rather smothered than extinguished.[b]

The dissolute successor of the fourteenth Louis had not sufficient liberality of mind to restore to the protestants the plenitude of toleration. To their religion he preferred that in which he had been educated; and, though he probably would not, like his predecessor, have spontaneously annulled the edict of Nantes, he did not think that it was either consonant with the dignity or conducive to the advantage of the church to favour those who were hostile to the establishment. He therefore, by an edict of the year 1724, menaced protestant preachers with death, and their abettors with imprisonment, or the labours of galley-slaves. He also renewed the prohibition of return to all emigrants, unless they should abjure the protestant tenets and ordered that no molestation should be given to the present possessors of the estates of refugees, while the latter retained their anti-catholic opinions. At length, however, he so far yielded to the advice of the less bigoted members of his cabinet, as to allow the votaries of the reformation to become legal husbands and wives, by having the clergy to witness their marriages as civil contracts; and it was also intimated to them, that no notice should be taken of their religious assemblies. Upon these terms, the marechal Richelieu, in 1754, re-established the tranquillity of Languedoc, where compulsory attendance upon the Romish worship, and constrained abjurations of supposed heresy, had not effected that conversion which the court so earnestly wished to produce.[c]

In the disputes between Louis XV. and the provincial and Parisian parliaments, the protestants were prompted, by their zeal for liberty, to side with the opposers of the court; but they were obliged to be cautious in their proceedings, that they might not entail upon themselves the indignation and vengeance of royalty. They witnessed with secret joy the ruin of the Jesuits, the zealous supporters of catholicism, and looked forward with renovated hope to the grant of a full toleration.

The French protestants maintained an amicable correspondence with the Genevans, to whose sacramental celebrations a multitude of the inhabitants of Languedoc and Dauphiné resorted at the four great festivals of the year. They also encouraged the anti-papal perseverance of the Vaudois, who, though molested by the catholic zeal of the king of Sardinia, would not suffer his priests to pervert their principles.

The inhabitants of Bern, and other protestant cantons of Switzerland, refused to grant to the Lutherans that toleration to which they were entitled. The liberal example of the Genevans, who held out a friendly hand to that sect, did not excite imitation among the followers of the Helvetic confession.

While Christian VII. and Gustavus III. reigned in Denmark and Sweden, the spirit of toleration became more prevalent in those kingdoms. By the former prince, the Calvinists were gratified with a greater degree of freedom in point of religion; but, in some places, they were not suffered to preach against other creeds and modes of worship, or to make proselytes. The Mennonites, though protestants, were placed on the same footing with Romanists; were not allowed to contract marriage with Lutherans without a licence, and were obliged to acquiesce in the Lutheran education of their children of both sexes. In Sweden, the diet (in 1779) granted, to foreigners settling in that country, the freedom of worship, with an exception of public ceremonies and processions; at the same time excluding them from offices in the state, and forbidding them to propagate their opinions in seminaries.[d]

The Danish church, at that time, consisted of twelve superintendants or bishops, many provosts or directors of districts, parochial priests, and chaplains. The annual

[a] Many of these sectaries pretended to the gift of divination; and, in the year 1705, some of them came over to Great Britain, where they met with little encouragement. Those who ventured to appear in Holland were confined as fanatics, that, amidst hard labour, they might have time to recover their senses.

[b] Histoire de France sous le Regne de Louis XIV. par M. de Larrey. - Essai sur l'Hist. Generale, par M. de Voltaire; *art.* de Calvinisme.

[c] Vie Privée de Louis XV.

[d] Dr. Erskine's Sketches and Hints of Church History and Theological Controversy.——Yet a writer in the Encyclopædia Britannica, (edit. 1791,) after speaking of the Lutheran establishment, says, "There is not another sect in these kingdoms," [*Denmark, Sweden*, and *Norway.*] He probably borrowed the remark from some *old* geographical work.

revenue of the metropolitan did not exceed one thousand pounds; and the income of some pastors in Iceland scarcely amounted to five pounds. In Sweden, there were fourteen bishoprics, the occupants of which had not, in general, a greater income than the superintendants of Denmark. Associated with deputies from each archdeaconry, they formed the second component body of the states or national council. The clergy of that kingdom, by order of the states, had the care of the general education of the people, all of whom, females as well as males, were required to learn the easy arts of reading and writing.

In Germany, the frequent controversies between the Lutherans and Calvinists, and also between them and the catholics, had cherished and kept up that spirit of free inquiry which originally produced the reformation. In the discussion of doctrinal points, and in bringing them to the test of Scripture, writers of different capacities and dispositions gave such varied interpretations, that many readers were perplexed and confounded, and began to doubt whether any doctrines had ever been revealed to mankind. Some protestant authors, having seduced themselves into scepticism in the solitude of their closets, propagated their doubts among the people; still pretending, however, to be well-wishers to the cause of religion. Others openly ventured to recommend reason as a substitute for religion.

The Pietists, on the other hand, continued to promote the diffusion of religious zeal and vital Christianity. They not only withstood the efforts of infidel philosophy, but also reprobated latitudinarian indifference, censured the predication of mere morality, and raised their voices against the worldly spirit and increasing dissipation of the age. They were "exposed to much obloquy" (says an English Pietist)[a] "for their rigid maxims, and resolute rejection of all unhallowed conformity to the manners and amusements of a wicked world." "As the century advanced" (he adds) "the fervour of Pietism abated; and, iniquity abounding, the love of many waxed cold." The same zealous censor represents the generality of the Lutheran clergy, as sinking at that time into a *Laodicean state*, and "maintaining the forms and formulæ of Lutheranism, instead of the spirit of Christianity." Undoubtedly, this was the case with many of the ministers of that church: but it does not follow, because they were not continually speaking of faith and grace, that they were destitute of a Christian spirit, or regardless of the purity of religion. They might have less cant, less ostentation of piety, than those who considered themselves as the only sincere votaries of evangelical truth; but it is uncandid to insinuate that they were Christians only in name and in form, not in principle or in substance.

In Saxony and the Prussian territories, the metaphysical philosophy of Wolff, privy counsellor to Frederic William, king of Prussia, had a considerable effect in the diffusion of a sceptical spirit; and, although he was publicly censured for his pernicious writings, and deprived of a professorship at Halle, he continued to propagate his sentiments after his retreat into the principality of Hesse Cassel. He was subsequently protected by the Swedish court, but was more particularly favoured by that philosophic prince who became king of Prussia in the year 1740. Professor Kant, the celebrated metaphysician, was patronised by the same monarch; and his system likewise tended to generate scepticism.

This prince, the well-known Frederic, was fond of free inquiry, and eager to evince his superiority to what he considered as idle prejudice. He therefore easily suffered himself to be persuaded by infidel philosophers, that religion was the invention of interested hypocrites and artful statesmen. He was not more favourable in this respect to Christianity than to the Moslem creed. Priests of all persuasions were, in his eye, either wilful deluders of the multitude, or the credulous instruments of delusion. These opinions he gloried in propagating among his friends; and his court thus became the seat of irreligion, and a school of impiety. It was a matter of indifference to such a monarch, what religion his subjects professed, or whether they followed any religion at all, provided that they were subservient to his military and political despotism. He considered the morality of different sects as nearly the same;[b] and, while he tolerated all, his active vigilance kept his dominions in tranquillity, undisturbed by open animosities or serious dissensions. His people were free in a religious sense, but in no other respect.

Societies of *illuminati*, or enlightened reasoners, were at length formed in some of the protestant towns and principalities of Germany, and even in several of the catholic states. At Munich, professor Weishaupt, who had received his education among the Jesuits, became the founder of a club of reformists; and, when he had been banished from Bavaria for his dangerous principles, he was protected and encouraged by the duke of Saxe-Gotha. Baron Knigge strenuously laboured in the same cause; and, although greater effects have been attributed to these societies than their real importance may induce us to believe, it must be allowed that they paved the way for revolutionary mischief, and aided the pernicious influence of Gallic impiety and sedition.

While Louis XVI. filled the French throne, the clergy of the establishment repeatedly complained of his connivance at the encroachments of the protestants, who insulted or derided the institutions of the holy church, presumed to draw within their pale the children of catholics, taxed the people for the payment of salaries to unlicensed ministers, obtained the direction of public schools, and procured admission into the seats of magistracy. They did not, however, dare to recommend an infliction of the rigours of vengeance upon these "deluding and deluded men," but merely advised that the protestants should be *bribed* into an adoption of the Romish faith. Louis did not wish that considerations of interest should have any influence upon religious conversions; but he was willing, by occasional grants out of the royal temporalities, to assist those converts who required relief. The proselytes thus made by the church were not very numerous. The number of protestants, on the contrary, continued to increase, until the court thought it expedient to accede to their wishes. Under the administration of M. de Brienne, archbishop of Toulouse, the king issued an edict, by which they were admitted (in January 1788) to the free practice of their religion, and to all the rights of citizens. The revolution soon followed; and all religions were then confounded in the vortex of politics.

Before that revolution commenced its attack upon all

[a] Dr. Haweis.

[b] "Il n'y a aucune religion (he said) qui, sur le sujet de la morale, s'ecarte beaucoup des autres."

former institutions, religious as well as political, Frederic William, the successor of the infidel king of Prussia, endeavoured to stem the torrent of latitudinarianism and of irreligion by a spirited and not injudicious proclamation.[a] We take notice of this edict, not only because it is remarkable in itself, and tends to show the state of religion in the Prussian dominions at that time, but also because it produced a warm controversy. His majesty ordained, in the first place, that the three principal Christian creeds and systems (the Reformed, Lutheran, and Romish) should be preserved genuine. The second article provided for a continued toleration of Moravians, Mennonites, and the Bohemian brethren, beside Jews; but prohibited sects, pernicious to the state, from holding public assemblies. Thirdly, all endeavours to make proselytes, in any confession, were forbidden: yet all persons were at liberty to change their religion. Popish emissaries, monks, and ex-Jesuits, were particularly prohibited from attempting to convert those whom they called heretics. After commending the general harmony in which the clergy and laity of the three confessions seemed to live, the king ordered, that the two first churches should preserve their liturgies and directories: they might, he said, abolish immaterial ceremonies; but he would not suffer them to change any essential part of their old systems; an injunction which appeared to him to be the more necessary, as he had observed that many of the preachers of those communities denied important articles of Protestantism and Christianity, depreciated the authority of the Scriptures, and "served up again the often-refuted errors of Socinians, Naturalists,[b] and Deists," under the pretence of enlightening the people. Such ministers as disapproved the creed which they had originally adopted, were required to resign their pastoral charges, rather than teach any thing contrary to the received doctrines of their church.

Several free-thinkers and latitudinarians fiercely attacked the edict, as if it had been an unwarrantable invasion of liberty of conscience; but it was ably defended by Doctor Semler of Halle, and other divines. Its assailants reprobated the arbitrary spirit that fettered the freedom of inquiry, and which commanded individuals to believe without conviction; affirmed that Christ's kingdom was not of this world, and that the penal laws of temporal governments were inapplicable to religion, and wholly unjustifiable when employed for the coercion of the conscience; and animadverted on the inconsistency manifested by a protestant ruler, in condemning and counteracting a freedom of opinion analogous to that which had produced the Reformation. The supporters of the decree denied, that it enforced belief, as people might still believe only what suited their ideas, and might even freely publish their thoughts: but when a minister, in the exercise of his pastoral charge, taught doctrines repugnant to those which he had formerly undertaken to maintain, or inconsistent with the fundamental truths of religion, there was no injustice, they said, in preventing such a preacher from continuing to be unfaithful to his trust.

Infidelity was less observable in Poland than in Prussia or Brandenburg: but that country was a frequent scene of religious dissension. The Polish protestants had long njoyed, not merely toleration, but an equality of privilege with the catholics. After the expulsion of the Socinians, the Romanists obtained the ascendency, and gradually encroached on the rights of the protestants, for whose exclusion from the diet they procured, in the year 1733, a decree of the majority of that assembly. After the election of Stanislaus Poniatowski to the sovereignty, in 1764, the *dissidents* (under which term the members of the Greek church were included with the Lutherans and Calvinists) had recourse to the kings of Great Britain, Prussia, and Denmark, and to the empress of Russia, who readily promised to assist them by intercession for the recovery of those privileges which had been stipulated for them in the in the treaty of Oliva. The diet, however, for some years, would only allow them the freedom of worship; but, in 1768, being over-awed by a Russian army, the assembly acceded to the requisitions of the four courts. Many of the catholic nobles, resenting this compliance, and disgusted at the domineering influence of Russia, took up arms for religion and liberty; and a desultory warfare commenced, which did not entirely cease before the first partition of Poland. The dissidents were then less favoured than they had been by the preceding diet; but, beside toleration, they obtained seats in some of the courts of justice. When the czarina, and her allies in spoliation (the empress of Germany and king of Prussia,) had seized three considerable portions of the country, her influence was paramount over that part which still retained the name of a kingdom; and she preserved peace among the votaries of the different religions. In the provinces which were ceded to Austria, the catholics gave little molestation to the dissidents, as it was apprehended that, if oppressed, they would offer themselves as subjects to the tolerant Catharine, or take refuge under the wings of the Prussian eagle.[c]

By that constitution which Poland obtained in 1791 from the spirit of her nobles, but which her potent adversaries would not suffer long to subsist, toleration was more fully allowed; and, when the kingdom was finally dismembered, however unjust was the spoliation, the new rulers of the country established the security of religious opinion and worship.

In Hungary, the protestants did not enjoy, during the reign of Joseph, the full effect of his liberal declarations and fair promises. They complained that his edict was not properly enforced; but, after his death, their solicitations procured a favourable decree from his successor Leopold. It was ordained by the diet, in 1791, that persons of all ranks should enjoy a perfect freedom of public worship, and the liberty of erecting churches, even with steeples and bells; but that, when the protestants should wish to build a church, parsonage-house, or school, a mixed committee of the district should be holden, to ascertain the sufficiency of the proposed means, and the landlord should then fix upon the spot; that no protestants should be compelled to attend mass, witness catholic processions, or pay dues to the Romish priests; that they might form consistories and hold synods, but that no laws or ordinances framed at those meetings should be operative without the royal confirmation; that their authority over their own schools should also be subject to their sovereign's control; and that they might publish religious books, under the in-

[a] Dated at Potsdam, July 9, 1788.

[b] Not the cultivators of natural history or philosophy, but the teachers of natural religion, as opposed to Christianity. The count de Buffon, indeed, was a naturalist in both senses.

[c] Coxe's Travels in Poland.

spection of censors of their own appointment, who should, however, be responsible to the government for their official conduct. It was also decreed that they should be eligible to public offices, and even to a seat in the diet, equally with the Romanists.[a]

These grants were deemed, by the catholics, great *favours* and liberal *concessions;* but, by the protestants, they were considered as no more than natural *rights.* The Romish bigots, in some instances, counteracted the new ordinances, and prevented the immediate accomplishment of the patriotic intentions of the diet: but the court, and the catholics in general, were disposed to permit the execution of the decree.

The protestants of Bohemia were, at the same time, freed from all persecution and molestation, on the subject of religion. During a great part of the century, the Jews in that kingdom were more favoured by its catholic rulers, than were even the Christian sects: but the latter, at length, found an opportunity of emerging from their difficulties and depression.

When the revolution had broken out in France, the spirit of irreligion was more openly manifested in Germany, among the three denominations of Christians, than it had been at any time from the first establishment of the religion of Jesus in that country; and, being mingled with the desire of enjoying a greater portion of civil liberty, it prompted the people, in several states of the empire, to submit to the arms of France, soon after the war began to rage. When French fraternity had lost the charm of novelty, many repented of the blind forwardness with which they had accepted it: but, when the yoke was fixed upon their necks, it was too late to retract. In the ecclesiastical electorates, capricious varieties of opinion were substituted for the catholic creed; and, although religion was not absolutely neglected by all classes of people, either in the protestant or catholic states, the worship became less decorous and regular; the public service of God ceased, in a great measure, to be an object of devout attention.

CHAP. IV.

History of the Church of England and its Dependencies, and also of the Protestant Sects in the British Dominions.

When the church of England had been rescued from danger by the seasonable exertions of the prince of Orange, and the free exercise of *particular* worship had been allowed by a wise and liberal parliament to those protestants who dissented from the *general* religion of the state, the defeat and depression of the catholics, and the removal of anxiety from the minds both of the orthodox and the sectaries, produced a degree of tranquillity which the church had not enjoyed from the time of the Reformation. The schism of the nonjurors, indeed, still subsisted at the beginning of the eighteenth century; the legality of the ecclesiastical government was boldly disputed by many zealots; and a spirited contest was carried on between the high church and low-church factions, or the Tories and Whigs of the hierarchy. But the collisions of party were less vehement, and the animosity of disputants less bitter and malignant.

If Anne had reigned immediately after the Revolution, she would not have been so ready as king William to grant toleration to dissenters. She suspected them of aiming at the ruin of the church, while they professed only a wish for an unmolested indulgence of their peculiar opinions. But, as the legislature had thought proper to gratify them with the freedom to which they had long aspired, she resolved not to encroach upon their admitted claims, or offer the least violence to what she called their tender consciences. She wished, however, to prevent the practice of occasional conformity, by which not a few presbyterians and other dissenters procured employments intended only for the orthodox. They took the sacrament according to the established forms, to qualify themselves by law for particular offices, and then frequented the meeting-houses of non-conformists. The Tories frequently introduced a bill to restrain this interested duplicity. Thrice their views were baffled by the influence of the Whigs; but when, upon a renewed attempt, clauses were inserted for the security of the protestant succession and the confirmation of the act which tolerated non-conformity, the low church party suffered the bill to pass.

In the convocation, or clerical senate, the two parties occasionally disputed with eagerness; but the queen's ministers rather checked than promoted these debates, because they deemed it sufficient that the parliament should be the scene of contest. The literary war, on the subject of the claims and rights of the convocation, which had been carried on in the reign of William, did not cease amidst the discouragement of debates in that assembly: but it gradually declined; and the able work of Dr Wake, archbishop of Canterbury, seemed triumphantly to close the controversy in favour of the Whigs. The Tories had maintained, that it was the indisputable right of the clergy, not only to meet in ordinary synods, but (as often as a new parliament met) to sit and vote in convocation; and that in this assembly they might deliberate upon ecclesiastical affairs, and agree to various resolutions, without the formality of a previous license. The opposite party referred all the acts of the church to the pleasure of the sovereign, without whose permission the clergy could not lawfully meet, debate, or enact.

It is remarkable that the former of these factions, while they disputed the power of the temporal prince in religious affairs, recommended passive obedience on the part of the people, as what the governing power of the state might justly claim; and that the Whigs, on the other hand, while they promoted the authoritative interference of the crown in the government of the church, professed a desire of clipping, on other occasions, the wings of royalty.

The predications of the maxims and doctrines of Toryism by Sacheverel, a hot-headed divine, excited in parliament a flame which diffused itself through the kingdom. The Whig leaders imprudently fanned it, and, by impeaching a zealot, whose effusions might safely have been neglected, seriously injured their own interests. The sentence of the high court of peers seemed rather to be a triumph than a punishment; and the high-church party obtained a decisive advantage in the cabinet. The queen then indulged the clergy with a greater latitude of debate in convocation, than she had allowed them in the former part of her reign.

The church of Ireland was also agitated by the distinctions of Whig and Tory; but its tranquillity was not

[a] Travels in Hungary, by Robert Townson, LL. D.

disturbed in any remarkable degree. The catholics still formed the great bulk of the nation: but power was in the hands of their adversaries, who, from principles of policy, and in the spirit of self-defence, were determined to hold it with a vigorous grasp. The holders of benefices, however, in the wild and unfrequented parts of that island, found it difficult and even dangerous to collect tithes from the papists, who sometimes were guilty of acts of violence and outrage.

The presbyterian establishment in Scotland remained unimpaired under the sway of Anne: and its preservation was an essential article of the legislative union which dignified her reign. The episcopalians, however, were tolerated in that country; and a bill was enacted, in 1712, by the united parliament, in confirmation of the unrestrained freedom of their worship. Public chapels, which had not been allowed to them in the preceding reign, were now erected in many parts of North Britain; and the people, confiding in the protection of the *court*, were not afraid to dissent from the *kirk*.

These episcopalians, in general, were unfriendly to the Revolution, and to the succession of the house of Hanover; and, therefore, fell under the general suspicion of favouring the views of the queen's brother, the catholic claimant of the crown. When the elector of Hanover had ascended the British throne, this suspicion became stronger; and, during the rebellion that arose in the year 1715, those who had no concern in it were closely watched, and the ministers of their communion were restricted in their functions; with the full exercise of which, however, they were soon re-indulged.

During the reign of that monarch, the church of England continued to flourish. The king, indeed, supported that party which did not bear the character of being particularly zealous for the ecclesiastical establishment; and we need not be surprised at his habitual regard for the Whigs, as they were the only cordial promoters of those statutes and arrangements which paved his way to the throne. He encouraged those divines who recommended the principles of civil liberty, and who at the same time wished to subject the church to the state, and give the temporal prince a commanding height of religious authority; not such, however, as would enable him to oppress the church, but only to secure its welfare and tranquillity, in the midst of general toleration.

After the suppression of the rebellion, while the nation enjoyed general repose, the church was disturbed by the warm prosecution of a literary controversy. This dispute was occasioned by a sermon which the king (who heard it) ordered to be printed. Dr. Benjamin Hoadly, who had been honoured with a vote of the house of commons, requesting the crown to reward his services, as a friend of liberty and of the protestant settlement, was the preacher of this discourse, in which he delivered his sentiments on the subject of Christ's kingdom or church. He endeavoured to prove, that the true church did not require any other than spiritual sanctions; that it was not intended by its divine founder to be supported by political *encouragements*, or checked by political *discouragements;* that such interferences, on the part of the state, tended to give to the church a worldly character, not altogether consistent with genuine piety, and not favourable to pure or sublime devotion; and that the ecclesiastical establishment would flourish more under its own guidance, than under temporal direction. The kingdoms of this world, he said, could not suggest proper ideas of that government which ought to prevail, in a visible and sensible manner, in Christ's kingdom. The sanctions of Christ's laws, appointed by himself, were not the rewards of this world, not the offices or glories of this state, not the pains of imprisonment or of exile, or the smaller discouragements that belong to human society; these could not be the instruments of such a persuasion as would be acceptable to God. To "teach Christians that they must either profess, or be silent, against their own consciences, because of the authority of others over them, was to found that authority upon the ruins of sincerity and common honesty; to teach a doctrine which would have prevented the Reformation, and even the existence of the church of England." No power, repugnant to the supreme authority of Christ, could be justly claimed over the church by Christians, even of the highest rank. His supremacy, as legislator and judge, no temporal or human power ought to infringe or invalidate. These opinions were censured in convocation, as tending to produce disorder and anarchy in the church, and to prevent the due subserviency of that body to the state; and they were combated in print by the celebrated Sherlock and other divines. The dispute was denominated the Bangorian controversy; and, when it ceased, the same diversity of sentiment remained, which had before prevailed on the subject. Such is the frequent result of a literary dispute!

While the controversy was at its height, the dissenters were gratified, in the session of 1718-9, by the introduction of a bill, calculated to relieve them from those tests to which the bishop of Bangor objected: but it did not pass in that favourable shape which it assumed at its first appearance; for it did not provide, as the sovereign wished, for the repeal of the sacramental test, although it annulled the acts against schism and occasional conformity.

The dissenters affirm, that tests of this kind are the remains of a persecuting spirit, and are therefore disgraceful to a government which professes to avoid persecution. When conscientious individuals, they say, are excluded, on account of their religious opinions, from those offices and preferments which are bestowed on their fellow-citizens, they do not enjoy the full rights of toleration. It is not sufficient that they are allowed to worship God in their own way, if they be debarred from the general advantages of that community with which they are connected. Their claims, we answer, might be admitted where no particular religion is established by law and authority, as preferable to all other creeds and systems: but, where an ecclesiastical establishment forms a part of the constitution, it is by no means unreasonable to exclude, from its advantages and emoluments, those who are unwilling to conform to it. It is the natural character of sects to be hostile to each other; and those who differ from the establishment cannot be expected to be its defenders or preservers. To guard against the intrusion of such men, it is ordained that conditions should be annexed to the acceptance of benefices; and, if the consciences of individuals should be too scrupulous to suffer them to accede to the terms, they ought rather to blame themselves than the government, for the want of preferment in that church to which they are not closely allied.

or (to put the affair in another point of view) they may congratulate themselves on their disinterested piety. But tests, they say, only serve to make hypocrites; for many will be induced to conform outwardly, who secretly retain their supposed heresy: only good men, therefore, or the ingenuous and sincere professors of religion, are discountenanced and stigmatised. We answer, that it is not the wish of the rulers of the state to obtain merely exterior conformity: that is an accidental circumstance, arising from the interested views of the candidates for preferment; and there is surely less danger in having a few hypocritical intruders, than in opening the doors of the church to all who may choose to dissent from its doctrines; the majority of whom, though many of them may be pious and worthy men, would wish to overturn the prevailing system.

The utility of the test, as a barrier to the church, has influenced the greater part of the nobility, and also of the national representatives, to withstand all the efforts made by the dissenters for its annulment; and it is not very probable that the present generation will witness its removal. It has repeatedly resisted, in our times, all the eloquence of latitudinarian orators, and all the arts of presbyterian and independent sophists. The chief objectors to it would, perhaps, if their system should ever be predominant, recommend a stronger exclusion of all other religionists from power: such is the perverseness, such the selfishness of human nature!

The tolerant disposition of the king induced him to disapprove the violence of the Tories, who endeavoured to procure a new penal act against the Arians and Socinians, and all who might be guilty of blasphemy and profaneness. The Whigs strenuously opposed the bill; and it was not suffered to be added to the statutes of the realm. The same party checked the spirit of debate which agitated the ecclesiastical senate; and, from that time, the two houses of convocation have only met *pro formâ*, with every new parliament.

During the remainder of this reign, the church of England, and also that of Ireland, enjoyed tranquillity: but the increased liberty of the times encouraged a freedom of thinking, which led some bold spirits into a denial of Christianity and of all divine revelation. Anthony Collins was one of these assailants; and he rendered himself so obnoxious to the clergy, that they reviled him as an atheist. As he had attacked revelation under the government of a devout queen, it was not likely that he would refrain or desist when the sovereign (though not a free-thinker) was less religiously disposed. He therefore again took up the pen, and, in 1724, published a Discourse of the Grounds and Reasons of the Christian Religion. Some able theologians strenuously defended the faith and system which he thus attacked; and his Scheme of Literal Prophecy likewise drew forth spirited replies and indignant animadversions. Bernard de Mandeville, an emigrant Dutch physician, also wrote, both in this and the succeeding reign, against Christianity. Dr. Matthew Tindal, a professor of the civil law, represented this religion as being coëval with the creation;—in other words, he controverted the credibility of Christ's mission; and, alleging the sufficiency of natural religion, denied the expediency of any revelation of the divine will. He even affected to think that such a communication was incompatible with the rights of man. This bold attack was repelled by the learning of the orthodox Waterland, and the ability of the virtuous though schismatical Foster.

We do not find that any new sects arose in this island under the government of the first George; but, in the long reign of his son, various instances of schism occurred, both in North and South Britain. To the former of these reigns may be assigned the formation of a religious *party*,[a] which, although it never became numerous, drew some distinguished men into its vortex. Mr. John Hutchinson, a pretender to philosophy, controverted the Newtonian system,[b] substituted a *plenum* for a *vacuum*, and ridiculed the laws of gravity. The true system of nature, he said, was to be found in the writings of Moses; and no philosophy could be deemed correct, except that of the Hebrew Scriptures. With regard to the doctrine of the Trinity, he advanced a fanciful opinion, importing that the idea of three persons of one and the same essence, answered to fire, light, and spirit, the three grand agents in nature, or the three modifications of the same substance, namely, air. His opinions were eagerly espoused, and warmly recommended, by Mr. Julius Bate, whose zeal he rewarded by procuring him a benefice. Sixteen years after his death, his system was defended by Mr. George Horne, a young clergyman, whose merit afterwards elevated him to the episcopal dignity. Forbes, the Scottish judge, also wrote in its vindication; Mr. Romaine, the popular preacher, gave his assent to it; Dr. Wetherell, William Jones, and other divines not destitute of learning, regarded it as worthy of adoption and support. Bate and Spearman, the editors of Hutchinson's works, maintained, not (as some have interpreted the author's meaning) that the sun moves and the earth stands still, but that no scriptural passages, properly construed, are repugnant to the Copernican hypothesis respecting those parts of the universe.

A secession from the established church of Scotland took place in the year 1727, in consequence of the independent spirit of John Glas, who, disapproving every establishment of a *national* church, maintained that all churches ought only to be *congregational;* in other words, that no general church ought to be formed for a nation, but that each religious society in a kingdom or state should be self-constituted and controlled only by itself. For this and other opinions, he was suspended from his ministerial functions, and, for continued contumacy, he was deposed from the rank of minister, first by a provincial synod, and afterwards (in 1730) by the general assembly of the Scottish church. He persisted, however, in the propagation of his sentiments, both by preaching and writing, and formed several congregations, of which the most numerous was that of Dundee.[c]

While Mr. Glas, and those who adopted his opinions, were employed in strengthening their secession, some other divines, on different grounds, were meditating a retreat from the establishment. These ministers wished to maintain the national church in its original strictness;

[a] As the followers of Hutchinson did not form a distinct church or society, and continued to belong to the church or body with which they were formerly connected, they did not so far give way to schism as to compose a sect.

[b] In a work entitled, "Moses' *Principia*," the first part of which appeared in 1724.

[c] Adams' Religious World Displayed, vol. iii. p. 170—6.

and, as they could not accomplish that object, they resolved to form new congregations. Supposed infringements of the constitution of the kirk had excited their strong disgust. They complained of the laws of patronage, and wished for a popular election of ministers: they alleged that the right of protest against the proceedings of the assembly had been invaded, and that the rulers of the kirk, beside acting arbitrarily, suffered its doctrines to be corrupted. Four ministers were suspended from their parochial functions, in 1733, for the freedom of their animadversions on these points; but the assembly reinstated them in the following year: yet, as the grievances of which they complained were not redressed, they refused to re-join the establishment. They strengthened their interest by considerable adjunctions of force, drawn from the ranks both of the clergy and laity, particularly after they had published a second *testimony* of the grounds of their secession. Being cited to appear before the assembly, and refusing to acknowledge its jurisdiction, they were debarred, in 1740, from all clerical functions in the kirk, and excluded from all emoluments connected with that church. It may be proper to mention, that Ebenezer Erskine, who had acted as minister at Stirling, was the chief of these seceders.[a]

When the seceders had formed three presbyteries, a division arose among them, in 1747, in consequence of an oath which some of them deemed inconsistent with the sentiments avowed in their *testimony*. It was the ordinary oath of a burgess, in support of the *true religion* established by law. We cannot, said one party, conscientiously honour with that appellation the establishment from which we have seceded; while the other members of the synod contended, that the oath might safely be taken, as the religion of the state was still the true faith, though many of its ostensible votaries had departed from its principles, or loosely professed it. The former, who were called *Anti-burghers*, prevailed on this occasion, and voted, that the oath was incompatible with the testimony: they even excommunicated the members by whom it was vindicated. This idle dispute long continued to keep the seceders in distinct synods: and, at the close of the century, the schism was not entirely healed, though the two parties were less hostile than they had been.

The secession of Mr. Glas was continued by Robert Sandeman, who, in 1757, published his opinions in a series of letters, which led to the establishment of several congregations in England, as well as in Scotland. The sect also extended itself to North America, particularly to New England. Its members were of opinion, that all who *found* the apostolic report concerning the death and resurrection of Christ *true in their minds*, possessed that *faith* from which *justification* resulted, even if they were the most sinful of mankind; that, though good works be not essential to justification, it is proper to observe the moral precepts which were inculcated in the times of the apostles; that brotherly love and social kindness ought strikingly to mark the demeanour of Christians; that such love however, ought not to preclude the excommunication and disgrace of an offending brother; and that, in this and other cases of deliberation, not merely a majority, but the whole congregation, ought to decide. They required the sacrament of the eucharist to be taken every week; and they encouraged a great frequency of prayer. They had *love-feasts*, or meetings of mutual hospitality, which were terminated with hymns and the kiss of charity; and, in the same spirit of fraternal affection, they inculcated the maxim of a community of goods.[b]

In the same reign, a sect, which soon became far more numerous and flourishing than those now mentioned, arose in England, and spread over the British dominions. We have already remarked, that the animosities between the orthodox and the dissenters had gradually subsided after the Revolution; and we may add, that this diminution of rancour was more particularly observable after the accession of the Hanoverian family to the throne, when the principles of toleration were more fully established amidst the progress of free inquiry. At the same time, the clergy of the establishment seemed in general to sink into a lukewarmness and indifference which disgusted all but the worldly-minded pursuers of immediate interest. Infidelity also gained ground among the laity, and sneers at religion were beginning to be a part of the fashionable system.

This degeneracy was observed with sensations of horror by John and Charles Wesley, who were then students at the university of Oxford, and had contracted a serious turn of mind from the writings of William Law, the celebrated mystic. These devout brothers passed a great part of their time in religious conversation, in reflecting on the interesting contents of the Holy Scriptures, and in private prayer. They were joined by some other academics who were religiously disposed; and a sect which afterwards made an extraordinary progress, took its rise in the year 1729, deriving the appellation of *Methodists* from the regular distribution of their time, their orderly and composed demeanour, and the supposed purity of their religious principles. Mr. Hervey, the author of the Meditations, occasionally attended their meetings; and, in 1735, they were gladdened with the adjunction of a young and eloquent orator, named George Whitefield. In that year, the two Wesleys undertook a voyage to Georgia, to impart to the colonists the doctrine of *saving grace*. but their mission did not produce any extraordinary effect. When they had left the province, Mr. Whitefield undertook the task of chief missionary.

Pure, genuine, evangelical religion, or that which Mr. John Wesley considered as such, was at length[c] publicly preached by him, after his return to Great Britain, not in the churches of the metropolis or of the different counties, (for the incumbents would not suffer him to enter their pulpits,) but in the open air and in the fields. As souls might be saved even in this seemingly irregular way, it was far better, he said, so to preach, than not to preach at all. He soon drew many into his opinions, and propagated, with great success, the doctrine of salvation by faith. For his new society he instituted rules, not inexpedient or injudicious, recommending an orderly behaviour and an avoidance of dissipation and licentiousness. Meeting-houses were gradually erected by his followers, and, in defiance of the insults of the populace, and the sneers of the higher orders, methodism extended itself into all parts of England and Wales, made some progress in Scotland, and crossed the sea into Ireland.

A division of sentiment, between Wesley and Whitefield, resulted from those deliberations and reflections

[a] Adams' Religious World Displayed, vol. iii. p. 193—6.

[b] Adam, vol. iii. p. 177—90.

[c] In the year 1738.

which occupied the mind of the latter, while he acted as a preacher beyond the Atlantic. He became more inclined to Calvinism than to Arminianism, to which the former was well affected. This difference, however, did not produce in their minds the bitterness of animosity. Each spoke favourably of the Christian piety of his *quondam* associate; and, if not cordial friends, they were not enemies to each other.

The opinions and the piety of Mr. Whitefield recommended him to the notice of a devout peeress, who appointed him her chaplain, and patronized him through life. This lady was Selina, countess dowager of Huntingdon, who liberally promoted the erection of meeting-houses for the Calvinistic Methodists, and erected a college at Treveka (in Monmouthshire) for the instruction of future preachers. Happy in the idea and prospect of drawing sinners from the error of their way, and of diffusing an acquaintance with the Scriptures, as understood and explained by Mr. Whitefield and his associates, she disregarded the ridicule to which she was exposed by a taste so unusual among persons of rank, and prosecuted her religious career with inflexible perseverance.[a]

The proselytes of Whitefield were less numerous than those of Wesley, and their association was less compact. Their ministers and places of worship were respectively supported by the different congregations, not (like those of the Wesleyan sect) by a general fund. The former had not an annual court for the government of the whole body: but the latter had a regular session, under the name of a *Conference*, in which the affairs and circumstances of the confederacy were examined, funds provided, abuses corrected, and grievances redressed. This meeting was composed of preachers chosen by the assemblies of preachers of different *districts*, as representatives of the Methodist connexion, and of the superintendents of the *circuits* (or inferior divisions:) it was at first limited to one hundred of the senior itinerant predicators; but, in the sequel, all the preachers were permitted to assist, if they were so inclined, or had an opportunity of attending. At first, laymen were allowed to preach; but ministers were afterwards ordained for that purpose by the clerical heads of the society. It may here be observed, that Wesley and some of his associates had taken orders regularly in the church of England.

The same pious and indefatigable preacher, to counteract the misconceptions of the character of a Methodist, fully stated the "distinguishing marks" of his followers. Those marks, he said, were not to be found in "their opinions of any sort," in their words and phrases, or in any desire of being "distinguished by actions, customs, or usages, of an indifferent nature, undetermined by the word of God;" nor did they lay the whole stress of religion upon any single part of it. But they were distinguished by having the love of God shed abroad in their hearts, by being always happy in God, ever resting on him, giving thanks for every thing, praying constantly with earnestness and fervour; by purifying their hearts from the lust of the flesh and of the eye, from envy and malice, from pride and petulance; by doing kind offices to neighbours and strangers, to friends and enemies; and by other fruits of a *living faith*. Nothing, he added, was required by St. Paul but the faith here mentioned. By that alone could any one be justified, or accounted righteous before God; and the remission of sins could only be obtained through the merits of Christ, not by the good works or supposed deserts of individuals. Holiness of heart and life would flow from such faith: but good deeds without it would be inoperative and nugatory. No man could produce it in himself, as it was the work of omnipotence. It was the free gift of God to those who were before "ungodly and unholy, and fit only for everlasting destruction." He who received it was born again, yet was not so perfectly regenerate, as to be fully sanctified; for there would still be some struggles between the old and the new man, which would not cease before the Holy Spirit had given to the zealous Christian "a new and clean heart." He would then attain the *acmè* of sanctification, and be qualified for the society of "just men made perfect."[b]

Thus did Mr. Wesley vindicate his opinions; and he continued to propagate them with zeal and success. He sometimes preached four times in one day, in places considerably distant from each other; and his zeal seemed so far to invigorate his frame, that he fainted not in his spiritual course. Not content with preaching, he promoted by writing, the system which he deemed most conformable to the will of God, the instructions of our Redeemer, and the suggestions of the Holy Spirit.

Mr. Whitefield's constitution did not preserve itself so long unbroken, or so well support the fatigue of preaching, as that of Mr. Wesley; for he died of a disorder of the lungs, in 1770, at the age of fifty-five years; whereas the life of Wesley was not closed before he had made some progress in his eighty-eighth year.[c]

Nearly at the same time with Mr. Wesley, died the countess of Huntingdon, who, although she admired the eloquence of Mr. Whitefield, and approved the fundamental principles of his system, organized a society that differed in some points from his sect, and which, indeed, deviated less from the church of England. Her seminary at Treveka, not being endowed, expired with her: but a new one quickly arose at Cheshunt, from which have issued some distinguished preachers.

A sect less obnoxious than the methodists to the orthodox clergy, assumed the denomination of *United Brethren*. These were called Moravians by the public, and are said to have first appeared in England in the year 1728. Their rise and progress upon the continent we have already noticed. They were favoured with the patronage of some of our prelates, (particularly archbishop Potter,) by whose recommendation they obtained a parliamentary recognition, in 1749, as composing an ancient protestant episcopal church. As their number increased, so did their zeal; and they meritoriously distinguished themselves by their eagerness for the propagation of Christianity among pagans and barbarians. A society was formed at London for this purpose; and missionaries were employed with success both in the eastern and western hemispheres. The Brethren were opposed in their views by numerous adversaries, who accused them of disseminating pernicious doctrines, and indulging in dissolute and immoral prac-

[a] Between the sects thus formed, the chief points of difference are the following. The Whitefieldian or Calvinistic Methodist do not admit the possibility of attaining perfection in this life; but the followers of Wesley believe that it may be attained. The latter substitute imputed faith for imputed righteousness. They reject the doctrine of predestination, and also that of irresistible grace; both of which are maintained by the disciples of Whitefield and the followers of lady Huntingdon.

[b] History of Religion, vol. iv.

[c] He died in March 1791.

tices, particularly at their love-feasts: but they repelled these charges with effect, and acquired the esteem of unprejudiced observers of their conduct.

Near the close of the century, this sect had three provincial settlements in England, beside meeting-houses or chapels in London and some other towns. At the same time, the Brethren had six settlements in North America. The most flourishing was that of Bethlehem in Pennsylania; an establishment which was distinguished by he moral respectability, decorous behaviour, and philanthropic spirit, of its members. They "studied (as we are informed by an English visitant of their settlement) to render their conduct strictly conformable to the principles of the Christian religion. They seemed to have only one wish at heart,—the propagation of the Gospel and the good of mankind." They were active and industrious; carried on manufactures of woollen and linen, and indeed practised all the necessary arts of life; and, at the same time, they did not neglect literary pursuits. Three of the largest houses in the town were respectively occupied, in 1797, by unmarried young men, young women, and widows, who were employed in various arts, and lived in a monastic or conventual mode. It may be added, that the savages are more amenable, to conversion under the influence of arguments and persuasions offered by the Moravians, than from the endeavours of other votaries of Christianity.[a]

Amidst the progress of sectarian opinions, and particularly while the Methodists and Moravians were extending their influence, an able defender of the establishment rose into notice and reputation. This was William Warburton, a provincial clergyman (afterwards bishop of Glocester,) who, in a work which appeared in the year 1736, enforced the "necessity and equity of an established religion and a test-law, from the essence and end of civil society." In his next performance, he was less successful in point of argument. It was entitled, "the Divine Legation of Moses demonstrated on the Principles of a Religious Deist, from the Omission of the Doctrine of a Future state of Rewards and Punishments, in the Jewish Dispensation." We do not dispute the divinity of the mission of that legislator, while we believe it to be sufficiently evident, that the doctrine in question was a part of the ancient Jewish creed. This work was answered by Dr. Middleton, Stebbing, and other divines, to whom Warburton replied with contemptuous acrimony. During the rebellion of the year 1745, he was one of the assailants of popery, and assisted in confirming the zeal of the protestant majority of the nation. He afterwards took part in the controversy occasioned by Dr. Middleton's Enquiry concerning the Miraculous Powers supposed to have subsisted in the Christian Church from the earliest Ages;[b] a dispute in which he was more orthodox than the ingenious author whom he opposed; who maintained, that miracles had ceased at the expiration of the apostolic age. Dr. Warburton also defended revealed religion with spirit against the infidel philosophy of lord Bolingbroke, the annunciation of whose unpublished works had alarmed the votaries of Christianity; and an answer from him to Hume's Natural History of Religion, roused into asperity the feelings of that artful sceptic.

The two free-thinkers whom we have here incidentally mentioned, call for more than a transient notice, in a history of that religion which they endeavoured to undermine and subvert. Bolingbroke was a man of great talents, an able orator, a polite scholar, and an interesting writer. As a statesman, however, he did not evince that wisdom which might have been expected from his abilities; and, as a philosopher, he so conducted his inquiries, as to persuade himself into a disbelief of the Christian revelation, while he outwardly supported that establishment which connected this religion with the state. By furnishing his friend, the bard of Twickenham, with the philosophical basis of the Essay on Man, he entailed upon that writer the suspicion either of being unfriendly to revelation, or of not fully comprehending the tendency of his own poem. Crousaz, a Swiss professor, reprobated the Essay as a system of fatality and naturalism; and, although it was vindicated by Warburton, the defence was not generally regarded as satisfactory. Pope, however, thought the attack sufficiently repelled, and thanked his clerical advocate for what he termed a clear and full answer to the charge.

Bolingbroke's chief attacks upon Christianity were comprehended in his posthumous works. These he ordered to be published;[c] and therefore he deserves the stigma of a propagator of impiety; a practice which he had condemned (in a private letter) as mischievously atrocious. As soon as they appeared, they were read with avidity; but they did not answer the expectations either of his friends or of the public in general. His reasoning was found to be feeble and inconclusive; and his weapon, instead of being the club of a giant, seemed merely to be the dart of a pigmy.

David Hume possessed greater acuteness than the profane peer. His vanity would not suffer him to wait for his death before he should illuminate the world with his anti-religious writings; and he attacked Christianity with a degree of insiduous art, which seduced many readers into the paths of infidelity. He ridiculed the belief in miracles, and sneered at other parts of the Christian creed. Campbell and Adams took the field against him, as champions of the miraculous powers of the apostolic age; and other divines defended with zeal the general cause of orthodoxy. It was in consequence of his infidelity, that he was disappointed of a professorship of moral philosophy, which he wished to obtain; and, in the general assembly of the kirk, it was proposed that a vote of censure should pass against him for his attacks upon the religion of his country; but this was not deemed necessary by the majority. In the words of Bolingbroke, (applied to free-thinkers in general,) Hume was a pest of society, because he endeavoured to loosen its bands, and to remove at least one curb out of the mouth of that wild beast, man, who required many more curbs.

While infidelity spread on one hand, sectarianism or nonconformity increased on the other. The Baptists, Anabaptists, or Anti-pædo-baptists, were then gaining ground in this country. The *remonstrant* or *general* Baptists were openly joined, in 1747, by the learned but eccentric Whiston, who was of opinion that they were the best Christians in the kingdom, both in doctrine and

[a] Weld's Travels through the States of North America, in the years 1795, 1796, and 1797; letter xxxvii.

[b] Until the Reformation, it was the general opinion, that a miraculous power had continued in the church from the era of Christianity. It was afterwards maintained by protestants, that such a power did not extend beyond the first three centuries from that epoch; but the Romanist affirm, that it is still exercised by the saints of their church.

[c] The editor was David Mallet, the poet.

practice, and "the only body of Christian people who rightly constituted their three orders of ecclesiastical governors, *bishops* [*angels* or *messengers*], *presbyters*, and *deacons*." He recommended their *immersion* of *adults*, as the genuine practice of the apostolic age: he agreed with them in believing the *millennium;* and he adopted, with them, the idea of *hades*, or an "intermediate state and place between heaven and hell." He was pleased with their "abstaining from blood and things strangled," and with the practice of some of their congregations, of praying over the sick, and "anointing them with holy oil, upon the confession of their sins;" and, with many of those sectaries, he denied original sin. But he blamed them for dipping only once, instead of practising the *trine immersion;* for using wine undiluted with water in the sacrament (an abuse which, he said, had also crept into the foreign protestant churches;) and for requiring that such as had been baptized in infancy, or by sprinkling, should be re-baptized before they could be admitted into this sect.[a]

He afterwards endeavoured to form a union of the Baptists with the presbyterians and independents; and, with this view, he recommended and re-published some "heads of agreement assented to by the united ministers in and about London,[b] formerly called presbyterian and congregational." But all his efforts, and those of other divines in the same cause, were rendered abortive by the prejudices of some, the vanity of others, and the general want of a conciliatory spirit.

The *Calvinistic* or *particular* Baptists, who had little communication with the former class, augmented their number much more considerably than the remonstrant or Arminian division; but they had not in their sect so many respectable ministers as the other class could boast. Some congregations of both classes were also called *Sabbatarians*, from keeping their sabbath on Saturday.

With an exception of the time of Oliver Cromwell, when a Baptist church subsisted at Edinburgh, no traces of the sect have been discovered in Scotland before the year 1765, when a congregation was formed by Mr. Carmichael and Mr. Mac-Lean. The latter not only assisted the former in preaching, but wrote several vindications of *Believer-Baptism*, against the attacks of the advocates of *infant-sprinkling*. These ministers and their followers maintained, that, as only the baptism of believers could be justified by Scripture, infants, being unable to believe, ought not to be made partakers of that sacrament: yet, they thought, there was reason to conclude that children, recommended to Christ by the prayers of believing parents, would be saved, even without that holy ceremony. They admitted that mere baptism, without proofs of faith and spiritual conversion, would be insufficient to save adults. Faith, they said, would operate in that respect without good works; yet the effect of true faith and of God's grace would appear in the performance of just, virtuous, and benevolent acts.[c]

In the same division of this island, another party quitted the establishment,[d] and assumed the title of the *reformed Presbytery;* a less modest denomination than the *dissenting Presbytery*, an appellation which has also been given to these descendants of the old supporters of the solemn league and covenant. Persecuted in the reigns of the arbitrary brothers, Charles and James, the covenanters enjoyed tranquillity after the Revolution; but they were not satisfied with the religious arrangements of that period. They looked back with regret to the good old times, when the reformed faith was at its zenith in Scotland, and when the three kingdoms were united in the sacred bonds of the same pure religion. Lamenting the defection of the national rulers, and the majority of the people, from the true principles of the Reformation, a party of religious malcontents renounced all connexion with the *revolution kirk*, and, under the guidance of Mac-Millan and Nairn, formed a seceding presbytery. By these ministers, others were selected for the same functions; and the secession has been continued to the present time. Beside the congregations of this complexion in North Britain, there are several in Ireland, and some in North America. The members profess to follow the Scripture as their principal guide, and the ordinances of the Westminster assembly in the next place. They disapprove the high authority assumed by the state over the church of Christ, as the fruit of worldly policy, rather than a claim justified by the genuine spirit of religion. Yet they submit peaceably to the higher powers, and do not indulge in the clamours of sedition or the murmurs of disaffection.

Their worship is thus described by one of their own ministers:[e] "Public prayers, with the heart, and with the understanding also, and in a known tongue, but not in written or in humanly prescribed forms; singing psalms of divine inspiration, and these alone; reading and expounding the Scriptures; preaching and receiving the word; administering and receiving the sacraments of baptism and the Lord's supper; together with public fasting and thanksgiving; are considered by them as the divinely instituted ordinances of religious worship, while they reject all ceremonies of human invention."

While these reformers were slowly increasing their numbers, a more considerable sect, in the year 1752, departed from the establishment. Mr. Gillespie, having opposed the reception of a new minister, whose appointment was unpleasing to the majority of the inhabitants of Inverkeithing, was expelled from the church in which he officiated; but he soon found followers, who, like him, wished to throw the election of pastors into the hands of the people, and formed a congregation at Dunfermline. The *Presbytery of Relief*, in allusion to the desired relief from the arbitrary rigour of the laws of patronage, was the denomination assumed by this body of seceders. They were more liberal than the generality of presbyterians; for they were willing to admit into their communion all those who seemed worthy of being called Christians, however they might differ with regard to particular points. Their congregations continued to multiply; and, about the close of the century, above sixty places of worship belonged to the association.

[a] Memoirs of the Life of Mr. William Whiston, written by himself, p. 461—487.—Before this divine entered into the fraternity of Baptists, their ablest defender was Dr. John Gale, whose animadversions on Dr. Wall's History of Infant Baptism influenced James Foster to join the sect. This convert became an admired preacher and an esteemed writer; and his merit would have reflected honour upon any society.—We may here incidentally mention the growing connexion between the baptists and independents, the latter usually admitting the former into their communion.

[b] In the year 1691.

[c] Adam's Religious World Displayed, vol. iii. p. 233, &c.

[d] In the year 1743.

[e] In an account of the Old Dissenters, sent to Mr. Adam for insertion in his Religious World.

Above twenty years after the formation of the Presbytery of Relief, the Berean[a] sect arose in Scotland. Mr. Barclay, who was its founder, represented a mere *belief* of the Gospel as producing an absolute certainty of salvation. "Faith in Christ," he said, "and an assurance of salvation through his merits, are inseparable, or rather the same." As this faith, he added, is the gift of God alone, so the individual to whom it is imparted is as conscious of possessing it as he is of his existence; and the assurance of it is "established, with the resurrection from the dead, upon the direct testimony of God, believed in the heart." This is, apparently, a confident and presumptuous statement of the nature of faith, and a *personal* application of *general* passages of Scripture. In the opinion of the Bereans, unbelief is the sin against the Holy Ghost, which has been pronounced unpardonable. They admit the most profligate characters into their society, if a belief of the Gospel be declared by the applicants; but these members, if they should afterwards disgrace themselves, are excluded from the Berean pale.

The leaders of these sects propagated their sentiments by the press, as well as in the pulpit; and hence frequent controversies arose. Among the religious disputes which have excited attention in the present reign, that which related to confessions may claim early mention. It was the opinion of many, both divines and laymen, that the freedom of conscience and of sentiment ought not to be so far obstructed, even in an established church, as to render an occasional disagreement in unessential points a ground of exclusion from the emoluments of that church; that, when the bulk of a nation agree in a reformed religion, precise and circumstantial confessions of faith are unnecessary; and and that subscription to a variety of articles, not all closely connected or concordant, ought by no means to be enforced. Mr. Francis Blackburne, a respectable divine, maintained these points with ability in a work entitled "the Confessional,[b] or a full and free enquiry into the right, utility, edification, and success, of establishing systematic Confessions of faith and doctrine in Protestant Churches." Many pens were drawn against this work; and the propriety of subscription was strongly vindicated. The opposer of confessions did not resign the preferments which he had already obtained, but was so far conscientious as to reject the offer of an additional benefice. He had previously entered into a controversy respecting a state of happiness or misery between death and the resurrection, (a supposition which he did not consider as sufficiently countenanced by the Scriptures;) and he afterwards took part in the dispute with the catholics, in a manner which did not accord with his usual benignity and liberality of mind. He contended against the grant of toleration to those who were unwilling to allow it to others; but true generosity will prompt a person to do more for others than they will do for him; and it ought to be considered, that the catholics of that time were not so bigoted or intolerant as those of former periods.

By those members of the church who agreed with Mr. Blackburne on the subject of religious confessions, a petition was signed, and presented in 1772 to the house of commons. The Tory members strongly opposed the request of those whom they considered as latitudinarian religionists; and the assembly refused to relax the rigour of compulsory subscription. A similar application being made by the protestant dissenters, the commons agreed to a bill in their favour; which, however, the house of peers rejected. The catholic dissenters, six years afterwards, obtained indulgences for which they had long wished. They were permitted to meet publicly in chapels, keep schools, and hold landed property, on taking the oath of allegiance, and denying that the bishop of Rome had any temporal power or jurisdiction in Great Britain. The presbyterians and other protestant sects then renewed their request for a release from subscription; and the legislature no longer refused compliance.

After a long interval, during which the catholics were distinguished by their peaceable behaviour, they were placed in the same predicament with the orthodox subjects of Great Britain, (except with regard to places and employments,) on disclaiming the intolerant spirit and sanguinary zeal of their church against supposed heretics.[c]

The catholics of Ireland were more favoured than those of Great Britain; for they were declared eligible to all posts and employments, except some of the highest under the crown, and were allowed to vote for parliamentary candidates. It may seem surprising, that they should be more gratified and indulged, in a country where their great superiority of number might make it hazardous to trust them with power, than in a kingdom where they formed a very small proportion of the community: but it was deemed a point of policy to conciliate the sect. When the union with Ireland took place, strong hopes were entertained, by the catholics, of the grant of every thing which they could desire: but the reigning prince repeatedly declared, that he could not conscientiously agree to their complete emancipation, which, he thought, would be repugnant to the clause in his coronation-oath, binding him to support the church, *as by law established.* Yet, if both houses of parliament should vote a bill for the gratification of the catholics, his assent to it might be vindicated, as those two assemblies, in concert with the sovereign, are allowed to make greater alterations than the mere grant of the remaining demands of a tolerated sect.

The doctrine of the Trinity, in which the church of England and the catholics agree, employed at various times the pens of controversial theologians. Some thought it incomprehensible; others laboured to explain it on rational principles; and some opposed it, as unsupported either by reason or by Scripture. After having sustained occasional and desultory attacks, it was exposed to a systematic assault from Dr. Joseph Priestley, who endeavoured to prove that it was not the opinion of the early Christians, and that it was introduced by artifice and imposture, in repugnance to repeated declarations both of the Old and New Testament.[d]

[a] So called from the Bereans of the apostolic age, who "received the word with all readiness of mind (μετὰ πάσης προθυμίας,) and searched the Scriptures daily." [b] Which first appeared in 1766.

[c] Those of South Britain in 1791, and those of Scotland in 1793.—In the time between those years, the penal laws against the Scottish episcopalians were abrogated, as the death of the pretender had induced them to acquiesce, with seeming cordiality, in the claims of the house of Hanover.

[d] In an Essay on Spirit, Anti-Trinitarian notions were boldly urged, in 1751, by a clergyman of the Irish establishment; and Dr. Clayton, bishop of Clogher, who had adopted it as his own work, afterwards proposed, to the peers of Ireland, the omission of the Athanasian and Nicene creeds in the service of the church. The zeal of the prelate hastened his death; for, when he had renewed his attack upon the Trinity, he was menaced with a prosecution, the dread of which threw him into a nervous fever.

Dr. Priestley was a man of considerable talents, of an ardent and active spirit, who wished at once to shine as a philosopher, a divine and a politician. He certainly extended our knowledge of air, and of other natural objects: but we are less indebted to him for his endeavours to enlighten mankind in theology or in the art of government. In politics, he was inclined to republicanism; in religion, he entertained various notions which are exploded by more erudite biblical scholars and more profound divines. Unawed by the terrors of the law, which denounced punishment against all who, in sermons or in writings, denied the Trinity, he gave new vigour to the Socinian doctrine, and maintained that Christ was a mere man, divinely commissioned indeed, but not God himself, or the son of God. He even went farther than Socinus, and affirmed that Jesus was only entitled to respect, not to adoration or worship, from the world which he so essentially served. He and his followers unwilling to be called Socinians, claimed the appellation of *Unitarians*, as they preferred the idea of one God to that doctrine which represented the Deity as consisting of three persons, equal in power and dignity. Mr. Lindsey warmly supported the same opinion; and he, as well as Dr. Disney, resigned a benefice, from a conscientious preference of the divine Unity to the Trinity. The number of Unitarians, from this time, rapidly increased; and they seemed to think themselves the only rational professors of religion, while the Trinitarians did not regard them as true Christians.

To avoid the terrors of the law, the Unitarians made an appeal to that tolerating spirit which, they hoped, would actuate the majority of the house of commons. They petitioned that assembly for the repeal of all penalties denounced against those who denied the Trinity; and Mr. Fox supported their pretensions with animated eloquence. But their request was not granted, because many of the members considered them as a dangerous set of men, and others thought it unnecessary to abrogate the law in question, as it was suffered by the lenity of the government to lie dormant.

Dr. Priestley and many of his Unitarian brethren maintained another doctrine, which excited strong opposition,—that of *materialism*. They asserted that the soul, though a sentient principle, was the mere result of an organized system of matter;[a] and that, consequently, death would extinguish all consciousness; but that a resurrection was still possible, and even probable.[b] This doctrine led to that of *necessity*, or the *necessary agency* of human beings, which this philosopher strenuously inculcated. It extended to the *mind* what was known to belong to *matter:* it represented the causes of volition and action, in the former, as equally decisive and irresistible with the impellants of the material world.[c] These opinions were combated by various writers, both in and out of the establishment; and the debated points are not yet decided; for the disputes of theologians are endless.

On one of these topics we may observe, that the properties of the soul are so essentially different from those of matter, as to produce a conviction (even if we had no revelation to guide us in our inquiries,) that these two parts of our composition are decidedly dissimilar, notwithstanding the connexion of one with the other, and the reciprocal influence of each. If the ideas of the materialists, however, be adopted, the resurrection (it would seem) will not be that which we are taught to expect, namely, that of *identity*, but the excitation of the spark of life in new frames. This is a very gloomy and discouraging doctrine, and one that no good man would be disposed to propagate.

The second opinion is represented by its advocates as the only mode of doing justice to the prescience and omniscience of the Deity. Whatever is done by any one, must, they say, have been fore-known and pre-determined by the Almighty: yet persons, they add, are not absolutely *compelled* to act as they do, although it be fated that they should so act; for they are still influenced by motives, and have therefore some freedom of choice, being unacquainted with the pre-determination of God respecting what they should do, or forbear to do. For instance, when a man has been guilty of robbery or murder, which his Creator knew that he would commit, these reasoners say, that he had the liberty of avoiding either of those crimes, but that God permitted him to incur this guilt, instead of preventing him by a particular exertion of providence. Some of these Necessitarians even boast, that their system is the only theory consistent with true morality; but, if *definite circumstances* (to use their expressions) produce *definite volitions*, where will be the merit of a good action, or the demerit of a bad one? Their scheme detracts from the goodness, justice, and wisdom of the Deity, by holding him up to view as an encourager of evil, and as a punisher of those who, from fate or necessity, have fallen into wickedness or guilt. Others pretend, that, if the mind had a self-determining power, the world would be a scene of confusion, and the purposes of God might be defeated: for a self-governing mind, therefore, they substitute motives that cannot be effectually controlled or resisted. The supposed derangement of the plans of Providence is an absurd supposition, in the case of an omnipotent Creator; and the idea of irresistible impulse is repugnant to that obvious freedom which enables an individual to act from choice, and frequently to follow the suggestions of wild caprice.

Upon this and other points of metaphysical theology, arguments might be multiplied on both sides by the sophistry of disputation; but it is unnecessary to dwell on a subject in which absolute certainty cannot be attained by our limited faculties. A Thomas Aquinas or a Duns Scotus might spin out a long thread of argument upon such a topic; but, though they would amuse some,

[a] Early in the century of which we are treating, Dr. Coward had propagated a similar doctrine; and his Grand Essay, as he styled his work upon this subject, was followed by Dodwell's "Epistolary Discourse, proving, from the Scriptures and the first fathers, that the soul is a principle naturally mortal, but immortalized actually by the pleasure of God, to punishment or reward, by its union with the divine baptismal spirit." Dr. Hartley afterwards discussed the same topic in his Essay on Man (published in 1749,) and referred thought, reflection, judgment, &c. to the laws of animal organization; thus endeavouring to invalidate the idea of a separate immaterial soul, while he seemed, in some parts of his work, to be inclined to adopt it. La Metherie and Helvetius more decidedly and avowedly maintained the doctrine of Materialism; and l'Homme Machine of the former was publicly burned in Holland. Priestley was chiefly influenced by the reasoning of Hartley, and also by that of Dr. Law, to adopt sentiments which exposed him to the imputation of infidelity and even of atheism.

[b] Not (said Priestley) from the light or evidence of nature, but from the authority of Scripture, and the example of Christ's resurrection.

[c] Priestley first imbibed his notions of necessity from Collins, who, in 1715, had published a Philosophical Inquiry into Human Liberty. Leibnitz had previously given to the world his Essays on the Goodness of God, the Freedom of Man, and the Origin of Evil in which he vin-

they would weary others, and give little instruction to any.

The Unitarians, in recent times, have found some artful and plausible vindicators of their doctrine; and they have been so elevated by their success in making proselytes, that they seem to expect the ultimate triumph of their creed. They assure themselves, that a great number of Christians who *profess* an adherence to the church of England, really *think* with them, but are deterred by motives of interest from an avowal of their opinions.

The majority of modern Unitarians affirm, that, as far as they can judge from Scripture, from which all Christians profess to deduce their doctrines, Christ had no existence before the time assigned for his human birth;[a] that he was not miraculously conceived; and that he is not God, nor was ever invested with a super-human nature. But they allow, that he was chosen by the Creator of the world to be a medium of communication between him and fallen man, to teach truth and righteousness, and lead sinners to repentance and salvation; and that he obtained the favour of resurrection, as a reward for his obedience to the divine commands, without *atoning* (in the sense of the Trinitarians) for the sins of men by his sufferings and death. They consider the Holy Ghost not as a distinct person, but as a mere emanation of the Deity; and they are not even willing to allow, that it has any extraordinary influence or operation upon the mind or heart, so as to produce a disposition to piety. They differ from the Methodists in denying the necessity or utility of grace, and in earnestly recommending integrity, good works, and social kindness; and many of them agree with the Universalists, in thinking that the punishment of the most flagitious sinners will only be temporary, and that the whole human race will finally be "gathered unto Christ."

Some of the Unitarians entered into a controversy with the followers of Swedenborg, a Swedish baron, with whose ideas of the Trinity they were disgusted. This nobleman published *Arcana Cœlestia*, (Heavenly Secrets,) Angelic Wisdom, the True Christian Religion, a Treatise upon Heaven and Hell, and many other works. It may excite surprise, that a being, merely human, should pretend to know so much of heaven and hell, or presume to judge so confidently of the precise nature of both those *kingdoms*, as did baron Swedenborg: but our surprise will abate, when we reflect on the force of enthusiasm and the unfettered boldness of a wild imagination. The noble Swede fancied that all secrets respecting futurity had been disclosed to him, and that he was better enabled and qualified to lead an erring world into the way of truth, than any former or contemporary theologian. He affected to be guided by Scripture in his pursuits and researches; but he interpreted its hints according to his own fanciful ideas, and expanded its meaning to a conformity with his own visionary conceptions. He peopled the new Jerusalem at his pleasure, and regulated its polity by the whimsies of his eccentric brain. He framed a religious world with as much ease as the author of Utopia had formed a civil one; certainly with good intentions, but not always with the soundest judgment. Considering himself as commissioned to enlighten his fellow-creatures with the knowledge of every thing that concerned their essential and eternal interests, he published his religious code with the air of a dictator, and, as if he had been a a new prophet, pretended to point out the promised land.

The writings of this enthusiastic nobleman did not at first produce the desired effect; but they gradually attracted notice, and at length so far operated as to make many converts. Congregations were formed upon his principles, and ministers were animated with a portion of his zeal. His chief doctrines were of the following complexion. He asserted the divinity of Jesus Christ, in whose person, he thought, resided the whole Trinity: a point which he endeavoured to explain by comparing it with the human trinity. As every man, he said, consisted of soul, body, and operation, so the Trinity was formed by the Father, or soul, the Son, or divine humanity, and the Holy Ghost, or virtue proceeding from the two former. The redemption, he added, was not the mere fruit of the supposed death of Christ, considered as a sacrifice to the justice or wrath of God, or as an atonement for the sins of men, but consisted in the triumph obtained over Satan and other evil spirits, by the exertions of Jehovah, manifested in the flesh, and appearing in a state of glorified humanity. In substance, perhaps, there is no great difference between this and the ordinary doctrine of the Trinity.

Another doctrine, propagated by the baron, was that of man's co-operation with Christ. An inclination, he said, was requisite on the part of man (as a free agent,) to work out his own salvation, as it was unreasonable to suppose that he was to remain in a state of indolence, or to neglect the duties of his station. We therefore ought so to exert ourselves, as if all our future hopes and prospects depended on our own efforts. Yet, as all our powers are the gifts of God, all the merit we are disposed to claim is not strictly our own, but must be referred to the adorable giver of all grace and virtue: it belongs to Christ, not to man.

The correspondence between spiritual and natural things formed the basis of Swedenborg's doctrine relative to the Scriptures. He affirmed that they were written with an eye to the natural world, so as to explain divine things by a comparison with those which are plain and obvious. Imagining that he had been favoured with the means of interpreting this correspondence, he was willing to impart, to the well disposed, the mode of obtaining this clue to scriptural truth and celestial wisdom.[b]

dicated God's permission of partial evil, according to the system of necessity, by contending that it would lead to general good; and, avoiding the predestinarian rigour of Calvin, made benevolence the chief attribute of the Deity. So thought our ancestors, when they gave the name of *God* (that is, goodness in the abstract) to the Divine Being. See Dr. Maclaine's note [e e] upon the progress of Arminianism, Cent. xvii. sect. ii. part ii. chap. 3.

[a] Those Unitarians who are of the Arian class admit the pre-existence of Christ.

[b] Mr. Adam, after remarking that "Some persons will be disposed to doubt the credibility" of baron Swedenborg's doctrines, "on the ground of the utter improbability, that a mortal man, during his residence in a material body, should have been permitted to enjoy open intercourse with the world of departed spirits, and instructed, during the uninterrupted period of twenty-seven years, in the internal sense of the Scriptures hitherto undiscovered," ventures to observe, that "others (as appears from many respectable instances) will see nothing *improbable* in all this referring the case to those extraordinary dispensations of the providence of an All-wise and All-Powerful Being, who, in all ages of the world, has been pleased to enlighten and instruct *chosen servants* concerning his will and kingdom." The latter opinion seems to be that of Mr. Adam himself; but we cannot wholly concur with him. As nothing is impossible with God, it is not *impossible* that such a communication of his *will* might take place; but that, we think, is the utmost extent to

From the Scriptures, and from his own experience, he maintained the connexion between human beings and angels or spirits, by whose influence and aid the former were encouraged to think and act justly, and guided in the most interesting concerns. He did not, however, wish that the idea of this association should preclude a constant attention to holy writ, the grand source of wisdom and illumination.

In giving advice for the conduct of life, he inculcated the propriety of avoiding all sins and vices prohibited by the divine law, and of fulfilling every duty required by the laws of government and society. He also enjoined repentance as a necessary preparative to justification and acceptance with God.

With regard to the resurrection, he declared it to be his opinion, that, as every one has a spiritual frame, enclosed in a material body, the former, after the death of the individual, would rise again, and dwell for ever with angels, or, in case of incorrigible depravity, with evil spirits.

The variations between these doctrines and those of the church of England, did not induce the baron's disciples and followers in general to desert the communion of that church; nor did all the presbyterians, or other dissenters, who adopted the Swedenborgian tenets, abandon the worship to which they were before attached. The orthodox ministers, however, seemed to consider them as fanatics; and the majority of the dissenters were not pleased with the doctrinal alterations of their respective creeds. Yet the votaries of the New Jerusalem gradually multiplied; and several men of ability entered into the association. Their preachers still have sufficient influence to draw other Christians within their pale, as well as to prevent their former communicants from renouncing the system.

Another sect, also, boasted of the spiritual joys of the New Jerusalem, but exhibited, in a stronger point of view, the leaven of fanaticism. A party of enthusiasts left England for America in 1774, and settled in the province of New York, where the society soon increased, and received the ludicrous denomination of *Shakers*, from the practice of *shaking* and dancing.[a] They affected to consider themselves as forming the only true church, and their preachers as possessing all the apostolic gifts. The wicked, they thought, would only be punished for a time, with an exception of those who should be so incorrigibly depraved as to fall from *their* church: for these miserable offenders, there would be no forgiveness. Baptism was not practised by these sectaries; nor did they celebrate the eucharist. They did not object to those sacramental ceremonies as improper in themselves, but alleged that they had been abolished in the apostolic times, and that they were particularly unnecessary in the present age, as the *new dispensation*, (at least with regard to their society) was beginning to take place. This was an allusion to the Millennium; in which period, they said, Christ would not appear personally, but only by his sainted votaries. Their leader was Anna Lee, who, they ridiculously pretended, was the woman mentioned by St. John as a great wonder.[b] The successors of this *elect lady* have been, they say, as perfect in their characters as she was, have enjoyed unreserved intercourse with departed spirits and with angels, and have possessed the power of imparting a plenitude of spiritual blessings to their disciples.[c]

The Shakers chiefly confined themselves to New England and New York, scarcely making any proselytes in the other provinces of North America, from Lake Ontario to the frontiers of Florida. During the subjection of those provinces to the sway of Great Britain, the religion of the church of England prospered in a very inconsiderable degree among the colonial communities, in comparison with presbyterianism, or with the prevailing system of the independents: yet it gradually gained ground, as the people became more polished in their manners, and less infected with puritanical austerity. The prelate, to whose authority the Trans-Atlantic episcopalians then submitted, was the bishop of London: but, when the provinces rose to the dignity of an independent state, this spiritual connexion ceased with the political ties which had bound them to the mother-country. As a new director of the headless church was deemed requisite, application was made to some English prelates for the canonical consecration of a bishop, who was to reside in the province of Connecticut. The divine upon whom the Americans fixed, was Dr. Seabury, who had been employed as a missionary by the society for the propagation of the Gospel.[d] The doubts and hesitation of the prelates of England, with regard to the mode of proceeding in this case, on account of the new predicament in which the provincials stood, induced the reverend stranger to apply to those of Scotland; and by them he was gratified, in the year 1784, with the episcopal honour and dignity. The parliament afterwards deliberated upon this affair, and enacted a bill which empowered either the primate or the archbishop of York to consecrate subjects of foreign states to the rank and office of bishop. In consequence of this statute, two clergymen, one from Philadelphia, the other from New York, were invested by the archbishop of Canterbury and some of his brethren, in 1787, with the episcopal character; and the sanction thus given to the views of the American episcopalians promoted the growth and

which a rational Christian can proceed in this argument. To see nothing *improbable* in it, argues a degree of superstitious credulity, which we should not have expected to find in a modern clergyman. What reason can we have to suppose that God would impart his will, by a supernatural medium, to a person who had no claim to such peculiarity of distinction, after the lapse of many ages from a similar revelation, and at a time when the most enlightened nations acquiesced in, and seemed satisfied with, the scriptural knowledge that they had already acquired? Is there any thing, in the intimations of Swedenborg, so much more important and material than the former treasure of divine wisdom, as to justify the belief of a new revelation? If we admit his *ipse dixit*, we may also believe the declaration of the Arabian legislator, who affirmed that he had received from heaven, by the angel Gabriel, the substance of the *koran*; or we may give credit to the legends and pretended miracles in the lives of the Romish saints; listen with implicit faith to the reveries of Jacob Behman, and regard the vaticinations of Joanna Southcott, as the prophetic effusions of unerring wisdom!

[a] These devotees, in their religious *exercises*, resemble the *Jumpers* of Wales, who thus testify their joy for spiritual blessings.

[b] "There appeared a woman clothed with the sun, and the moon under her feet, and upon her head a crown of twelve stars." *Revelations*, xii. 1.

[c] "Erskine's Sketches of Church-History.—The *Dunkers* of North America (so called from their baptizing by immersion) formed a sect long before the Shakers, but never became so numerous as these religionists. In the year 1777, their number did not exceed 500. Their principal tenet is, that future happiness can only be secured by penance and mortification. They deny the imputation of Adam's sin to his posterity, and the eternity of punishment for wickedness; hate war and violence, and protest against the practise of enslaving others. They allow marriage; and yet do not seem to entertain a high opinion of the sanctity of that union, as they compel those who have thus fallen into the snare of temptation to retire to a distant settlement.

[d] This society had been enabled, by the subscriptions and legacies of well-disposed Christians, to make considerable progress, not only in

respectability of their church. A convention of this church had already been holden at Philadelphia ;[a] and, in that assembly, some alterations had been made in the liturgy and service of the church of England, and the thirty-nine articles were reduced to twenty. In a subsequent convention, several of these alterations were revoked, and all intentions of departing from our church in any essential point of doctrine, discipline, or worship, were disclaimed. From this ime the number of Episcopalians continued to increase in he territories of the United States ; so that, in the penultimate year of the century, fifty-two congregations of that description were reckoned in Connecticut, twenty-five in New-Jersey, and sixteen in the Massachusetts state, beside a considerable number in other parts of the republican territory. Seven bishops then presided over this church, and it boasted of a university and an academy at Philadelphia.

A small party or association, which may be thought worthy of some notice among the varied sects of the age, arose in England from the zeal of Joanna Southcott. This crafty or enthusiastic female offered herself to notice as a prophetess in the year 1792 ; and she soon met with friends and admirers. She pretended that she was influenced and tutored by the Holy Spirit, and that her unlimited obedience to that divine power had procured for her the signal honour of being commissioned to announce the approaching accomplishment of scriptural promises, the establishment of Christ's kingdom on the ruin of that of Satan, and the redemption of pious believers and penitent sinners from the affects of the fall of man. She intimated that various disasters and calamities would befall the nations, as warnings to a sinful world ; but that these awful visitations would have less immediate effect upon other communities than upon the people of this favoured island, who enjoyed the benefit of her personal presence. This nation, she said, would have the good fortune to be the first redeemed from the bondage of sin and the tyranny of Satan, and would become an instrument in the hands of Providence for awakening the rest of the world to a lively sense of true religion.[b] Such a supposition is an instance of patriotic enthusiasm, rather than the fruit of just reasoning, or the dictate of a sound mind.

Another pretended prophet was a naval officer of the name of Brothers, who, for giving hints of the king's eventual dethronement, when he (the prophet) should be recognised as prince of the Hebrew nation, was apprehended as a seditious delinquent. Mr. Halhed, a senator of distinguished learning, but apparently not of sound judgment, vindicated the fanatical effusions of Brothers, and gravely advised the national representatives to peruse his writings, that they might have a chance of religious conversion. The officer was afterwards confined as a lunatic, and was thus deprived of an opportunity of forming a sect.

Of those who have faith in supposed prophecies, many (particularly the most sinful) may be more disposed to listen to the deliberate opinions of the Universalists, than to the reveries of Southcott or Brothers. From several passages of Scripture, alluding to the restitution of all things and the reconciliation of all to the Father by the blood of the cross, the celebrated Origen, and other divines in successive ages, inferred that redemption and salvation would be universal ; that, if punishment should be inflicted upon sinners, it would be temporary ; and that an eternity of happiness would follow. They entertained the idea of *election*, in a sense which implied that some were chosen but merely as examples to others, and as the first-fruits of the harvest of salvation. Baxter had softened the rigours of Calvinism by admitting, that every one had a portion of grace, with which he might work out his own salvation ; so that if he should not attain everlasting life, it would be his own fault. He gave name to a sect which so understood his meaning ; but we now hear little of the *Baxterians*. The Universalists were, more positively and determinately, the advocates of fallen man.

A distinguished modern supporter of the doctrine of universal restoration was Mr. Elhanan Winchester, a native of North America, who visited Great Britain about the year 1787, with a view of disseminating his consolatory tenets.[c] He published a course of lectures which he had delivered with applause, upon the "Prophecies remaining to be fulfilled," and also Dialogues on Universal Restoration.

The Rellyan universalists may here be mentioned. They are the followers of Mr. James Relly, who entered into public life as an associate of Whitefield, but at length renounced his Calvinistic opinions, and preached salvation to all. He believed in "a resurrection to life, and a resurrection to condemnation." Believers only, he thought, would enjoy the former, and dwell with Christ in his kingdom of the *millennium ;* but unbelievers, after being raised from death would be obliged to wait, in darkness and under wrath, the ultimate manifestation of the great Redeemer of the world.

These sectaries were stigmatised as *antinomians* by their adversaries ; but, as they recommended morality and good works, they disclaimed the imputation. With regard to antinomianism, we may here observe, that it tends to encourage every species of immorality. It releases its votaries from the ties of moral honour, and the duties of social life. If respectable individuals belong to the sect, they were not rendered so by the tenets which they profess, but by the innate goodness of character, which the wild effusions of their ministers have not corrupted. Let piety and devotion be encouraged ; but let not morality and rectitude be superseded by affected purity of religious zeal. Those sectaries who deride good works, are not good members of society ; for they endeavour to loosen its bonds, and to invalidate its regulations. If we were not advocates for unlimited toleration, we should wish that the latitude of antinomianism might be restrained by public authority.

The antinomian system has been refuted by various writers ; and, as it has not been (nor can be) defended with equal ability, it rarely makes the least impression upon men of sense. It is still professed, however in some parts of Great Britain and of Germany. In 1761, one of

converting the American savages, but also in diffusing among the colonists the doctrines of the church of England.

[a] In the year 1785.

[b] Sketch of the Denominations of the Christian World, by the Rev. John Evans, *the eleventh dition*, p. 221—225.

[c] Dr. Chauncy, of Bost n, was also a zealous advocate for this doctrine ; whence the Universalists are sometimes called by his name. It was controverted by the president Edwards and his son ; the latter of whom imputed to Chauncy a provisional retention of the scheme of *Destruction*, if the system of the Universalists should not be tenable. The abettors of the scheme alluded to, maintain that the wicked will neither be subjected to endless misery, nor be finally saved, but will be involved in total destruction.

its professors maintained, that prayers for the forgiveness of our sins are unnecessary; that repentance is not requisite; that no judgment will take place after this life, and no punishment will be inflicted; that Christ, by subduing the evil spirit, introduced universal righteousness, and thus redeemed all mankind from what would otherwise have been the effect of sin. Many antinomians, on the contrary, are rigid Calvinists, and, by their doctrine of partial, or indeed general, reprobation, endeavour to counteract the last mentioned opinion.

The different sects, beside their habitual eagerness to disseminate their particular notions among other classes of Christians, were in general well disposed to propagate Christianity among heathen tribes; and a few years before the century closed, the consideration of the benighted state of pagan ignorance, in which the inhabitants of the numerous islands of the Pacific Ocean were involved, prompted the friends of religion to form an extensive scheme of missionary exertion. Some clergymen of the establishment, and of almost every sect, concurred in the scheme: but it appears to have been devised and chiefly promoted by Calvinistic Methodists. When subscriptions had produced a sufficiency of pecuniary supplies for the commencement of the enterprise, a ship was freighted with every requisite, and sent out under the command of Mr. Wilson, who had as much zeal for the success of the mission, as any of the preachers that embarked with him. Religious colonies were formed at some of the Society and Friendly Islands: but difficulties and dangers obstructed the progress of conversion, and several of the missionaries perished amidst barbarian commotions. Many other adventurers, however, visited the Pacific with the same views, and new attempts were made to subdue the prejudices of the islanders, and bring them within the pale of Christianity.

While the missionaries of the first embarkation were thus engaged, Mr. Haldane, an opulent North Briton, on the rejection of a proposal which he had made to the government for instituting a mission in the East Indies, resolved to employ himself and others in a similar plan within the limits of this island. He therefore, in 1797, organized an association, which he called the "Society for propagating the Gospel at home." Itinerant preachers were deputed with this view; tabernacles were built, and seminaries established; and considerable success attended the well-meant undertaking. The members of this society and of the rising congregations were styled *New Independents*. Menaced with the vengeance of the kirk, they still prosecuted their object, and firmly asserted the irreproachable propriety of their conduct, and the commendable nature of their exertions. They reprobated all fixed national creeds and systems, all civil establishments of religion; and professed to regulate all church government and discipline by the rules of Scripture, not by human ordinances. They declared that the church had no head upon earth; yet they were willing to pay proper submission to the temporal sovereign.

Their efforts in the cause of what they considered as the true or evangelical religion, exposed them to the censures of the kirk; and a pastoral admonition[a] was issued against them by the general assembly; but they boldly continued their career, and extended their influence.

The New Independents were not the only persons who endeavoured to promote religious zeal. Some individuals of consideral talents, in England, also pursued that object, but in a different manner, and without recommending a secession from the establishment. The prevalent habit of moral preaching, and the want of religious fervor in persons of rank, and also in the middle class of society, had disgusted and shocked those Christians who were studiously attentive to the concerns of their souls and to the interests of genuine piety. Mr. Wilberforce, who had distinguished himself by his reiterated efforts for the abolition of the slave trade, and had acquired the reputation of an able and independent senator, surprised the public by appearing as a religious writer. He published in the year 1797, a "Practical View of the prevailing Religious System of Professed Christians, in the higher and middle classes in this country, contrasted with real Christianity." He enumerated the chief defects of the former of these systems, such as the want of adequate conceptions concerning our Redeemer and the Holy Spirit, or of sufficiently exalted ideas of the strictness of practical Christianity, the neglect of the peculiar doctrines of our religion, and the allowance of only a narrow and qualified jurisdiction to that which ought to embrace every object and influence every pursuit. He animadverted on the error of substituting amiable tempers and useful lives in the place of piety; a "great and desperate error," involving a "fatal distinction between morality and religion." The *particular good* arising from such lives, he said, might be more than counterbalanced by the *general evil*, as they tended to discourage "that principle (namely religion) which is the great operative spring of usefulness in the bulk of mankind." He therefore earnestly exhorted his countrymen to attend strictly to the doctrines and precepts of evangelical religion and vital Christianity, to look to Jesus, imitate the example of his blameless life, and surrender, unconditionally, their souls and bodies to the will and service of God. Undoubtedly, he added, the sincere Christian has a great work to perform, and his internal state is a continued scene of discipline and warfare; but pleasures of the purest kind attend his progress; and he is enlivened with the consciousness of well-meant endeavours, encouraged by the succours of divine grace, and animated by the hope of a blissful immortality. He may enjoy the innocent amusements of life, partake of the delights of social intercourse, open his heart to the calls of philanthropy, indulge the sensibilities of taste and genius, and cultivate his mind with the varieties of science.

Much praise is certainly due to the good intentions of this writer. Similar praise may be bestowed on a celebrated female who has laboured in the same cause—we mean Hannah More. In her "Strictures on the Modern System of Female Education, and view of the Principles and Conduct prevalent among Women of Rank and Fortune," she has given much good advice to the fair sex, and has properly censured the frivolity and dissipation of the age, and the relaxed morals of the higher classes.

[a] Dr. Haweis, speaking of the *admonition*, says, "Whoever is at the pains to examine facts, and the assertions in this philippic against the promoters of evangelical religion, will find *as many falsehoods as lines*." It breathes, indeed, a spirit of intolerance; but, in thus inveighing against it, the indignant divine incautiously deviates from that strict veracity which he recommends to others.

SKETCH OF THE ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY

OF

THE NINETEENTH CENTURY

CHAPTER I.

History of the Romish Church.

THE corrupt state in which we left this church at the close of the last century, has not yielded to the influence of that superior light which has since illuminated the civilized world. The Romish bigots have still some remains of an intolerant spirit, and still resist the progress of free inquiry; yet even the catholic governments find it expedient to profess liberal principles, and to endure that boldness of dissent which they dare not punish and cannot effectually prevent.

After the death of the unfortunate pontiff, Pius VI., this church remained for eleven months without a head, while the cardinals, exiled from Rome, were dispersed over different countries. The pious zeal of the emperor of Germany at length prompted him to provide a remedy for this unsettled state of affairs, which seemed to reflect disgrace on those princes who professed a reverential regard for the catholic hierarchy. He desired the fugitive members of the sacred college to hold a conclave at Venice, which was then an Austrian dependency; and the cardinal di Chiaramonte, a native of Cesena, who had been raised by the late pope to the see of Imola, was advanced to the papal dignity.[a] This pontiff assumed the designation of Pius VII., and entered with alacrity upon the exercise of his spiritual functions, to which the advantages of temporal power were again annexed, when the Roman territory was recovered by the vigour of the allied arms.

When Napoleon had raised himself to the dignity of first consul or sovereign of France, he applied to the new pope for the purpose of a religious settlement. It was then stipulated that the 'catholic, apostolic, and Romish religion,' should be freely and publicly exercised in France; that a new division of dioceses should take place; that, as soon as the first consul should have nominated bishops, the pope should confer upon them the honour of canonical institution; that the prelates should appoint, for parochial ministers, such persons as the three consuls should approve; that no council or synod should meet without the consent of the government; and that no papal legate or nuncio should act, and no bull or brief be operative in France, unless the ruling power should sanction such interference. Ten archbishops, and fifty bishops, were assigned to the whole republic; and it was required that they should be natives of France, and have attained the age of thirty years. They were not to be very liberally remunerated for the due exercise of their functions, only 15,000 francs being promised to each of the former as an annual stipend, and 10,000 to each of the latter;[b] and the parochial priests were declared to be entitled only to 1500 or 1000 francs *per annum*.

While Napoleon allowed that the Romish faith should be the established religion of France, he did not mean to preclude himself or his eventual successors from the power of making such alterations as might be deemed expedient, either in doctrine or in discipline; for his great object was to be despotic both in religious and civil affairs, and to dictate the law in every branch of polity.

His power was now at its height; but he was not content without the acquisition of the imperial dignity; and, when he had obtained his wish from a servile and prostrate nation, he aspired to the honour of being anointed and crowned, in the most solemn and religious manner. Full of this idea, he applied to his friend the pope, and requested his speedy attendance at Paris. Sensible of the expediency of compliance, Pius submitted with a good grace to a mandate which he had not the courage to resist, and prepared for a journey to France. Having convoked a secret council of cardinals, he congratulated his venerable brethren on the effect of the *concordat*, which had restored the true worship of God in France, and had seasonably checked the mischievous influence of impiety and profaneness: he applauded the zeal of that powerful prince who had promoted this change, and declared that he felt himself bound both by policy and gratitude to bestow the imperial crown on 'his dearest son in Christ.' When a prince earnestly desired the performance of a sacred ceremony, it was the duty of the head of the church (said the servile pope) to gratify him by impressing a religious character on the ties which bound him to his people; and an act of this kind would be rewarded with the divine benediction. Having given directions for the administration of public affairs (although, in a state which he knew not how to govern, no serious injury could result from his absence,) he presented himself at Paris in the autumn of the year 1804, and officiated at the imperial coronation, which, with all its splendour, did not strikingly excite the joy or enthusiasm of the people. He was treated by Napoleon with politeness and respect; but, if he had the honour or the feelings of a man, he could not be altogether

[a] On the 14th of March, 1800.—The votes were long divided between the cardinals Bellezoni and Mattei; but the election terminated in favour of the bishop of Imola, even though he was supposed to be more friendly to the French than to the Austrian interest.

That the character of the new pope was not very highly estimated, may be inferred,—yet not decisively,—from the satirical effusion of Pasquin, the unknown director, or perhaps only the follower, of the general opinion at Rome. The anagram of the pontiff's title was thus given: *Roma, china-ti*, that is, 'Rome, humble thyself.' The pun upon the word *Pax*, inserted by the order of Pius above his coat of arms, was still more severe: for the satirist hinted that those letters could only be meant for the initials of *Peggoire Assai X.*—'ten times worse.'

[b] That is, 625 pounds sterling to an archbishop, and two-thirds of that sum to an inferior prelate.

pleased with his own conduct. He had given the force of religious sanction to the usurpation of an adventurer.

After his return to Rome, Pius gave a pompous account of the result of his journey. Even his appearance in France, he said, had been visibly beneficial to the cause of religion. An innumerable crowd followed him in every part of his progress, and his readiness to grant apostolical benediction gladdened the people, and invigorated their pious zeal. He reclaimed to their duty some bishops who had refused to submit to the *concordat*, and procured decrees for the augmentation of the revenues of the prelates, for the regular establishment of funds sufficient to defray the expenses of public worship, for the erection of theological seminaries, and for the revival of many religious societies, particularly the Priests of the Mission and the Daughters of Charity. He also obtained an edict, allowing to the bishops the full liberty of judging with regard to spiritual offences, and of punishing violations of the canonical laws. In return for these concessions (which, in all probability, were not carried into full effect,) he conferred on the archbishops of Paris and Rouen the highest dignity that he could grant, by presenting the cardinal's hat to each of those prelates.

The French had left to the pope scarcely any other pretence for interfering in their concerns, than that of granting canonical institution to those prelates whom their emperor might think proper to nominate: but with this shadow of honour his holiness was not so elate as to be particularly anxious for the performance of that ceremony. The applications made to him for that purpose were coolly disregarded; so that, in 1811, twenty-seven bishops waited for his confirmation of the imperial choice. Resenting his refusal, Napoleon declared that the *concordat* was at an end, and called a council of prelates to act in this case for the refractory pontiff. He hinted that the pope, if he would not conduct himself like a Frenchman, could not expect to retain any authority or influence in the great empire. This is not an unreasonable doctrine; for every state ought to have a peculiar director of its religious concerns, rather than have recourse on any occasion to a foreign priest.

Napoleon always pretended to be a friend to religion; and, in his own opinion, he did not forfeit that character, when (in the year 1809) he divested the pope of his temporal power: but, however justly he might argue in this case, he acted solely from motives of ambition. It suited his policy to adopt a line of argument which philosophers had used, by representing the possession of political power as inconsistent with the essence of religion, and injurious to the purity and sanctity of spiritual government. But the despot went still farther, and, by imprisoning the pontiff at Avignon, disunited him from the sacred college, prevented him from presiding in a grand ecclesiastical council, and impaired his authority and influence as a director of the conscience and a teacher of piety. Pius did not tamely bear the insults and injuries to which he was subjected. He protested, in a public declaration, against the outrageous violence and sacrilegious wickedness of Napoleon, and even ventured to excommunicate the daring oppressor; but it must be observed, that he evinced his moderation even in this act of apparent revenge; for he disclaimed all intention of exciting a revolt or an insurrection, declaring that the act was merely a spiritual censure, inflicted with a view of bringing the delinquent to a due sense of his error and a consequent reparation of his injustice. He indeed denied and condemned the assertion of some former pontiffs, that sovereigns might lawfully be deposed by the spiritual father of Christendom. If a national council had at any time voted the deposition of a prince, the pope (he said) might as justly confirm the sentence, if it suited his own ideas of policy or rectitude, as he might crown a legitimate prince, or consecrate a foreign prelate who had received his appointment from the ruling power in the state to which he belonged. This acknowledgement was a concession to the reforming spirit of modern times, and a proof of the decline of pontifical arrogance.

The idle thunder of excommunication only provoked the tyrant's derision, and the mode in which it was softened excited ridicule, while this treatment of the pontiff was considered by many catholics as a judgment upon him for having favoured and indulged an enemy of the church in the *concordat* and at the coronation.

Still affecting a high regard for religion and its ministers, the ruler of France concluded a new agreement with the pope, whom he unexpectedly gratified with the privilege of nomination to ten bishoprics, either in France or in Italy, allowing him also to exercise the pontificate in France, and in the kingdom which had been formed in the north of Italy, in the same manner in which his predecessors had acted: but the master of Rome was not yet so humbled by a reverse of fortune, as to be disposed to reinstate the pontiff in his temporal authority.

The ruin of Napoleon was at length the consequence of his wanton ambition. After his mad expedition to Russia, he was unable to withstand that powerful confederacy which, with the most determined zeal, was organized against him. Holland and the German states shook off his yoke,—and Rome reverted to its temporal and spiritual lord.

Adversity has been styled a teacher of wisdom; but the maxim was not verified by the conduct of the restored pontiff, who soon manifested his bigotry and imprudence, instead of displaying the enlightened policy of a wise prince. Not content with the resumption of ecclesiastical property, and the abolition of Napoleon's code in the Roman state, he re-ordained the observance of all the festivals, re-established the monastic orders, revived in some degree the inquisition, and reinstated the obnoxious society of the Jesuits. As an excuse for the last measure, he declared that the catholic world demanded, with an unanimous voice, the revival which he had ordered.* He therefore readily granted to Taddeo Barzozowski, 'general of the company of Jesus,' and his associates, all suitable and necessary powers for the admission of all who might be disposed to follow the rules prescribed by St. Ignatius of Loyola,—for the education of youth in the principles of the catholic faith and in good morals,—for hearing confessions, preaching the word of God, and administering the sacraments of the church. As this edict required funds for its execution, such property as had not been irrevocably transferred from the former as-

* We ought not to dispute the pope's veracity: but, as we know that the influence of the chief catholic powers constrained Ganganelli to dissolve the institution, we doubt whether the call for its re-establishment was either strong or unanimous.

sociation was assigned to the new fraternity, compensations were allowed for that which had been alienated, and subscriptions were requested from the opulent and the liberal.

Even if this impolitic conduct in religious affairs had been accompanied with the display of wisdom and justice in the civil and ordinary administration, it would not have been sufficiently redeemed from censure or complaint; but, when joined with general misgovernment, it tended only to convince the public of the pope's unfitness to be the ruler of a nation. Pius, however, proceeded in his course with little alteration and few concessions, considering himself as the worthy successor of St. Peter, and as a proper object of general regard and esteem.[a]

After the deposition and banishment of Napoleon, the pope entertained the hope of some accession to his authority, as it was not to be supposed that Louis XVIII. would retain, unaltered, the ecclesiastical settlement which the usurper had framed; but, when a new compact was adjusted with France, in the year 1817, it was more calculated to augment and dignify the establishment, than to increase the influence of the supposed head of the church. Thirty-two new sees were ordered to be erected; but his holiness was to have no more concern with them than to grant canonical institution to such individuals as might be nominated by the king; and it was foreseen or understood that, if he should refuse to confirm the royal appointment, his majesty would not revoke it; for Louis, however pious and devout, was determined to support the independence of his kingdom against the high claims even of the spiritual father of Christendom.

The general state of religion in France, for a considerable time after the expulsion of Napoleon, was so inconsistent with true piety, that the respectable part of the priesthood seemed to apprehend its speedy extinction. Alarmed at this prospect, many churchmen, in different parts of the kingdom, undertook missions with a view of reclaiming the people. As a specimen of the mode in which these missions were conducted, we may observe, that, in the year 1819, nine ecclesiastics paraded the chief streets of Avignon, singing penitential psalms, and two of them, halting on a hill, preached to two divisions of the assembled multitude. On the following day, they visited the churches, and harangued overflowing congregations; and, for a week, their time was almost wholly employed in giving public or private instructions to the citizens, and in visiting the hospitals and prisons for the same purpose; and the second week was principally devoted to the consolation of those who came to confess their sins, and who, seeming to be penitent, received absolution and pardon. The baptismal vows were publicly renewed with pompous solemnity, and, in every church, while the Gospel was holden up to general view, all were required to swear that they would faithfully observe the precepts contained in that divine book. After the administration of all the sacraments of the church, a great cross was borne in magnificent procession, and erected on a terrace in holy triumph; and the mission was closed with appropriate and interesting discourses.

As these missions had only a partial effect, the state of the church was represented as deplorable, in a letter which the bishops addressed to the pope. The ecclesiastical discipline, they said, was relaxed; many dioceses were so neglected by their lawful rulers, or so ill-governed, that the faithful wandered like sheep without shepherds; the enemies of the church took advantage of this weakness, to inflict severe wounds on the declining hierarchy; and the pious divines who endeavoured, by acting as itinerant preachers, to revive that religious spirit which had nearly become extinct, were treated with contempt or with insult. It was therefore highly expedient that some measures should be speedily taken to restore the dignity and influence of the church. Repeated deliberations on this subject in the French cabinet led to a royal ordinance for the erection of chapels of ease wherever they seemed to be requisite, for the immediate grant of pecuniary aid to the impoverished church, and for the general protection of that establishment. 'It was the duty of every state (said the leading minister on this occasion) to foster or to renew a religious spirit. To support religion was to support the unfortunate whom it consoles, to cherish that morality which it elevates, and that virtue which it creates and maintains.'

While these measures were operating to the relief of the established church, tranquillity was restored to the south of France. At Nismes and other towns, the protestants had for several years been most illiberally molested by the catholics, and in a great measure deprived of that toleration to which they were by law entitled. Some of them had been murdered on their way to the meetings of the electoral colleges, and, in defending their cause, two military officers of high rank had lost their lives. It was pretended that the court connived at these outrages, because the sufferers were more attached to Napoleon than to the house of Bourbon; but this was an unfounded allegation; for the king, though he did not in every point adhere to the charter which he had granted, was not disposed to violate its provisions in the case of the protestants. The ultra-royalists (as the friends of the old *régime* were styled) would probably have continued these persecutions to the present day, if Louis had not covered the descendants of the Huguenots with the broad mantle of toleration.

The pope, from the time of his restoration to the day of his death, was chiefly influenced by the counsels of cardinal Gonsalvi, who was a better governor both of the

[a] While we adopt the general impression which prevailed with regard to the political conduct and administration of this pontiff, we are bound to annex a different statement, given by a writer who boldly maintains the accuracy of his information.—"Pius (says M. Vieusseux) effected many useful improvements in the country over which he ruled. His impoverished finances, the inveterate habits of the people, the old forms and routine of church-government, his own scrupulous and gentle nature, and the prejudices of some of his advisers, prevented him from doing more. He enacted a law, however, compelling the proprietors of the large estates in the Campagna di Roma, to cultivate all their lands, or give up, for a reasonable compensation, those which they could not bring into culture; he allowed rewards for the plantation of trees; he completed the *cadastro* of the Roman provinces, begun before his time, and fixed upon its basis the rate of a moderate land-tax, in lieu of the arbitrary contributions previously exacted; he abolished the unjust exemptions of the upper classes from proportional taxation; he enforced a rigid economy in the expenditure of his household, and in the charges of the public departments; he established manufactures of wool and cotton in the houses appropriated to the reception of the poor; he instituted an office for the registration of mortgages, and the security of loans: he withdrew from circulation the base and enormously-depreciated coin which had been issued in disordered times, and replaced it by standard money, at a great loss to his treasury; and he issued an edict, announcing a plan of legal and judicial reform, which, however, was imperfectly followed."

church and state than his master. Thus the pontiff became more popular in the decline of his life than he had been in the vigour of his age; and his death, which happened in the eighty-fourth year of his age and the twenty-fourth of his reign,[a] was not unlamented either by the clergy or the people.

The intrigues for the election of a new pope were conducted, on the part of the Italian cardinals, with great art and dexterity. They resolved neither to be ruled by the French nor by the Austrian faction, and were intent upon the choice of a zealot, who would be disposed to assert and maintain the high prerogatives of the church. Cardinal Severoli, though not so violent in his disposition as some of the bigots wished, was one whose professed principles were agreeable to the party; and therefore, on one of the days of meeting, he had twenty-six votes. He might have had as many more as would have served his purpose, if the Austrian party had not, in the emperor's name, *excluded* him from the chance of appointment; for there are four potentates who are allowed to exercise that right. When the exclusion was announced to him, he seemed to bear it with fortitude; and he desired that the act might be registered to prevent the privilege from being exercised twice in the same conclave, as in that case one of his intimate friends might be rendered ineligible. The disappointment preyed on his spirits, and is said to have hastened his death.

On the morning after this rejection, the friends of Severoli requested him to name a fit candidate for the papal throne. He replied, that, if he had sufficient influence over the election, either the cardinal Annibale ella Genga, or Gregorio, (an illegitimate son of Charles III. of Spain,) would be the next pontiff. The former was the determined enemy of Gonsalvi, and his election, which quickly followed the recommendation, demonstrated the prevalence of the bigoted party. He assumed the denomination of Leo XII., because one of his ancestors had received some feudal property from the tenth pope of that name.

Gonsalvi was now dismissed from power, and the chief adviser of the new pope was the cardinal della Somiglia, who, like his sovereign, had been a libertine in his youth and in his middle age. From the high-church principles and arbitrary policy of such men, no just government, no attention to the rights of the people, could be expected; and their subsequent conduct appears to have proved, that those who foreboded ill from their combination with the Jesuits, did not judge too harshly. Indeed, priests in general are not the best administrators of temporal power, and, when we say that they ought to be restricted to their spiritual duties, we mean no disrespect to their sacred order.

With all his bigotry, and all his zeal against reform, the present pontiff has treated the protestants in his dominions with a degree of mildness and complacency not expected from his rigid principles. He even allows a chapel at Rome for the exercise of their religion, being probably influenced by a regard for the British and other protestant governments, even while he thinks that the professors of this faith do not pursue that course which would give them a full assurance of salvation. He finds it expedient to make some concessions to the more enlightened spirit of the age, while his own mind is darkened by inveterate prejudices. He would wish to dictate, as his predecessors did, to all the princes of Christendom; but as he cannot influence them to the extent of his wishes, he is content to exhort without commanding. The prince whom he finds most devoted to him, is the French king (Charles X.,) who, in his late law against sacrilege, has imitated the pontifical rigour of the middle ages; but it does not appear that even this monarch is inclined to surrender, to the claims of the papacy, any of the prerogatives of the Gallican church.

The reigning pope has had the high honour of celebrating a Jubilee. It commenced on Christmas eve, in 1824, and a whole year from that time is considered as peculiarly sacred. The beginning of the ceremonial was a solemn procession to the sacred gate which leads to St. Peter's church. The magistrates of Rome, the chief citizens, the cross-bearers and other ecclesiastical attendants, the parochial clergy, the bishops and cardinals, and (last in order, though first in dignity) the holy father, with his *tiara* carried before him, advanced to the gate. As it did not open at the first blow which he gave to the wall with a silver hammer, he tried a second, saying, with an air of authority, 'I will enter thy house, O Lord.' An opening not being yet made, he struck the wall a third time, and, with the aid of workmen on the other side, a passage was opened for the anxious throng. Fragments of stone, thrown out in this operation, were eagerly picked up by the votaries of superstition, and the medals which had been left within the wall at the jubilee of the year 1800, were also seized by the scrambling devotees. The church was soon filled to an overflow: the pope set the example of singing and praying, and the thanksgiving service was performed amidst the united sounds of choral and martial music, enlivened by peals of bell-ringing. Similar scenes occurred at three other churches; and all the subjects of the state, as well as pilgrims who flocked from various countries, now hoped for a remission of their sins, a favour which may be purchased at the altars on moderate terms. Poor strangers, it appears, obtain this indulgence *gratis;* and the pope sometimes condescends to grant it to them in person. He presides at the celebration of the most sacred service in the metropolitan church, and afterwards entertains the pilgrims at the Vatican palace with humble fare and spiritual conversation, and distributes silver medals among them, commemorative of the jubilee. But the usual place of resort, for these strangers, is the hospital of the *Pelegrini*, where they are treated with great respect, and even have their feet washed by some of the cardinals. In the course of the year which is thus dignified with peculiar sanctity, public amusements and diversions are prohibited: yet the idea of a jubilee ought not, we think, to 'impoverish the public stock of harmless pleasure.' Where a general fast is ordered, there may be some reason for a suspension of ordinary amusements; but, in the case of a joyful celebrity, the interdiction seems to be misplaced and inapplicable.

From the religious concerns of France and of Italy, we proceed to the survey of other catholic governments. In Spain, the pope's authority was not suffered to be free from control, as will appear from the following restrictions upon his representative. In 1803, the council of Castile, in admitting the archbishop of Nicea to the

[a] On the 20th of August, 1823.

office of papal legate in the Spanish dominions, stated three remarkable exceptions to the authority claimed by that officer. One was, that he was not to have the power of visiting the patriarchal, metropolitan, or other churches, with a view to correction or reform; another was, that he was not to examine any individual, whether of a religious or civil character, who might be estranged from a particular community or institution, or in any way criminal; and the third imported, that he would not be allowed to receive appeals from the ordinary judges.

The pontifical authority was still more restricted after the usurpation of the Spanish throne by Napoleon's brother Joseph, who, while he declared that only the Romish religion should be allowed, left to his holiness a mere shadow of power, suppressed a considerable number of monasteries, and abolished the court of inquisition. But, as the continued efficacy of his regulations depended on the permanence of his power, (for they were not attended with the general assent of the nation,) it remained for the cortes to determine whether his ordinances should be exploded or confirmed. They decreed, in the year 1813, that the inquisition was injurious to religion and to the state; but, to gratify the bigots, they voted the erection of episcopal courts for the trial of heretics. They made various attempts for the reformation of abuses and the redress of grievances; but, amidst the prevalence of war and civil dissensions, they could not make great or effective progress in their schemes; and their acts were annulled by the tyranny of that prince whose throne they endeavoured to establish. Being released by Napoleon in 1814, Ferdinand re-entered Spain with those emotions of resentment which prompted him to reject the new constitution; and, by listening to the suggestions of priests, excited discontent and odium. He was even so attached to the old school of bigotry, that he concurred with the pope in the propriety of re-establishing the order of Jesuits, and commanded that all the colleges, houses, funds, and rents, which belonged to this fraternity at the time of the suppression, and had not been altogether alienated, should be quickly restored. Yet, in his other concerns with the court of Rome, he displayed a laudable spirit; for, when the papal nuncio required that the ancient oath of fidelity to the king and regard for his prerogative, exacted from every prelate on his consecration, should no longer be administered, he answered the unwarrantable demand by declaring, that no innovation should be made in that respect. This prince, indeed, though deficient in sense and judgment, is sufficiently disposed to defend his prerogative against papal encroachments and attacks. The king of Portugal is equally attached with Ferdinand to the Romish faith, and, at the same time, equally ready to resist the high claims of the pontiff.

All the Austrian prelates, except the archbishop of Olmutz, are nominated or appointed by the emperor; and, although the papal confirmation is afterwards accepted, it is not considered as absolutely necessary. As king of Hungary, the same prince appoints the prelates of the Latin and Greek churches; and those who are named immediately exercise their full jurisdiction before they receive the pope's confirmation of their appointments; for it is a settled point in these countries, that bishops hold their power directly from God. When the episcopal oath is taken, it is understood to imply only a canonical obedience to the pope, not derogating in the smallest degree from the rights of the emperor, or encroaching on the duties which the prelates, as subjects of the state, are expected to perform to the ruling power. This practice certainly tends to explode the idea of a double allegiance on the part of the Austrian subjects, whose sovereign, while he is an hereditary bigot to the Romish faith, is determined to secure his own authority from the encroachments of a foreign pontiff. By the *Placitum Regium*, no papal edicts or rescripts are allowed to have any force or operation without the express consent of the government; and no persons are even suffered to apply to his holiness with regard to any new act of devotion, or for any other purpose, without the emperor's permission.

The catholic zeal of the Bavarian government has in this century declined. Bigotry has in a great measure yielded to a sense of liberality, and the protestants are not only tolerated but encouraged. A new constitution, allowing a national assembly, has been conceded to the people, and a meliorated system, both in the church and state, consequently prevails.

In the catholic cantons of Switzerland, there is not a uniformity of religious regulation. The rulers of Fribourg, in 1815, renounced the right of appointing their bishop, leaving it to the uninfluenced judgment of the pope. In the Grison territory (now a part of the Swiss republic,) the bishop of Coire is elected by the twenty-four canons of the establishment; but it appears that the pope is allowed to fill up the vacancies among these canons, alternately with the chapter itself. The same bishop promulgates the papal ordinances, without waiting for the sanction of the temporal power. In the new canton of Tessin, the bishop of Como is appointed by the government; but the papal confirmation is deemed requisite for the establishment of his pretensions. In the Valais, four priests are proposed by the chapter to the diet for the episcopal dignity: of these, one is selected as the most unobjectionable candidate; the pontiff at first pretends to reject him, but soon after nominates the same person, as if no previous recommendation had been given. In those states which, before the year 1815, composed a part of the diocese of Constance, the prelates are chosen by the government; and his holiness is expected to confirm the appointment. Thus, on the prelate's death, in 1818, a new bishop was nominated by the grand duke of Baden, and, though the pope objected, he was obliged to yield to the spirit of that prince. In most of the cantons, no papal or episcopal ordinances, except those which relate to an exemption from fasts, or other affairs of little moment, are suffered to operate without the consent of the civil power. With regard to the monasteries, it appears, that the election of the head depends, in some, upon the pope, and, in the rest, upon the bishops.

In the kingdom of Naples, the pope's authority is seriously checked by the spirit of the government, although the doctrines which he maintains are still professed by the people. No bulls, rescripts, or dispensations, are effective without the royal assent; and, in the appointment of bishops, the court justly assumes a paramount authority.

In speaking of Naples, our attention is called to a remarkable society, which was formed in the year 1812, while Murat (that is, the usurper Joachim) filled the

throne of Ferdinand. We are induced to mention it, not for its chief object, which was evidently political, but because its members mingled a sense of religion with their general views, and professed a high regard for evangelical truth, declaring that their grand aim was to establish on that basis a system of freedom and justice. Our Redeemer, they said, was the victim of despotic tyranny; and it was therefore the duty of his votaries to use all their efforts for its extinction. The founders of this association were the friends of the exiled family; but many persons of different political principles were encouraged to join them; and, borrowing the symbol of their confederacy from the charcoal trade, they did not disdain the degrading appellation of *Carbonari*. The existence of such a society did not escape the vigilance of Murat, who took measures for the repression of its audacity; and, being thus endangered, it was reduced to a comparatively small number; for the leaders dismissed a very considerable part of their force, and carried on their intrigues with greater caution and secrecy. After the death of Joachim, Ferdinand, the restored king, or rather his minister the prince of Canosa, instituted a new association as a counterpoise to the Carbonari; but this did not prevent the great increase of the latter, who now propagated their principles of reform over many parts of Europe. At length, in the year 1820, their intrigues produced a revolution in the Neapolitan kingdom; but it was easily suppressed by the operations of an Austrian army, and many of these mal-contents were punished in various modes. The society then desisted from its machinations, and declined into insignificance.

In Sicily, so feeble is the papal power, that it is treated with a freedom bordering on contempt; and the intercourse still maintained with the court of Rome is confined to the formality of procuring either patents for bishoprics, to be granted to those who are nominated by the king, or dispensations for spiritual wants, when the individuals who apply for them have received the royal permission. If these applications should be disregarded, the king, being (by an ancient grant) a legate of the holy see by birth, would, in all probability, order the prelate who acts for him in that capacity, and who presides in the spiritual courts, to accede to the different requests in the pope's name, like the English parliamentarians, who, when they opposed Charles I. in the field, pretended to act in his name.

In the grand dutchy of Tuscany, after the laudable efforts of Leopold in opposition to papal encroachments, little remained to be done in the present century to establish the independence of the temporal sovereign. It appears, indeed, that the pope ostensibly supplies the vacancies in episcopal preferments; but the rule is, that the names and pretensions of four candidates are communicated to him by the Tuscan minister at Rome, who points out the one more particularly favoured by the grand duke; and with this recommendation his holiness feels himself obliged to comply. The ordinary benefices are conferred on such persons as are deemed by the king or the bishops the most deserving; and the pope's confirmation of any appointment of this kind is considered as absolutely unnecessary. The injunctions of the pontiff are allowed to have some influence in cases of conscience or of private penance; but, if the answers to these cases should affect in any way the civil state of the persons who have solicited the illuminations of his wisdom, the acceptance is noticed and sometimes punished as a misdemeanour.

Even the hereditary bigotry of the king of Sardinia does not render him a slave to the pope. He bestows the highest ecclesiastical preferments at his own discretion, and rejects such orders from Rome as relate to the external polity of the church. He indeed suffers appeals to be made from bishops or their judicial deputies to the pon tiff, in those few causes which are still subject to the jurisdiction of an ecclesiastical tribunal; but these appeals are not actually transferred to Rome, unless each subject should have been thrice investigated, without a uniformity of decision, by pontifical delegates, chosen from the whole number of churchmen resident within the kingdom.

CHAPTER II.

History of the Greek Church, and of the Christian Communities in Asia and Africa.

When the Roman empire was divided into two great states, it could not be expected, either that a community of interest, or an entire coincidence of religion would long prevail. As adult persons, who have left their homes and formed new families, do not feel themselves bound to adhere invariably to the opinions or the practices of their parents, nations, when disjoined by mutual consent, gradually adopt new sentiments, both in religion and in politics: we cannot, therefore, be surprised on finding that the Greeks soon began to differ from their former friends and fellow-subjects. The occasional religious differences between them have been stated by our predecessor; they were not essentially important, but sufficient in the eyes of irritable theologians to justify a secession. The schism still subsists to such an extent, that there are many Greeks, especially in the Morea, who are more unwilling to be upon friendly terms with the members of the Latin church, than even with Moslems or pagans. These haters of their Christian brethren, we may conclude, are men of weak minds and illiberal dispositions; and the majority of the Hellenic race, we hope, are not so bigoted and intolerant, though they certainly do not harmonise with the Romanists. A respectable votary of the Greek church, we are informed, made a formal application to the pope in 1825, requesting his authoritative aid and support in the present contest, and holding out the prospect of a religious union: but it does not appear that he was authorised on this occasion by the leaders of the insurgent confederacy, or that they are disposed to sacrifice any point of doctrine or even of ceremonial practice for the insignificant assistance which they can derive from the feeble remains of power and influence, yet enjoyed by the head of the Romish church.

The contest to which we incidentally referred, did not arise from any new provocation, but from continued reflection upon the enormity of existing abuses. The Greeks, habituated to the most disgraceful slavery, seemed to submit with patience to the sway of the most brutal barbarians that ever obstructed the progress of humanity and civilization: but, when the Spaniards, Portuguese, and Neapolitans, had roused themselves from that torpor which was apparently inconsistent with the warmth of their dis-

positions, the descendants of an illustrious nation resolved to exert their energy for the recovery of their independence. They boldly took up arms in the year 1821, and soon formed a new government, which, unaided by the jealous and selfish powers of the continent, they are still defending against their savage oppressors. Without speculating on the probable event of the contest, we shall merely observe that they are entitled to encouragement and support from all the advocates of freedom, and all the professors of Christianity. But, say the abettors of arbitrary power, rebels ought rather to be punished than assisted. As a general rule, we admit that position; but we may venture to affirm, that an exception ought to be allowed in the case of the Greeks, the injured slaves of a government which is in itself an *anomaly* and an *outrage*.

The ministers of the church, in general, were among the promoters of the revolt, and many of them are even engaged in the military service, in which some have displayed great alertness and courage. The priests, also, in numerous instances, take part with the rest of the community in agricultural labours, and in the mechanic arts, and thus eke out their scanty incomes in a mode which detracts from the respect that would otherwise be paid to them.

The doctrines and ceremonies of this church do not appear to have been altered since the beginning of the century. The priests have continued their old course; the people have not called for any innovation; and, since the insurrection unfolded the banners of liberty, religion has been treated as a secondary concern.

Adverting to the state of the Greek church in one point of ceremonial observance, which also exhibits traits of national manners, we are induced to take notice of the celebration of Easter. This festival, being deemed the most important of all, is observed with great joy and respect. The termination of *fasting* necessarily leads to the idea of *feasting;* but devotional exercises and pompous ceremonies in the churches precede the general indulgence and merriment. All the inhabitants of the towns and villages, in holiday trim, or in their best apparel, sally forth to pay visits and to receive congratulations; and they salute each other on the cheek, saying at the same moment, "Christ has risen." Beside private rejoicings, firings from the batteries and discharges of small arms announce the prevailing joy; and, not content with putting powder into their muskets or pistols, they introduce bullets, not, we hope, with a malicious intent, but from the wantonness of joy. In the evening a grand ceremony takes place in the chief towns: all men who sustain public characters, after attending divine service in the principal church, meet in the street, and the members of the executive body, approaching the legislative subjects of the state, who are drawn up in a line, embrace them with an air of affection. On Easter Monday, the festivities are renewed. In the environs of the towns, while many of the women, dressed in a tasteful manner, are reclining on the grass, listening to the attractive sounds of the guitar and the flute, equestrian bands are scouring the plain, and hurling their javelins; other parties are engaged in the Romaic dance, while discharges of pistols add to the effect of the music; children, fancifully arrayed and crowned with flowers, sport around their delighted relatives and friends; and apparent joy and hilarity animate the scene. Yet there is no great degree of true piety or sincere devotion in this celebration of Easter;—not more, indeed, than we observe in the Christmas festivities of England, where few think of the religious origin of the general joy.

As the Russian ecclesiastical establishment scarcely differs in any respect from the mother-church, there is no occasion for the formality of descriptive remark. Ceremonies are more regarded both by the clergy and the laity than the dictates of sound morality. Prostrations before the pictures or figures of saints,—

> ——— "Who never yet had being,
> Or, being, ne'er were saints;"

pilgrimages over immense deserts to favourite chapels and shrines, and other marks of superstition, are the general substitutes for true piety. The majority of the priests are men of low birth and imperfect education, and many of them attend more to the length of their beards than to the propriety of setting a good example to their flocks.

The late emperor Alexander, while he followed the rules of the established church, tolerated all sects in the exercise of their respective modes of worship, but did not suffer them to make proselytes. It was on this ground that he banished the Jesuits from his dominions: if they had been content with teaching the elements of literature, he would have left them unmolested; but they endeavoured to seduce the youth into the pale of the Romish church. The same prince treated the Jews, and the Moslem and pagan tribes of his Asiatic empire, with mildness and forbearance, promoting without enforcing their conversion. When he completed the reduction of Georgia under his yoke, he found the people already Christians; and, allured by his beneficent sway, they seemed more observant, than they had before been of the ordinances of the Greek church. Over Armenia and Kurdistan he had some influence, because those countries seemed not to have any regular government; but he did not ostensibly direct either their religion or politics.

Directing our course to the neighbouring territory of Chaldæa, we meet with a numerous body of Christians. They inhabit the country on each side of the Tigris, and are said to amount to 500,000 persons. They form an unconquered state, and are so determined to resist all attempts for their subjugation, that they constantly bear weapons of defence, which they do not lay aside even when they assemble for public worship. Their ostensible ruler is a patriarch, who exercises both a spiritual and civil jurisdiction; but he is not invested with that arbitrary power which is so prevalent in Asia; for the government is, in effect, rather republican than monarchical. The most intelligent men in Chaldæa do not pretend to know either at what time, or by whom, Christianity was first preached in that country; but it is probable that Gregory, styled the Enlightener, whom the Armenians consider as the founder of their church, introduced the Gospel likewise among the ancestors of those tribes of which we are now speaking. Yet, as the majority of their number follow the opinions of Nestorius, they differ from the Armenians, who are Monophysites. They appear to be divided into two hostile parties,—namely, the Nestorians, who compose an independent church, and the converts to the Romish persuasion. Literature, at present, is at a very

low esb among them; and we need not wonder at this circumstance, when their neighbours, in every direction, are equally unenlightened, or still more ignorant.[a]

In Persia are found the remains of sects that have Christianity for the basis of their religion; but the superstructure is a miscellaneous kind of erection, not fully suited to the foundation. The Sabeans, near the Persian Gulf, have tenets and practices borrowed from the Jewish and Mohammedan systems; but, as they believe in the divinity of Christ, and the redemption and atonement, they are justly considered as Christians. The Sefis resemble our Quakers in their regard to moral duties, and their endeavours to subdue the violence of the passions.

In India the Christians are widely diffused, not only in consequence of the invigorated exertions of modern missionaries, but from the remains of ancient conversions. Some have thought that the Saads are Christians in their hearts, though not in their external professions: but it appears that they are still heathens. About 155 years ago, one Jogee Das declared, at Dahli and other places, that he had been commissioned by the divine pupil of the Supreme Being to deliver the people from the clouds of error, in which they had been long enveloped; and he soon found many who were willing to secede from the Hindoo idolatry, and to assist him in the propagation of his doctrines. These sectaries resemble the Quakers in the plainness of their dress and the simplicity of their manners, in the avoidance of frivolous amusements, in that opinion of the profaneness of an oath which does not exclude a strict regard to honour and truth, and in their detestation of war and violence. They believe in the immortality of the soul, and expect a day of final judgment. Many of those who have intercourse with our missionaries seem inclined to become Christians; but, even among these well-disposed men, conversions are yet uncommon.

In the territory of Canara we still find a large Christian community, sufficiently remarkable to claim our notice. It was from the settlement of Goa that the rays of evangelical light diffused their lustre over Canara; but at what time a Christian colony was first formed in this part of Southern India, cannot be ascertained. The influence of the Portuguese government not only conduced to the protection of the settlers, but procured for them the favour of princely patronage, so that they obtained from the rajahs of the country, grants of land and various privileges. They received occasional accessions of European devotees and of native converts from Goa, and, by their forcible persuasions, drew many of the inhabitants from the darkness of idolatry; and the establishment became so flourishing, that about 80,000 persons are said to have belonged to it at the time when Hyder Ali, the bold usurper of the throne of Maissour, attacked and subdued Canara.[b] They were terrified at the success of a Moslem conqueror; but he treated them with mildness and humanity, and confirmed their privileges. Far different was the conduct of his son Tippoo, who, although he found them ready to submit to his authority, pretended to suspect that, under the influence of Christian zeal, they would not long remain faithful subjects to a prince of his religion. He therefore insisted on their adoption of that system which he preferred, and, observing their reluctance, proceeded to acts of violence and outrage. He banished or imprisoned the priests; sent the greater part of their flocks to Seringapatam and other towns, to linger in poverty and wretchedness; destroyed the churches, and seized the lands. The fall of the tyrant, however, in 1799, revived the establishment. Those who had been compelled to renounce the Christian faith, were re-admitted into the church; many who had emigrated during the persecution returned into Canara; religious structures gradually arose in various parts; and, in 1818, the population was estimated at 21,800. Agriculture is the occupation of the majority of this number; and, in that and other employments, the industrious habits and orderly conduct of the people are eminently conspicuous.

The spiritual concerns of this community are conducted by about twenty-five priests, who receive instructions from the primate of Goa. The religion of the establishment is consequently that of the Romish church. The mass is solemnized in Latin, while the sermon and other parts of the service are delivered in the vernacular tongue. Images of our Redeemer, the Virgin Mary, and favourite saints, are exhibited in the churches, and receive humble adoration; but public processions are avoided, from an unwillingness to shock the prejudices of the Hindoos. There is no ecclesiastical tribunal in the province, and the only punishment inflicted by the church is that of excommunication, of which there are two species, one trifling, and the other not so severe as to preclude the exercise of kind and charitable offices toward the delinquent.

Other parts of India, as well as a part of Canara, have received the Gospel from catholic emissaries. A missionary, writing to a friend in the year 1806, represented the Romish places of worship as very numerous in Travancour; but he added, that, in most of them, mass was performed only once in two years. Notwithstanding this apparent neglect of exterior ordinances, he thought that above 1000 catholic missionaries were dispersed over India; but this, we apprehend, is an exaggeration. We know, however, that the protestant missionaries are very numerous, extending their labours in one direction from Lahor to Cape Comorin, and, in another, from the Persian frontier to China. The mission in the province of Bengal appears to be the most flourishing; and it is more regularly organized, in consequence of the establishment of an episcopal see and a college at Calcutta. The late Dr. Middleton laboured with great zeal for the diffusion both of Christianity and learning among the Hindoos; and his successor in the bishopric (Dr. Heber) is usefully employed in the promotion of the same objects.

The promoters of Christianity are not very successful in the Chinese empire. They are rarely suffered to penetrate into the interior parts of the country;[c] and, even at Canton, where the British influence is very considerable, they are viewed with an eye of jealousy, and checked in their benevolent purposes. In the hope of more auspicious times, they carry on their operations at Macao, and also at Malacca, where a college has been

[a] An account of the Chaldæan Christians, by the Rev. Dr. Robert Walsh.

[b] In the year 1767.

[c] It is affirmed that, in the year 1815, the French missionaries and their converts had chapels at Fokien and other towns, but that a persecution arose against them, and ruined a concern which seemed to promise well.

erected, in which are many Chinese students. The New Testament has been translated into the Chinese language; and copies have been gladly accepted by many of those emigrants who have transferred their industry and arts to the islands of the Indian ocean.

In Syria and the Holy Land, our missionaries are also actively engaged. They hold religious conversations with the natives of all persuasions, preach the pure word of God, distribute translations of the Scriptures and religious tracts, and establish schools. Their success is not equal to their wishes: yet they are not discouraged. If they convert few of the Jews or Moslems, they guide the members of the Greek and Latin churches into a better path in their religious journey. As the Druses are supposed by some antiquaries to be, in a great measure, the descendants of the crusaders of the middle ages, it might be expected that they would be disposed to listen to the exhortations of Christian preachers. Many of them certainly are so inclined; the reigning emir is said to be a Christian in his heart; and we are assured that the votaries of the Gospel in their country out-number the followers of the Koran. However that may be, the Druses certainly live on more friendly terms with the Christians than the subjects of any other government in Western Asia.

In Egypt, the few Europeans who undertake the task of conversion are treated with mildness by the pasha who now rules over that country as an independent prince; but, though he is fond of European arts, he is not inclined to assist in the propagation of that faith which his hereditary prejudices teach him to reprobate, and the labours of the missionaries are counteracted by the efforts of itinerant Moslems, sent from a college at Cairo to enforce the doctrines of the pseudo-prophet.

The Abyssinians might be called a religious people, if we could depend on their professions of piety; but, when they make pompous boasts of their zeal, they speak more like Pharisees than lovers of truth. They are more attentive to forms and ceremonies than to the practice of true holiness and virtue; for their morality hangs loosely upon them, and their conduct is not sufficiently regulated by the laws of honour or by good principles. Their addiction to perjury is an odious trait in their characters; for they will frequently imprecate curses upon themselves if their assertions should be false, knowing at the same moment that they are wholly unfounded; and, when the king has sworn that he will pardon a delinquent, whom he afterwards wishes to punish, he says to his attendants, 'Take notice that I scrape this oath away from the tongue which pronounced it,'—making movements and gestures corresponding with his faithless declaration. They do not regard marriage as a religious obligation, and the priests therefore do not officiate on the occasion; and chastity is little regarded by either sex. They consider fasting as a strong proof of piety; but the priests, while they order the laity to fast about 190 days in a year, only practise that kind of forbearance for 70 days. At the end of each fast the chief priest entertains his brethren, who greedily devour the raw flesh of a cow, sing hymns, and drink some fermented liquor until they are stupified. With regard to the authority of the abuna or metropolitan, it does not appear that he has a great extent of power or patronage. Officers, who are not required to be priests, administer the revenues of the churches and monasteries, and determine spiritual causes,—an appeal to the king alone being permitted, if the decision should not give satisfaction.

CHAPTER III.

History of the Ecclesiastical Communities of the Lutherans and Calvinists.

The Lutherans still bear the chief sway in the Swedish and Danish kingdoms. Their zeal, however, is less fervent than it formerly was, and they are less arbitrary and intolerant. They begin to partake of the candour and liberality which are now more prevalent than even in the last century; they entertain more just sentiments of the right which all persons have to think for themselves in points of religion and of conscience; and they are more disposed to follow, in practice, that rational and well-founded axiom. Indeed, they now grant full toleration, from which even the Jews are not excluded. The addition of Norway to the kingdom of Sweden, in the year 1814, tended to infuse a more liberal spirit into the government. The easy acquisition of a new territory puts a prince into good humour, and he instantly becomes more mild and conciliatory: but, even before that event, it was ordained, in the new constitution which was promulgated in 1809, that no person should be harassed or called to an account for his religious opinions, unless it should clearly appear that his avowal of them, or the exercise of that religion to which they appertained, might be injurious to the state. This exception, it may be said, furnished a pretence for molesting the sectaries; yet the ordinance, we believe, was intended to convey a complete toleration.

The present Danish government is liberal and beneficent; and the king is as attentive to the interests of the church as to that of the state. Aware of the poverty of his clerical subjects in Iceland, he allows pensions to those who cannot procure a sufficiency of income from the limited bounty of their congregations; and he evinces his Christian zeal in the promotion of missionary undertakings.

In the kingdom of the Netherlands, formed in the year 1814, by the union of the seven United Provinces with those which the French had wrested from the hands of the Austrian emperor, the sovereign, though a Calvinist, granted to his new subjects an entire freedom of religious opinion and worship, and an equal share with the protestants in the representative government. This equality did not satisfy the prelates, who were of opinion that the Romish faith, followed for so many ages by the people of the Netherlands, entitled its professors to superior privileges: but the king, instead of adopting their suggestion, merely promised that every proposal connected with their religion should be submitted to the consideration of an executive committee, consisting of catholics. Since that time, they have occasionally vented their ill humour in complaints and remonstrances; but they cannot effectually resist the commanding influence of the protestants. In 1825, the king gratified them by the establishment of a seminary, in which candidates for the catholic ministry might acquire a sufficient fund of learning for the proper discharge of their sacred trust. With the same view, and in the same spirit of complacency, the college

of Maynooth in Ireland is supported by the liberality of a protestant parliament.

In France, the protestants are chiefly Calvinists. With regard both to the French and German branches of that sect, it was stipulated, in the agreement between Napoleon and the pope, that a synod, composed of five consistorial churches, should regulate all religious and ecclesiastical concerns, but that its resolutions should be submitted to the rulers of the state for confirmation; and that the appointment of pastors should be subject to similar recognition or approbation. If the contributions of the different communities should be insufficient for the support of the officiating ministers, the government promised to increase the amount to a fair allowance. As the incorporation of a part of Germany with France had added a multitude of Lutherans to the state, it was provided by the same *concordat*, that their church should be regulated, under the authority of the consuls, by consistories both general and local, and by councils of inspection. The ministers of the Calvinist persuasion were to be educated at Geneva, and those of the Lutheran church at a peculiar seminary of their own religion. When the territories in which these protestants resided were withdrawn by the allied powers from the French yoke, in the year 1815, such regulations were made as softened the arbitrary clauses of the former compact, and yet left a controlling authority in the hands of the civil power.

The attachment of the elector (now king) of Saxony to the Romish faith did not induce the people of that country to relinquish their habitual regard for the Lutheran system; and therefore no catholic bishop is allowed to act or reside in that realm, except the king's confessor, to whom the pope grants the authority of an apostolic vicar. In Upper Lusatia, some dignitaries who form a *chapter*, elect a mitred dean, in the presence and with the approbation of an Austrian commissary; and, at Bautzen, there is a chapter which, though catholic, has a Lutheran president. In civil rights, the members of the two communions now stand upon an equal footing in Saxony.

In the Hanoverian territories, the catholics were long subjected, by the Lutheran rulers of the state, to various restrictions. They were not allowed to carry the host publicly, or to have any processions; and, in points of ecclesiastical jurisdiction, they were obliged to have recourse to the odious authority of a Lutheran consistory. But more auspicious days at length dawned upon them; and they are now gratified with all the rights of citizens.

In the three electorial archbishoprics (Mentz, Cologne, and Treves,) which were incorporated with the Prussian monarchy by the congress of Vienna, it might be supposed that the catholics, forming the bulk of the population, would be treated with lenity and indulgence, if not highly favoured; and, in fact, they have greater privileges than their brethren who reside in other parts of the king's dominions. They have, at the court of Rome, an agent who promotes their interest, and encourages the pope to counteract the arbitrary spirit of Frederic. In Silesia, where the catholics form only a third part of the population of the capital, the king has suppressed some of their monasteries, and precluded all appeals to Rome. In East Prussia he suffers no Romish bishop to act, though the priests are retained; and, in Brandenburg and other provinces, he rules the sect with a high hand, yet not with oppressive tyranny. At the same time, he favours the Calvinists more than the Lutherans, but is so far from suffering the former to molest the latter, that he would rather witness their union than their discord.

The increasing liberality of sentiment, in the present age, is strikingly evinced by the union of the Lutheran and Reformed churches in many of the German states. The grand duke of Nassau, being connected in marriage with a lady of the latter persuasion, and wishing to preclude religious differences among his children, resolved, as far as his influence could extend, to unite his family and his subjects in the same devotional forms and worship; and his laudable endeavours were crowned with success. In the grand dutchy of Hesse and some other states the example was speedily followed; and the completion of three centuries from the first exertions of Luther in the cause of religious reform, furnished an appropriate day[a] for the first public celebration of the new union. To all liberal minded Christians this must have been a day of joy and of sincere congratulation. They recurred to the page of history for an elucidation of the dawn of religious reform: they reflected on the troubles and sufferings to which their ancestors were subjected in the progress of emancipation from the yoke of a corrupt church; and they now hailed with heart-felt satisfaction the union of those who, without differing on essential points, had long been unhappily divided.[b]

Notwithstanding these approaches to a union of sentiment, differences of religious opinion still subsist in various parts even of protestant Germany; for a uniform standard of thought cannot be expected to exist in any community. In those universities in which freedom of speech is in any degree allowed, the desire of political liberty appears to be accompanied with free-thinking on the subject of religion. It is affirmed by professor Tholuck, that the university of Halle is the seat of infidelity, and that even some of the teachers of theology are infected with an anti-christian spirit. This hostility to the truth, he says, is still more prevalent at Weimar, where zealous Christians are discountenanced and persecuted: but he seems, in this instance, to have used the language of exaggeration. We admit that those who wish to be reformers in politics are in general equally desirous of what they call a reformation in religion; but the charge of infidelity is the common resource of intolerant bigots, who are offended even with such as differ from them in unimportant particulars, and stigmatize, as infidelity, that which is merely a sectarian difference of opinion.

Dissatisfied with the religious systems established in Germany, the baroness Krudener ventured to propose a reform. This lady, in her youth, was not strongly impressed with sentiments of piety. Her vivacity seemed to disdain all restrictions, and her morals were not pure or correct: but, in the progress of her studies, she at length met with the works of Stilling, a German enthusiast, whose effusions, operating upon the warmth of her disposition, excited in her mind a strong devotional spirit.

[a] In the year 1817.

[b] Among the Bavarian protestants, this reconciliation was adjusted with particular formality in the year 1818. The united establishment received the appellation of the Protestant Evangelical Christian Church, and the holy scripture was declared to be the only basis of faith to which its members ought to adhere.

When the sparks of her piety were kindled into a flame, she resolved to illuminate the world, as far as her abilities would allow, and began, in the year 1813, to propagate her opinions publicly at Heidelberg. In the following year she visited Paris, in the character of a religious reformer, and prayed and preached at her hotel for the edification of the dissolute and depraved French; but, while she amused them by her eccentricity, she made no impression upon their minds. To Switzerland she afterwards directed her course, and preached in the open air to large congregations. She dwelt on the necessity of regeneration, and asserted the saving power of faith and grace, even without those works which are meritorious in the opinion of the world. She was consequently more severe in her denunciations against what the Methodists call sin, than against acts of worldly wickedness and guilt. She pretended to be convinced that her frequent and earnest prayers had so far secured the divine favour, as to give her that inspired and influential character which enabled her to reclaim thousands of sinners: but, by declaiming at the same time against some civil ordinances, she so displeased the rulers of several cantons, that they ordered her to quit the country. Retiring into the dutchy of Baden, she assembled at her house the supposed friends of true religion, and boldly continued her career, until the magistrates stopped these irregular proceedings. She thus became sensible of the danger of defying the constituted authorities, and was more prudent and cautious in her subsequent conduct. She lived many years unmolested on an estate which she possessed near Riga, where, as well as in her other places of abode, she was idolized by the poor for her numerous acts of charity and beneficence. She died in the Crimea, in 1824, without the fame of having instituted a formal sect.

While a protestant lady of Germany thus asserted her pretensions to the honour of inspiration, a Romish fanatic of the same country seemed to think himself equally favoured with the divine aid. This was the prince Alexander Hohenlohe of Bamberg, who pretended that he could cure bodily disorders by prayers and devotional exercises; and several cases have been obtruded on the credulous part of the community, containing attestations, seemingly strong, of the providential grant of relief (at the precise time when the prince solemnized the mass and offered up prayers to Heaven) to persons in distant countries, whose friends had applied to him in the fulness of their faith and the fervour of their zeal.

Of the twenty-two cantons which now compose the Helsetic confederacy, six are attached to the protestant communion; and of these Bern is the most populous and flourishing. In six of the states, the catholics and protestants bear equal sway, while the other ten cantons follow the Romish system. In these, a tolerating disposition usually prevails; but there has lately been an exception from that rule in the case of the Pays de Vaud. A new sect arose in this canton, or rather a number of persons resolved to commence a more methodical course of religious duties and devotional exercises, not supposing that their zeal in this respect could excite the displeasure of the ruling power. If they had restricted these marks of piety to their own families, the government would not have taken the least notice of their conduct; but their offence, it seems, consisted in propagating the same spirit among others, by inviting their friends to their houses to join in these acts of worship. It does not appear that they entertained any new opinions or heterodox notions: and therefore the great council of the canton had no sufficient ground of interference; nor ought it, indeed, to have interfered, even if the people had been heretically disposed: for, as belief depends on the unsophisticated mind, it ought never to be subjected to force or constraint. A minister of the Gospel, however, was accused, in the year 1824, of the *heinous crime* of having read and expounded a chapter of the Scriptures to four persons beside his own family, and condemned to banishment for three years by his arbitrary judges.[a] Other ministers were arraigned for similar conduct; but, when twenty-six clergymen petitioned the government to relax its rigour in cases of this kind, the prosecutions, we believe, were discontinued.

While the catholics sometimes transgressed the limits prescribed by the government, but (in the case which we have stated) without serious delinquency, the protestants occasionally deviated from the ordinary course of legitimate proceedings, and, in one case, disgraced their holy cause by sanguinary excesses. In a village of the canton of Zurich, the family and neighbours of a farmer, named John Peter, were infected with the superstitious folly of his daughter Margaret, who, having a tendency to devout enthusiasm, had been inflamed into absolute phrenzy by the effusions of itinerant preachers. So high was the opinion of her sanctity, that she was even supposed to have been favoured with celestial inspiration; and, by the influence which she thus obtained, she was enabled to hold religious assemblies, in which the most shameful extravagances and the most hideous enormities were practised. She maintained the necessity of waging perpetual war with Satan, to prevent him from triumphing over Jesus Christ, and recommended, as the most effectual mode of saving souls from the grasp of the restless fiend, either an act of self-sacrifice, or the infliction of mortal wounds on friends and relatives. At a meeting of her disciples, she attacked one of her brothers with such fury, that only the opportune aid of a female domestic saved him from death. Her sister then offered herself as a victim, and was beaten to death with an iron mallet by the cruel enthusiast and one of her mad friends. Her father did not actually witness these outrages; but he knew that she was perpetrating some enormity, and yet did not rush into the apartment to secure peace and order. He suffered the storm to rage, while he calmly pursued his ordinary occupations. Margaret's phrenzy was not yet cooled; and, while she sat on the bed on which remained the palpitating body of her sister, she began to strike herself with the mallet. Not satisfied with the vigour of her own arm, she desired a friend to use the instrument with fatal effect; but, suddenly thinking that crucifixion would be a more legitimate death, she insisted on suffering that species of torture. Some pieces of timber were then placed upon the bed in the form of a cross, and to these she was deliberately nailed, without seeming

[a] Des Persecutions Religieuses dans le Canton de Vaud.——A similar case occurred in France in 1825. At the village of St. Etienne, one man, sixteen women, and two children, were apprehended for meeting at a private house to read the New Testament; and, for this alleged violation of the law, they were reprimanded by the magistrates and fined.

to feel any pain,—so great was her fortitude, and so determined her self-devotement. At length she said, 'Drive a nail into my heart, or split my head;' the latter part of the alternative was instantly executed, and a low moan announced her expiration. A judicial inquiry was made into these horrid acts; and Ursula Kundig, the most willing and ready agent in the work of murderous fanaticism, was sentenced to imprisonment and labour for sixteen years. Some of Margaret's male associates were deprived, for the rest of their lives, of their political rights; and her father's house, the scene of her folly and cruelty, was demolished. Her opinions and fancies were not immediately renounced by her votaries, some of whom pretended to believe that she would soon re-appear in the world.

The commanding number of protestants in Switzerland may be supposed to keep those of Piedmont in countenance; but the latter (we mean the Vaudois) have been so discouraged by the bigotry of the court and the Romish clergy, that they are reduced to a small number, not exceeding 20,000 who are under the spiritual direction of thirteen pastors. They preserve those tenets which they maintained on their original separation from the Romish church. 'We are called heretics by the members of that church (said their primate Peyrani to a late visitant of their secluded valleys;) but our church is founded on the durable rock of Christianity. We have adhered to the pure tenets of the apostolic age, and the Romanists have separated from us.'

In all the states of which we have been speaking, the Jews were at an early period mingled with the Christians, notwithstanding the rooted odium which subsisted between the humbled posterity of the ancient patriarchs and the triumphant adorers of the Messiah. Although the former may be thought to have no concern in a history of the church of Christ, it may not be altogether improper to take notice of the treatment which they have received in our time from the Christian governments. While the French revolution was in progress, Gregorie was the first who openly proposed that they should be rescued from the state of degradation to which they had long been subjected; and, as freedom was then (ostensibly at least) the order of the day, there was no pretence for withholding it from the Israelites. In consequence of this change of opinion, they were admitted into corporations, promoted to a variety of offices, obtained considerable rank in the army during Napoleon's sway, and were deemed not unfit to belong even to his celebrated Legion of Honour. It was pretended that he entertained the idea of re-establishing their power in Palestine; but, though he perhaps mentioned that wild scheme in a moment of rhodomontade, he had no intention of carrying it into effect. By his order, however, seventy-four deputies, representing the whole Jewish community in the French empire, met at Paris, in 1806, and gave satisfactory answers to various questions respecting their institutions and practices, and their ideas of the allegiance due to the government. In return they were assured by the emperor, that he would not only secure to them the free exercise of their religion, but the full enjoyment of the rights of French citizens. This meeting was followed by one of a more dignified character and a more religious nature, —even by the convocation of the grand Sanhedrim. The revival of an assembly which had so long been discontinued gladdened the hearts of the Jews. Those of Italy were requested to send deputies to it; and the Mosaic tribes of Germany readily concurred in the proposed reform. Their worship was re-organised at the meeting; their moral system was placed on a more sound basis; and their civil conduct was judiciously regulated.

In Germany, Lessing, the philosophic dramatist, was the first who publicly avowed himself a friend to the Jews; and, with a view to their rescue from degradation and contempt, he introduced upon the stage a worthy and respectable Jew, as Cumberland did at a later period in England. He also gave the hand of friendship to Mendelsohn (a youth of that despised race,) whose subsequent literary exertions tended to dispel the mists of prejudice, and promote the diffusion of just and liberal principles. Some distinguished statesmen espoused the same cause, and urged the rulers under whom they acted to extend equal protection to all classes of their subjects. Indeed, the loyal zeal of the Jews entitled them to the favourable opinion of the German princes; and, from some of these rulers, they received honourable testimonies of approbation, and, from the Prussian monarch, all the rights of citizens. These marks of regard gave them a degree of confidence which the zealous Christians construed into arrogance; and hence arose in some of the cities, loud clamours against them. The senate of Lubeck resolved to treat them as strangers or aliens, and prohibited them from carrying on any branch of trade within the limits of the city; and, in several other free towns, the obnoxious Israelites were assailed by the tumultuous fury of the populace. But the envoys of the chief German powers, assembled at Carlsbad, were so far from being disposed to countenance these unjustifiable proceedings, that they menaced the constituted authorities of those cities with signal marks of displeasure, if the Jews should not meet with that protection which they had a right to claim. This interposition was at once honourable to the great powers and effective in its result.

In Holland, long before the present age, the Jews enjoyed full toleration and complete protection. They increase rather than decline in number, and now compose a thirtieth part of the population. At Amsterdam they have many synagogues; but the most respectable congregation is that which, near the close of the last century, was formed by the secession of some German Jews from the old community.

In Poland, the Jews are highly favoured; and it has been remarked (by many visitants of that kingdom) that they have a greater appearance of consequence and dignity, than the Israelites who reside in any other country. They carry on the chief trade, and, except the nobles, they form the most opulent portion of the community.

In Great Britain, the Jews cannot expect to be encouraged, because it has been repeatedly declared, from the judicial bench, that Christianity is a part of the established and constitutional law of the realm; yet, with the exception of power and office, they have every reason to be satisfied with their lot. They have opportunities of acquiring opulence, and they well know that riches not only impart comfort, but promote influence. Even under the sway of Roman catholic princes and the tyranny of Mos

lem barbarians, they are not prevented from indulging in their favourite practice of pecuniary accumulation; and, if they are sometimes harassed and fleeced, they are not totally ruined.

CHAP. IV.

History of the Church of England and its Dependencies, of the various Sects in the British Dominions, and of the Ecclesiastical Communities in the United States of America.

Our divines affect to consider the church of England as the best of all Christian establishments, because they belong to it; and many persons who have no interest in it, and who are therefore less prejudiced observers, entertain the same opinion. Yet there are some who venture to make one objection to the establishment, by alleging that the princely incomes of many of our prelates excite, in the public mind, suspicions of ambition and of selfishness, and that theological aspirants seek high preferments from motives of interest, much more than from views of piety. The primitive bishops, say these objectors, were content with the means of comfortable subsistence and of respectable appearance; luxury, parade, and ostentation, had no charms for them; they were meek and humble-minded, and aimed only at the propagation of religious sentiments in that mode which was most likely to render them efficacious. But many ages, they continue to observe, did not elapse before the prelates were corrupted by the flattery and submission of superstitious votaries, and by the increasing prosperity of the church; and they were then disposed to assume the lordly demeanor and high tone of the noble and the opulent. Even he who styled himself the "servant of the servants of God" gladly accept the grant of temporal sovereignty and of princely power, and, in his new capacity, acted more as the domineering potentate than as the father or friend of his people. Such conduct in the opinion of these censors, did not tend to promote the prevalence of a proper sense of religion, which would have been more generally diffused, if the leading members of the clerical body had not raised themselves so highly above the ordinary state of society.

Without presuming to settle this dispute, which Mr. Burke triumphantly (as he thought) decided in favour of the prevailing system, we take this opportunity of remarking, that our church is apparently more pure, in point of doctrine, than any other Christian establishment, and that its discipline is liable to few or no objections. We also readily allow that the episcopal bench exhibits talent, erudition, and virtue, and that the inferior clergy are, in general, respectable; but, if their piety should be accompanied with greater zeal and earnestness; their exhortations and example would be more influential and edifying.

The state of our church, at the close of the last century, was as tranquil as it was flourishing. It was not agitated by such dissensions as had prevailed at the time when the convocation acted in some measure like a parliament; and it exhibited a dignified front and an air of boldness, which over-awed the discontented part of the nation. The majesty of the fabric was supposed to contribute to the preservation of its strength; and, while the bishops, deans, and archdeacons, kept the inferior ranks of the clerical order in a state of due submission and ready obedience, the church militant bore the aspect of a formidable phalanx. It might reasonably have been concluded, that the conscientious spirit which induced the protestants to claim for themselves the full freedom of religious opinion, would have disposed them to tolerate every sect which demanded the same right; but it unfortunately happens, that both churchmen and politicians, when *out of* power, make pompous promises and plausible protestations, which they are not willing to remember when they are *in* power. Thus the champions of the church of England, when they had obtained a separate establishment by differing from *the pope*, would not quietly suffer any sectaries to differ from *them*. Even archbishop Cranmer, who was considered as very mild and humane, became a cruel persecutor, when poor and humble Christians ventured to differ from him; and queen Elizabeth, when she had subverted the Romish system in this country, put many persons to death for only asserting the same privileges which she claimed for herself and her supporters. The puritans also (when, under the appellation of Presbyterians, they gained the ascendency about the middle of the seventeenth century,) persecuted the adherents of the church of England with bitter animosity; and toleration did not properly exist in this country before the reign of king William III., who, while he studiously discountenanced the violent spirit and malignity of the *catholics*, admitted the *protestants* of every denomination to the free exercise of their religion. The catholics were not then entitled to such indulgence, because time had not then shown the increase of their humanity, or the melioration of their social feelings; and even now, when there is no reason to suppose that they would break out into the brutal fury of religious murder, even if they had the opportunity of authoritative exertion, we still say that they ought not to be trusted with *power*. They still cherish the zeal of conversion; they still brand us with the stigma of heresy; they still think that no one can be saved out of the pale of their church. They may say that we have no right to censure them for entertaining such an opinion; yet we have a right to exclude them from that establishment which they would wish to overturn, and from those emoluments in which, if they should ever gain their grand object, they would not allow us to participate. They, and also their puritanical opponents, refused to tolerate when they ought to have been so inclined, and would still, we apprehend, be equally bigoted; but the members of the church of England have derived lenity from the softening progress of time, and now make every concession that their adversaries can reasonably demand. They allow full protection and constitutional security, while they withhold the grant of that power which may be abused and misapplied.

This is the point which is still disputed between the advocates of the establishment on one hand, and the catholics and protestant dissenters on the other. The only ground of refusal, on the part of the former, is the danger that may be apprehended from that hostility which their opponents cannot fully disguise. Notwithstanding this ground of alarm, the leaders of the cabinet, in the year 1807, were advocates for the claims of the catholics. At a time when the rancorous hostility of a powerful enemy threatened the kingdom with serious danger, it became

highly expedient to concentrate all the energy of the nation, and call forth the animated exertions of every class and of every sect. It was therefore proposed by the ministry, that the permission which had been granted to the Irish catholics to hold any rank in the army except the highest stations, should be extended to their brethren in Great Britain, and that persons of all religious persuasions should likewise be allowed to serve in the navy. When the scheme was communicated to the king, he reluctantly gave his assent to the introduction of a bill on the subject. Its provisions, on more deliberate consideration, were in some degree extended; and his majesty then not only made strong objections to it, but insisted on a written assurance from the ministers, that they would never again bring it forward. They properly refused to agree to a demand which they deemed (and which unquestionably was) irregular and unconstitutional, and retired from the public service. The dread of danger from too great concessions to a sect avowedly hostile to the protestant ascendency, spread from the throne among the people, and the cry of 'no popery' again prevailed, not merely because it was artfully raised by the partisans of the new ministry, but from the general unwillingness of the nation to favour an intolerant sect.

As it was supposed that the prince regent was not hostile to the claims of the catholics, their advocates brought forward the question in 1813, at a time when the zeal of the British nation against them seemed to be dormant. Mr. Grattan denied that they contended for power; they only desired (he said) the same civil rights and official qualifications which other citizens enjoyed. He adduced the instances of France and Hungary to prove, that even the bigotry of catholic governments allowed them to give more than mere toleration to the protestants; and this was an example which our parliament ought readily to follow with regard to the present claimants. In the bill which he introduced, it was proposed that they should be eligible to a seat in parliament, and might be appointed to any civil office whatever, except two or three of the highest employments, on taking a new oath against the pope's temporal power and pretended infallibility, and disavowing any intention of subverting or disturbing the protestant establishment, either in the church or the state. When the question was put on the parliamentary clause, it was rejected by a majority of four votes; and the bill, having thus lost its leading feature, was indignantly relinquished by those who had exerted their whole strength in its support. Even the catholics were not united in its favour; for the prelates of their sect, in Ireland, alleged that it would encroach on the due exercise of their functions, and on the spiritual jurisdiction of their supreme pastor, although this result was not contemplated by the framers of the bill.

For many years the inferior catholics seemed to treat with indifference the question of their *emancipation* (as the claim was styled by their leaders:) but they at length loudly called, more particularly those of Ireland, for the restoration of their rights, and it was resolved that every effort should be made to interest the parliament in their behalf. Sir Francis Burdett, in the year 1825, readily undertook the enforcement of what he conceived to be their just pretensions, and introduced a bill which obtained the support of the house of commons; but the peers, impressed with a sense of constitutional policy, rejected the bill by a majority of 48 votes. The disappointment did not discourage the bold sectaries. Although an association which they had formed for the more effectual prosecution of their grand object was suppressed by a specific statute, they declared that no obstacles which might be thrown in in their way by the illiberality and malice of their adversaries should deter them from a renewal of their demands.

Among the protestant sects in Great Britain, the Presbyterians are considered as the most numerous class; the Independents are said to be the next in point of number; and the Baptists, or Anabaptists, are supposed to take the third place. The Methodists are rapidly increasing; and, indeed, their ministers in general are more earnest and zealous than the preachers among the other sects, and thus make a more powerful and permanent impression.

Amidst the multiplication of the votaries of *religion*, the followers of the *spirit* (we mean the Quakers) do not augment their number; we may rather say, that, for many years past, this has been a declining sect. Their more extensive concerns in trade, and the consequent increase of their connexions with worldly-minded men, and with the mass of the community, may have partly contributed to this effect; and, amidst the fondness for pleasure that pervades the nation, many of them may have imbibed a spirit of dissipation, which the grave elders of the fraternity have been unwilling to countenance. A philosophic reader may be induced to add, that the more enlightened reflection of modern times must have had the principal effect in accelerating the decline of Quakerism. Whatever may be the *causes* of it, the *fact* is admitted by the *Friends* themselves. They still form, however, a respectable sect; and a summary view of the principles which they at the present time profess, may perhaps gratify the curious observer of sectarian varieties. They are of opinion, that God has imparted to all human beings, though in different degrees, a portion of his own *spirit*, without which it would be impossible for them to discern spiritual things, or even to understand the Scriptures. It is, they say, a primary and infallible guide; and, as those who encourage it are in their progress to salvation or redemption it becomes also a *redeemer*. They consider redemption in two points of view; either as it is promoted by outward or inward means, or as it relates to past or future sins. Jesus Christ, by offering himself as a victim, effected the former redemption; but it is the spirit, or Christ within which tends to produce the latter, by leading to regeneration and to the perfection of piety and virtue. Christ, they add, was *man*, because he became *incarnate;* and he was *divinity*, because he was the *word*. A resurrection, they think, will take place, though not of the body as it is. In the regulations of future punishment, guilt will not be imputed to any one on the ground of original sin, or the delinquency of Adam and Eve, but only for the actual commission of sin. Baptism and the eucharist are not essentials of Christianity as outward ordinances, but only as they are administered by the spirit. By this internal guide, persons of both sexes are qualified for the ministerial functions; and, like the primitive Christians, they ought to preach the Gospel gratuitously. No difference of religious opinion can be a just ground of obloquy or persecution. Evil ought not to be returned for evil; and not only all private violence, but all wars and public hostilities, ought

to be avoided. The loss of life is not a proper punishment for any crime; the reformation of a delinquent ought to be the great object of jurisprudence. The laws ought not in any case to be forcibly resisted; and, even if the conscience should be offended by submitting to them, the penalties are to be patiently borne. Moral education ought to be the object of particular attention; and it is the duty of every religious community, not only to assist its poor members in point of bodily comfort, but to provide for the instruction of their children. The dignity of man requires, that his word should be equivalent to an oath; and the Scriptures, in the most positive manner, confirm this sentiment. Trade is not in itself degrading; but honesty, and a punctual adherence to engagements, are requisite for its prosecution, and such branches as may be attended with the moral detriment of the trader himself or of others, ought to be carefully avoided by every Christian.

These principles unquestionably exhibit the Quakers in the light of a moral sect; and those who are well acquainted with them will not deny their general claim to that character. They may also be regarded as a friendly community, if not distinguished by politeness of behaviour or elegance of manners. Shrewdness and good sense are frequently observed among them, though we cannot affirm that many of them are eminent for learning or erudition.

The Quakers, when their sect had been fully formed, were scarcely ever divided by doctrinal disputes; but, early in the present century they began to be agitated by a spirit of dissension; and the committee of management, selected at one of the annual meetings, seemed willing to assume a degree of authority which the synod never intended to allow. One of the friends, in a spirited pamphlet, animadverted upon this arrogant conduct, and particularly censured the proceedings against Hannah Bernard, an itinerant expounder of Quakerism, who, for denying the Trinity, expressing her disbelief in miracles, and differing from the committee in other points, had been prohibited from preaching. William Matthews also took up the pen against the new dictators, whom he accused of having arbitrarily excommunicated him for such doctrinal variations as he was prepared to justify. Dissensions of this kind are occasionally renewed, without leading, however, to a violent explosion.

Although the Unitarians had been excused from the obligation of subscribing the thirty-nine articles, they were not satisfied while the act of king William hung over their heads, menacing them with penal inflictions, if they should deny the Trinity either in conversation or in writing; but from this state of apprehension they were relieved in the year 1813. Another ground of dissatisfaction still remained; for their marriages, like those of the catholics, were not considered as legal, when the ceremonies were merely accordant to their own ritual. They therefore repeatedly applied to the parliament for a redress of this grievance. On their last application, in 1825, they were alarmed at the declaration of the lord chancellor, that, however they might think themselves protected by statute law, they are yet liable to prosecution and punishment, by the common law of the land, for denying that doctrine which is an essential part of Christianity. They loudly complained of this insinuation, and declared that they would take the earliest opportunity of obviating its effects. The learned judge says that they are not Christians, as they deny the divinity of our Redeemer; and yet he connives at the toleration enjoyed by the Jews, the avowed enemies of every establishment which bears the impress of Christianity. He has uniformly opposed their efforts to procure an act of parliament for the solemnization of their marriages according to their own forms, and, in this pertinacity, he is supported by the majority of the peers, in defiance of the arguments and influence of his more liberal friend, the prime minister. There is no good reason for withholding so slight a favour, or (as the Unitarians would say) so just a claim.

A new association has been formed upon the same basis. The framers of this society were at first Universalists, and so far orthodox as to be Trinitarians; but a doubt arose in the mind of one of the members, whether the holy Trinity really existed, and, in the progress of deliberation, he convinced himself that the idea of the divine Unity was a more rational doctrine. By the plausibility of his arguments he drew others into his opinion; and, when the pastor of the flock pronounced it to be heretical, a secession was the natural result. The seceders publicly declared the motives and reasons of their conduct, and, as if they were at a loss for an ecclesiastical constitution, and had never before thought of such a subject, attentively studied the New Testament, with a view of ascertaining the nature and the laws of the primitive Christian church. The result of this inquiry was a conviction that the unity of the church was one of its principal characteristics; that the equality of its members distinguished the kingdom of Jesus from all political realms, and formed the true ground and security of Christianity liberty; that this general equality ought not to prevent the appointment of elders and of deacons, who might preserve order in the establishment, and superintend its concerns; that not only these, but all the members of their society, had a right to teach and exhort, so as to preclude the necessity of appointing regular preachers; and that it was a sufficient ground of communion with their sect, to acknowledge the authority of Christ as a divine teacher, without regard to the various doctrines which have been engrafted upon that simple basis. They style themselves Free-thinking Christians, and ap pear to have made some progress in impressing others with their sentiments.

While these sectaries were extending their influence, a scheme of union was framed by the advocates of the same general principles. It was proposed, in the year 1825, that three partial societies should be united under the title of the British and Foreign Unitarian Association, which would be authorized to embrace every object and circumstance connected with the propagation of Unitarianism. The proposal was readily adopted; and, as many protestant dissenters had lately joined in the petitions presented to the parliament against the relief of the catholics, the assembly took this opportunity of expressing a 'thorough disavowal and disapprobation' of such conduct, and a determination to support every effort which might be made to 'break the chains imposed by interested or short-sighted policy upon the sacred rights of conscience.'

Some years before this concentration of Unitarian strength, a secession from the established church occurred, not perhaps very important, but at least entitled to our

notice. Several ministers, who had been in the habit of conferring on religious topics, began to question the propriety of continuing in a state of external adherence to the church, when they entertained what they deemed reasonable objections to various parts of the ritual and the liturgy, and also disapproved the enforced dependence of the church (according to the present constitution) upon the temporal power. The baptismal service, they said, prescribed a ritual observance in lieu of a divine and spiritual operation: in the service appropriated to the dead, every one was styled a Christian, whereas many who were thus honoured were merely so in external profession; and the Athanasian creed was repugnant to that scriptural declaration which promised salvation to all who believed in Christ. They at length resolved to renounce the general assent which they had given at their ordination to the thirty-nine articles, the homilies, and the prayer book, while they readily acquiesced in particular clauses of those branches of our religious system; and, being conscientious men, they resigned their ecclesiastical preferments, which they considered as the wages of error, if not of iniquity. They then began to exercise their new ministry in the vicinity of Taunton; but, being considered as Antinomians, they were not so far respected as to be enabled to make great progress in the work of proselytism. They agreed with the Methodists in their opinion of *faith*, which alone, they thought, could produce a sinner's justification; and, when it was argued against them that they did not sufficiently inculcate the axiom of religious obedience, they alleged that their enforcement of the principle or the theory would lead to the requisite practice. They believed (as far as we can judge from the opinions of some individuals of their number) that Christ existed with God before the creation of the present world, and that he is the proper object of religious worship, the prophet, priest, and king of the church; and they leaned to the doctrine of election, without making it so prominent a part of their system as the rigid Calvinists do. With regard to the Trinity, they held a middle course between the orthodox clergy and the Unitarians. Some variations have occurred in their opinions since their original secession; but these are of little moment, and are such as might reasonably be expected from sectaries who have not framed a deliberate creed.

The reveries of Joanna Southcott we mentioned on a former occasion. She continued her delusions long after the commencement of this century, and not only retained her influence over her original followers, but drew many more into her train. A seal, bearing the initials of her name, which she pretended to have accidentally found when she was at work in her master's house, furnished her with a pretence for declaring that she was authorized by Providence to propagate a new revelation; and, in the midst of her spiritual avocations, she derived temporal advantage from the sale of sealed passports for the admission of the faithful into the celestial regions. Near the close of her life, in the year 1814, she impudently announced herself as the future mother (though a virgin) of the Shiloh promised in holy writ. Her followers now became still more numerous, and by their senseless liberality, presents were lavished upon the supposed object of divine favour, that the approaching birth might be celebrated with due splendour. The lady, however, died without enjoying the honour of being a mother. Many of her friends would not believe that she was actually dead, and fondly expected the speedy resuscitation of the spark of life: but, after an anxious suspense of four days, they resigned their hopes, and suffered her to be consigned, like an ordinary mortal, to the grave. Her chaplain then declared, that she had renounced, on her death-bed, the visions of her disordered brain; yet there are still, it is said, many who are not ashamed to own that they yet follow her opinions. It might have been supposed that her recantation would have put an end to the delusion: but, even in enlightened times, the most senseless fanaticism will occasionally take possession of weak heads and narrow minds.

Compared with the wild fanaticism of Joanna, the sentiments of Dr. Alexander Tilloch may even seem reasonable. He was a philosophical and scientific man, who differed in some respects from the established church. He and his friends assumed the denomination of Christian Dissenters, declaring, at the same time, that they were slaves to no sect, though it was supposed that they entertained opinions similar to those of the Sandemanians. They professed a determination of directing their conduct by the rules and injunctions of the Scriptures, and went so far in the formation of a sect as to appoint two elders for the administration of their spiritual concerns. The death of the philosopher, in the year 1825, probably dissolved the association; for we do not hear of its continuance.

An attempt to form a religious party at Coventry may here be mentioned, though its features are not so marked as to entitle it to the distinction of a new sect. The members call themselves Samaritans, and we hope that their philanthropy gives them a just claim to the honourable appellation. They resemble the Quakers in the plainness of their apparel, in their allowance of female preachers, and their abstinence from oaths; but they seem to lean more to the doctrines of the Methodists than to those of any other sect.

A zealot named Muloch lately endeavoured to create a sect, by exclaiming against the corruptions of Christianity, and proposing such a reform as would, in his opinion, render that religion much more efficacious and salutary than it now is. By drawing the people about him at Oxford, and exhorting them to adopt his opinions and advice, he exposed himself to an attack from the supporters of orthodoxy: but the riot had no serious consequences. In his conduct toward the members of his society, he has shown himself to be more influenced by the arbitrary and intemperate spirit of Knox than the conciliatory mildness of Melancthon.

Having thus treated of the established church, and also noticed the deliberate secessions from its rules and ordinances, we advert to missionary concerns, in which both the orthodox and the heterodox are disposed to concur. Missions had been occasionally undertaken before the current century; but it is only in our times that the attempts of British subjects with that view have assumed a regular and systematic form. The English, for ages, were very slow in the promotion of missionary labours. They thought more of their immediate concerns than of foreign undertakings, and were content with the secure enjoyment of their religion at home, without troubling themselves about the faith or the piety of the rest of the world.

Desultory attempts, indeed, were occasionally made for the conversion of the slaves in our colonies, and also of the neighbouring savages; and, after the establishment of the Society for the propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts, either zealous and adventurous clergymen, or pious and well educated laymen, were regularly employed in that salutary work; yet their operations were conducted on a small scale, and the government did not add its energetic weight to the scheme, but merely suffered it to take ts course under that nominal encouragement which it derived from a royal charter. A new ebullition of zeal, however, in this cause, appeared before the close of the last century, and it has so far increased in vigour, as to form one of the marked features of the age in which we live. The first *stimulus* in our time appears to have been given by a mechanic of the name of Carey, and John Thomas, an equally zealous Christian. The former, being strongly inclined to preach the Gospel, had solicited and obtained the honour of ordination among the Baptists; and, at a meeting of his brethren, he proposed a question relative to the practicability of an effective diffusion of evangelical truth among the pagan communities. As the other ministers concurred with him in the affirmative opinion, he went with his family to India, accompanied by his friend, who had already preached to the Hindoos in Bengal. They were afterwards joined by some other missionaries, but were checked in their pious operations by the British government, and therefore gladly took refuge in the Danish town of Serampore, where they opened a school, and converted some of the natives to Christianity. The marquis Wellesley at length allowed them to travel in those provinces which he governed; but this permission, far from being fully granted, was arbitrarily restricted. The missionaries, however, prosecuted their course without murmuring, and in some measure diminished the number of Pagans.

While Mr. Carey and his associates were thus employed, a scheme of conversion was formed, in the year 1800, on a grand and comprehensive plan by the ministers and friends of the established church, and the institution was denominated the 'Church Missionary Society to Africa and the East,' with a proviso that the ostensible limitation of the efforts of its members and missionaries should not 'bind them to an exclusion of their attempts from any other unoccupied place, which might present a prospect of success to their labours.' The leaders of the society at first resolved that none but those who had received episcopal ordination should act on these occasions; but, when it was found difficult to procure a sufficient number of clerical missionaries, catechists were employed in the propagation of the Christian doctrines and the enforcement of salutary precepts. For the promotion of these objects, pecuniary contributions were earnestly solicited in all parts of the kingdom and of its dependencies; and even the smallest donations were thankfully accepted. During many years the produce was very inconsiderable, the zeal of the nation not being sufficiently awakened: yet the fund of the society continued to increase, and its income has enabled it to establish nine grand missions: these are extended over forty-two stations, comprehending 255 schools, in which about 1,350 adults and 11,500 children are instructed in religion and the elements of literature.[a] For the use of these pupils and other inhabitants of the country about these stations, the Scriptures have been printed in a great variety of languages, and useful tracts, composed in a familiar style, have been circulated. As a specimen of the effect of these pious labours, the growing civilization of the colony of Sierra Leone may be mentioned with pleasure. Two thirds of its population consist of negroes, (rescued from the hands of base and infamous dealers in slaves,) the majority of whom, by the care and example of Christian instructors, have been so far civilized as to become quiet and friendly neighbours, industrious artisans and agriculturists, and devout frequenters of places of worship.

Other instances of missionary success may be drawn from many of the inhabited spots in the Pacific Ocean. In the Society Islands, in particular, a great change has taken place. The manners and deportment of the natives are comparatively civilized; their morals are much less depraved, and (says a reverend gentleman) a "system of idolatry has been annihilated, which was reared by treachery and crime, and had for ages, through the terrors which it inspired, kept the population in a state of abject wretchedness." The Scriptures have been translated into that language which, with little variation of dialect, is diffused over many clusters of islands in the wide extent of the Pacific; and, in various places, public meetings are annually holden by the chieftains, to deliberate on the most effectual means of propagating that religion which they consider as a great blessing, communicated to them by the servants of God and the friends of mankind.

As the success of these labours, however, appeared to be partial and limited, it was found expedient to quicken, at intervals, the zeal of the public. It was therefore stated, in a late address from the Society for the Propagation of Christian Knowledge, that the great increase of population in those territories to which its operations had been more particularly directed, rendered a considerable augmentation of the number of missionaries and school-masters necessary for the useful prosecution of its career, although these now exceeded 200 in the American colonies alone; that, 'with a view to the formation of a body of native clergy for the service of the colonies, the society had contributed largely to the support of the King's College (at

[a] To this institution, and other schemes calculated for religious purposes, the subjects of the British empire are now more liberal than they ever were before our time. For instance, in the year 1822, they contributed a sum nearly amounting to 352,000*l.*—a subscription far exceeding the revenues of some German principalities. The British and Foreign Bible Society received much more than a fourth part of this sum; the next receipts, in point of magnitude, accrued to the Society for promoting Christian Knowledge; the next, to the Church Missionary Institution; the London and Wesleyan Missionary Societies obtained the next proportion; the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts had a smaller, yet a considerable share; then came the Baptist Missionary Institution, and the Society for the Conversion of the Jews. The five societies which received the smallest sums were the following;—one which was established for the promotion of religious knowledge among the poor, one for the distribution of the Scriptures among seamen in the mercantile service, one for the diffusion of orthodox tracts, and Sunday School Society, and the Irish Society of London. This enumeration, though partial (for the list then published included thirty-one associations,) serves to evince the proportional interest taken by the public in these pious undertakings. Many might think that the Gospel Society deserved the most marked encouragement from the contributors; but we have no right to blame, in this instance, the exercise of private discretion. These associations undoubtedly reflect great credit on the country to which we belong; and we trust that the zeal by which they are fostered will not suffer any abatement.

Windsor in Nova Scotia,) by an annual grant and by the endowment of divinity scholarships and exhibitions;' that the directors of its funds had also made frequent grants toward the erection of churches in the infant settlements, and had been greatly instrumental in diffusing the national system of education over every part of the Trans-Atlantic colonies; and that another source of expenditure had been opened by the extended colonization of the southern parts of Africa and the interior of New Holland. Thus religious instruction and elementary learning were happily combined.

The systematic addition of the duty of the school-master to that of the missionary arose from the zeal of the Rev. Dr. Bell, who, wishing to render ordinary scholarship more general, introduced a system of elementary education more comprehensive with regard to the number of pupils, and more rapid in its progress, than the ordinary mode of instruction. The supporters of the scheme boasted that 500 boys and girls might be taught to read and write, and to perform the common rules of arithmetic, sooner than fifty in the usual way. The plan chiefly consisted in simultaneous dictation to a large assemblage, and in the employment of a number of instructors gradually selected from the aggregate number of the pupils.

The scheme has an air of quackery; but it has been practised with such success, in the national schools of Great Britain, and in various parts of the continent, that there are more readers and writers than at any former period. It is now a prevailing wish that all the inhabitants of this and every other country should receive instruction in reading and writing: but the proposal has been condemned by some prejudiced men of the higher class of society, who pretend that the plebeian learners would thus sooner imbibe ideas of reform and false doctrines of every kind, or, from the pride of learning, would contract ideas too high for the stations which they might eventually fill. In reply to these objections we may remark, that principles of pretended reform may be taught to individuals who cannot read, and whose illiteracy will render them less able to detect the fallacies of the artful teacher; and, in the next place, that the instruction derivable by the poor from this plan, though useful, will not be of so elevated a kind as to inspire them with overweening pride or vanity, or give them a disgust to the meanness of ordinary occupations.

The labours of the missionaries in the West Indies were exposed to a serious check by the commotions which arose at Barbadoes in the year 1823. Apprehending that the parliament might be induced to put an end to slavery, and knowing that measures had been taken to repress the shameful tyranny of the planters, the leading men in that island exclaimed against the 'villanous African Society,' calumniated the characters of Mr. Wilberforce and his friends, and denounced vengeance against the Methodist missionaries, whom they accused of instigating the negroes and mulattoes to disaffection and sedition. The charge was ill-founded; yet many persons of reputed respectability encouraged the white rabble of Bridge-town to insult and harass the Methodists and their friends, and demolish their meeting houses. The chief preacher fled in consternation to the island of St. Vincent; those who remained at Barbadoes were not allowed to act as ministers, and no other missionaries were suffered to land. The parliament expressed its indignation at these outrages; but we do not find that any steps were taken for the punishment of the perpetrators. This forbearance excited strong animadversion when contrasted with the cruel treatment of the slaves in Demarara, many of whom, for an unwillingness to work, and for some riotous acts, were sacrificed, under the forms of justice, to the vindictive rage of the planters.

The late appointment of several bishops for the West Indies will, it is hoped, produce, by the influence of their examples and persuasions, a better spirit among the white population, and promote the conversion and enlightenment of the people of colour and the negroes. But it is necessary, for the due accomplishment of these desirable purposes, that the new prelates should be more active and zealous than those of Europe.

In the United States of North America, the episcopal appointments are still kept up, and the other religious communities and congregations are in that regular progress which proves that the nation is not ungodly, although the laws and government do not ordain or recognize, as in the European states, the superiority of a particular creed or mode of worship. Hence there is no occasion for the grant of *toleration*, as that term implies an allowance, by the ruling power, of such doctrines, ceremonies, and practices, as are not exactly consonant with the established system. As no community predominates over another, all are equal in the eye of the law; the Episcopalians and Presbyterians, the Jews and Roman catholics, the Moravians and Quakers, are perfectly on a level.

Among the more recent religious communities beyond the Atlantic, the Shakers seem to have excited the greatest degree of attention. Having mentioned their origin and their doctrines on a former occasion, we now state some particulars respecting their manners and conduct. Even while they disallow marriage, and do not permit a man to touch a woman on any occasion or pretence, they are assembled in families. The males and females occupy different apartments in the same house, and have separate tables, but meet occasionally for society and labour, as well as for religious service. They exercise all the useful arts and manufactures among themselves, without being indebted to persons of other persuasions for the least assistance. As far as they conveniently can, they have every thing in common; and, when new members are admitted, they are required to assign their property to the directors of the society for the general benefit. They profess to follow the advice of the apostle, "Let all things be done decently and in order." In one respect they appear to be disorderly; for, in the midst of their public worship, they sing and dance like maniacs: yet they have "method in their madness." Upon the whole, they form a quiet, inoffensive, and apparently virtuous community.

Another sect (if indeed a religious party in a country which has no established national creed can properly be called a *sect*) has arisen in North America; but it is little known, and not very prevalent. Mr. Rees, a Welsh clergyman, transported himself to America with the benevolent view of propagating Christianity in that form which he considered as the most pure and genuine, or rather in that way which would leave every one at liberty to follow his own opinion in points which were not essential, while he acknowledged Christ as his only head. He proposed

that the society which should be instituted should be styled the Christian Church, and that no other guide than the New Testament should be allowed to its members; and a secondary part of his scheme was the propagation of the Gospel among the heathen communities. While he laboured to make religious converts, he endeavoured, with equal zeal, to put an end to the existence of slavery in the United States; but he did not, either in this or in his other pursuit, meet with that success which his good intentions deserved.

Thus we have taken a cursory survey of the state of Christianity, both in the eastern and western hemispheres, and of its progress during the first quarter of the present century. Some progress it has unquestionably made, although its increase has not been so great as its zealous friends wished or expected. Its movements, depending on human agency, are necessarily slow; and, if no miracles should intervene, many ages may elapse, before the majority of the pagan nations, of the Jewish tribes, and of the followers of the Arabian pseudo-prophet, shall be numbered among the votaries of that system which we conscientiously follow and earnestly recommend. In the mean time, let Christians preserve their faith unimpaired, and exhibit, to unbelievers, impressive examples of piety and virtue.

CHRONOLOGICAL TABLES.

CHRONOLOGICAL TABLES.

ADVERTISEMENT,

BY DR. MACLAINE.

THE following Tables have been compiled with much attention and pains from the best authors; and it is therefore hoped that they will be considered as an useful addition to Dr. Mosheim's work; and the more so, as they are not confined to the *persons* and *things* contained in it.

The dates, that are placed in the columns which contain the sovereign princes and popes, are designed to mark the year of their decease.

As several of the *Ecclesiastical* and *Theological Writers*, mentioned in these Tables, deserve a place also among *profane authors*, on account of their philosophical, literary, or historical productions; so their names will be repeated in the two distinct columns that contain the learned men of each century.

It is farther to be observed, that the Romish church, even long before the time of the Reformation, looked upon many persons as *heretics*, whom we, on our principles, cannot consider in the same light, and whose doctrines really tended to promote that reformation in which we glory. I have therefore, in many places, added the words *real* or *reputed* after *heretics*, rather than seem to submit, in this point, to the decisions of a superstitious church.

CENTURY I.

Sovereign Princes.	A. D.	*Popes, or Bishops of Rome.*	*Ecclesiastical and Theological Writers.*	*Heretics.*	*Remarkable Events.*	*Profane Authors.*
Roman emperors	A. D.	The succession of the first bishops of Rome is a matter full of intricacy and obscurity. —We shall herein follow the learned bishop Pearson.	The Evangelists and Apostles.	Dositheus.	The tax of Augustus Cæsar.	Titus Livius.
Augustus	14		The three Apostolic Fathers,	Simon Magus.	The birth of Christ.	Germanicus.
Tiberius	37		Clement,	The Gnostics, Cerinthus, Hymenæus, Philetus, who together with Demas and Diotrephes, are rather to be consideres as apostates than as heretics.	The offerings presented to Jesus Christ by the Wise Men from the East.	Gratius.
Caligula	41		Barnabas,		The Four Passovers celebrated by Christ.	Ovid.
Claudius	54		Hermas.		John the Baptist beheaded.	Hyginus.
Nero	68		Philo, the Jew.	The Nicolaitans.	Christ's miracles, sufferings, death, resurrection, and ascension.	Labeo.
Galba	69	Linus.	Flavius Josephus.	Ebion.	The descent of the Holy Ghost.	Valerius Maximus.
Otho	69	Anacletus.	These are almost all the genuine ecclesiastical writers of the first century, whose works are now extant; for the supposed letter of Christ to Abgarus, the Gospels, Acts, Epistles, and Liturgies, that have (beside those which we esteem canonical) been attributed to the Apostles —as also the Epistles of Mary to Ignatius and others—the Acts of Pilate—the Epistles of Seneca to St. Paul, &c. Must be considered as a pocryphal and spurious.	The Nazarenes.	St. Stephen, the first Martyr.	Phædrus.
Vitellius	70	Clement.		N. B. The Ebionites and Nazarenes though generally placed by the the learned in the first century, yet belong more properly to the second.	The Conversion of St. Paul.	Verrius Flaccus.
Vespasian	79	Evaristus.			Institution of *Agapæ*, or Feasts of Charity.	Strabo.
Titus	81	Alexander.			Baptism is administered by immersion.	Dionysius of Alexandria.
Domitian	96	The dates of the deaths of the Roman pontiffs are not the same in the accounts of chronologists. Petau, Fleury, Pearson, Marcel, Pfaff, Bower, Lenglet, and others, differ frequently in this respect; and their differences sometimes are considerable. For example, the death of pope Anicetus is placed, by Petau and Lenglet, in the year 161, by Pearson and Pfaff in 162, by Fleury, Walch, and Bower, in 168. As it is impossible to reconcile these historians, and difficult often to decide which calculates best, we	The works that bear the name of Dionysius the Areopagite, were forged in the fifth century.		Several Christian Churches founded.	Seneca, the rhetorician.
Nerva	98				The first persecution under Nero.	Seneca, the philosopher and poet.
					The oracles reduced to silence, a dubious, or rather a fabulous story.	Velleius Paterculus.
					The destruction of Jerusalem.	Cremutius
					The accounts of a dispute between St. Peter and Simon the magician at Rome, and of the erection of a statue to the	Isidore of Charax.
						Celsus, the physician.
						Massurius Sabinus.
						Didymus of Alexandria.
						Cocceius Nerva.
						Philo the Jew.
						Pomponius Mela.
						Columella.
						Remmius Palæmon.
						Votienus.
						Servilius Marcus.
						Annæus Cornutus.
						Lucan.
						Andromachus.
						Petronius.
						Persius.
						Epictetus.
						Dioscorides.
						Flavius Josephus.
						Silius Italicus.
						Valerius Flaccus.

Sovereign Princes.	*Popes, or Bishops of Rome.*	*Ecclesiastical and Theological writers.*	*Heretics.*	*Remarkable Events.*	*Profane Authors.*
	shall follow Pearson and Pfaff as the surest guides.			latter in that city, seem idle fictions. The second persecution of the Christians under Domitian. St. John thrown into a caldron of boiling oil, a doubtful story. The adventures of Apollonius Tyaneus.	Pliny the Elder. Pliny the Younger. Asconius Pedianus. Plinius Valerianus. Juvenal. Martial. Statius. Frontinus. Quintilian. Dion Chrysostom. Tacitus. Phlegon. Apion. Trogus Pompeius. Athenodorus.

CENTURY II.

Sovereign Princes.	*Popes, or Bishops of Rome.*	*Ecclesiastical and Theological Writers.*	*Heretics.*	*Remarkable Events, and Religious Rites and Institutions.*	*Profane Authors.*
Roman Emperors: A. D. Trajan 117 Adrian 138 Anton. Pius 161 M. Antoninus 180 L. Verus Commodus 192 Pertinax 193 Did. Julianus 193 Niger 194 Albinus 197	Xystus or Sixtus 127 Telesphorus 138 Hyginus 150 Pius I. 153 Anicetus 162 Soter 172 Eleutherius 185 Victor 196	Ignatius of Antioch. Polycarp. Justin Martyr. Hegesippus. Theophilus of Antioch, the first who made use of the word Trinity to express the distinction of what divines call persons in the Godhead. The Christian church is very little obliged to him for his invention. The use of this and and other unscriptural terms, to which men attach either no ideas, or false ones, has wounded charity and peace, without promoting truth and knowledge. It has produced heresies of the worst kind.— Melito. Tatian.* Papias. Claudius Apollinaris. Hermias. Athenagoras. Clemens Alexandrinus. Tertullian. Aquila. Theodotion. Symmachus. The unknown Author of the Sibylline Oracles. Irenæus. Polycrates. Dionysius of Corinth. Pantænus. Quadratus. Add to these several fragments of the writings of some of the principal heretics mentioned in the following column. These fragments are collected by Cotelerius, Grabe, &c.	Nazarenes. Gnostics. Cainites. Elxai. Saturninus. The Millenarians. Basilides. Isidore, the Son. Carpocrates and his followers. Marcellina and Epiphanes. Prodicus, the chief of the Adamites. Valentine and his followers. *Tatian supposed to be the chief of the Encratites, Hydroparastates, and Apotactics. Ptolomæus Secundus. Cerdo. Marcion. Florinus. The Docetæ, or Phantasiasts. The Melitonians. The Saccophori. Severians. Ophites. Artotyrites. Theodotus, the Tanner, chief of the Alogi. Montanus. Tertullian. Priscilla and Maximilla, who where called Montanists, Cataphryges, and Pepuzians. The Sethites and Abelites. Heracleon. Bassus. Colarbasus. Blastus. Mark. The Valentinians. Bardesanes. Hermogenes. Apelles. Praxeas, the chief of the Patropassians, Seleucus and Hermias. Artemon.	Third persecution under Trajan, mitigated by the intercession of Pliny, the Younger. Fourth persecution under Adrian. Fifth Persecution under Antoninus Pius, continued under Marcus Aurelius and Lucius Verus. Conversion of the Germans and Gauls, and (if we may give credit to Bede) of the Britons. The Thundering Legion —a dubious event. Insurrections of the Jews against the Romans. Sedition and slaughter of that people under the standards of Barcochebа, the false Messiah. The Jews are driven from Jerusalem. Horrible calumnies thrown out against the Christians by Lucian, Crescens, Celsus, and the Pagans in general. The perusal of the Sibylline Oracles prohibited by an imperial edict. Christian assemblies are held on Sundays, and other stated days, in private houses, and in the burying-places of Martyrs. Infant baptism and sponsors used in this century. Various festivals and fasts established. A distinction formed between bishops and presbyters, who, with the deacons and readers, are the only orders of ecclesiastics known in this century. The sign of the cross and anointing used. The custom of praying towards the East introduced.	Arrian. Aulus Gellius. Plutarch. Florus. Celsus, the lawyer. Œnomaus Philo of Phœnicia. Ptolemy, the astronomer and geographer. Salvius Julianus. Seutonius. Apollonius, the philosopher. Appian. Fronto. Maximus Tyrius. Taurus Calvisius. Apuleius. Artemidorus. Lucian. Numenes. Pausanias. Polyænus. Sextus Empiricus. Athenæus. Julius Pollux. Diogenes Laertius. Gallienus. Ammonius Saccas. Priscus. Cephalion. Aristides. Hermogenes, who at the age of seventeen published his Rhetoric; at twenty, his Book on Ideas; and, at twenty-five, is said to have forgotten all that he had learned. Justin Martyr. Theophilus of Antioch. Chrysorus. Marcus Antoninus. Harpocration. Athenagoras. Celsus, the philosopher. Julinus Solinus. Plotinus. Papinian.

CENTURY III.

Sovereign Princes.	*Popes, or Bishops of Rome.*	*Ecclesiastical and Theological Writers.*	*Heretics.*	*Remarkable Events, and Religious Rites and Institutions.*	*Profane Authors.*
Roman Emperors: A. D.	Zephyrinus 219	The author of the Acts of Perpetua and Felicitas.	Adelphius.	Sixth Persecution under Severus, in which Leonidas, Irenæus, Victor, bishop of Rome, Perpetua, Felicitas, and others, suffer martyrdom.	Ælius Maurus.
Severus 211	Callistus 224	Minutius Felix.	Aquilinus.	Seventh Persecution (after one under Maximin) under Decius, in which Fabianus, the Roman pontiff, Babylas, Alexander, and others, suffer martyrdom.	Oppian, the Poet.
Caracalla 217	Urban 231	Hippolytus.	Manes, the chief of the Manicheans.	Eighth Persecution under Valerian, in which those more illustrious martyrs, Cyprian, Lucius, Stephen I. Sixtus I. and Laurentius, suffer for the faith.	Quintus Seren.
Geta 212	Pontianus 235	Ammonius.	Hierax.	Ninth Persecution under Diocletian, Maximian, Galerius, and Maximin, much more cruel than the preceding, and famous for the martyrdom of the Theban Legion, which however is a very dubious story.	Sammonicus.
Macrinus 218	Anterus 236	Julius Africanus.	Noetus.	The Jewish Talmud and and Targum composed in this century.	Julius Africanus.
Heliogabalus 222	Fabianus 251	Origen.	Sabellius.	The Jews are allowed to return into Palestine.	Acolus.
Severus Alexander 235	Cornelius 254	Cyprian.	Beryllus.	Jewish schools erected at Babylon, Sora, and other places.	Dio Cassius.
Maximin 237	A contest between him and Novatian	Novatian.	Paul of Samosata.	Remarkable deaths of those who persecuted the Christians, related by Tertullian, Eusebius, and Lucius Cæcilius.	Ulpian.
Gordian I. II. 237	Lucius 256	Gregory Thaum.	Novatians.	Many illustrious men, and Roman senators, converted to Christianity.	Ephorus.
Pupienus and Balbinus 238	Stephen 258	Dionysius of Alexandria.	Patropassians.	The origin of the monastic life derived from the austere manners of Paul the Theban, the first hermit.	Censorinus.
Gordian III. 244	Sixtus II. 259	Pamphilus.	Arabians.	Diocletian assumes the name and honours due to Jupiter, and orders the people to worship him.	C. Curius Fortunatus.
Philip the Arabian supposed to have been the first Christian emperor 250	Dionysius 270	Anatolius.	Cathari.	Religious rites are greatly multiplied in this century; altars used; wax tapers employed.	Herodian.
Decius 252	Felix 275	Arnobius Africanus.	Valesians.	Public churches, called in Greek Κυριακα, built for the celebration of divine worship.	Nicagoras.
Gallus and Volusianus 253	Eutychianus 283	Commodianus.	Privatus.	The Pagan mysteries injudiciously imitated in many respects by Christians.	Amelius.
Æmilianus 253	Caius Marcellinus 296	Archelaus.	A schism between Stephen and Cyprian, concerning the re-baptizing of heretics.	The tasting of milk and honey, previous to baptism, introduced. The person is anointed before and after that holy rite—receives a crown, and goes arrayed in white for sometime after.	Gentilianus.
Valerian 259		Lucianus.		The story of the seven sleepers of Ephesus, and the martyrdom of Ursula, and the 11,000 British Virgins, the principal fables invented in this century.	Erennius.
Gallienus 268		Hesychius.			Dexippus.
Claudius II 270		Methodius.			Cassius Longinus.
Quintilius 270		Theognostus.			Julius Capitolinus.
Aurelian 275		Malchion.			Ælius Lampridius.
Tacitus 275		Paul of Samosata.			Trebellius Pollio.
Florianus 276		Stephen, R. Pont.			Porphyry.
Probus 282		Eusebius, a deacon of Alexandria.			Ælius Spartianus.
Carus 283		Dionysius, R. Pont.			Flavius Vopiscus.
Carinus 284		Basilides, Bishop of Pentapolis.			M. Aurel.
Numerianus 284		Victorinus.			Olymp.
Diocletian		Prudentius.			Nemesianus.
Maximian					Alexander, a Greek philosopher.
					Philostratus.
					Julius Paulus.
					Sextus Pomponius.
					Herennius.
					Modestinus.
					Hermogenianus.
					Palladius Rutilius.
					Taurus Æmilianus.
					Justin.
					Julius Calphurnius.
					Arnobius.

CENTURY IV.

Sovereign Princes.	*Popes, or Bishops of Rome.*	*Ecclesiastical and Theological Writers.*	*Heretics, real or reputed.*	*Remarkable Events, and Religious Rites and Institutions.*	*Profane Authors.*
Roman Emperors: A.D.	Marcellinus 304	Lactantius Firm.	The Manichæans disguised under the denominations of Encratites, Apotactics, Saccophori, Hydroparastates, and Solitaries.	The Tenth Persecution continued.	Ælius Donatus.
Diocletian and Maximian abdicate the empire in the year 305	Marcellus 309	Lucius Cæcilius.		The Athanasians or Orthodox persecuted by Constantius, who was an Arian, and by Valens, who ordered 80 of their deputies, all ecclesiastics, to be put on board of a ship, to which fire was set as soon as it had cleared the coast.	Servius.
Galerius 311	Eusebius 311	Dorotheus, bishop of Tyre.			Helladius.
Constantius 306	Melchiades 313	Eusebius, bishop of Cæsarea.	Arius and his followers, who were divided into Eunomians, Semiarians, Eusebians, Homoiousians, Acacians, and Psathyrians.		Andronicus Nonius.
Constantine the Great 337	Sylvester 335	Constantine the Great.			Marcellus.
His adversaries,	Mark 336	Eustathius, bishop of Antioch.			Sext. Aurelius Victor.
Maximin 313	Julius 352	Commodianus.			Maximus of Smyrna, who is supposed to have taught the emperor Julian magic.
Maxentius 312	Liberius 367	Alexander, bishop of Alexandria.			Oribases.
Licinius 325	A schism between Liberius and Felix	Juvencus.	Photinus, Apollinaris, Father and Son.	The Christians persecuted by Sapor.	Eutropius.
Constantine II. 338	Damasus 384	Athanasius, bishop of Alexandria.			Libanius.
Constantius 361	A new schism between this pontiff and Ursinus.	Antonius, who (with Paul the hermit) was the first institutor of the monastic life.	Macedonius.	The supposed conversion of Constantine the Great, by a vision representing a fiery cross in the air.	Ausonius.
Constans 350	Siricius 398	Marcellus, bishop of Ancyra.	The Anthropomorphites.	First General council. It was held at Nice in 325. In it the opinions of Arius were condemned, and the popes declared merely equal in dignity to other Christian bishops.	Pappus, the famous mathematician.
Julian, the Apostate 363		Theodore bishop of Heraclea.	Priscillian.		Prudentius.
Jovian 364		Julius, bishop of Rome.	Andæus.		Rufus Festus.
Valentinian 375		Jul. Firm.	The Messalians, or Euchites.	A second general council is held in the year 381, at Constantinople, in which the errors of Macedonius are condemned.	Avienus.
Valens 378		Maternus.	Collyridians.		Themistius.
Gratian 383		Pachomius.	Eustathians.		Flavius Vegetius.
Valentinian II. 392		Eusebius, bishop of Emessa.	Coluthus.		Hierocles.
Theodosius the Great 395		Serapion.	Helvidius.	Remarkable progress of the Christian religion among the Indians, Goths, Marcomanni, and Iberians.	Julian.
The division of the Roman Empire into the Eastern and Western Empires.		Cyril, bishop of Jerusalem.	Bonosus.		Ammianus Marcellinus.
[*The Visigoths settle in Gaul and Spain about the end of this century.*]		Hilarius, bishop of Poictiers.	Vigilantius.		Symmachus.
Athanaric 382		Lucifer, bishop of Cagliari.	Three schisms of the Meletians, and Luciferians, and Donatists.	The famous donation of Constantine in favour of the Roman see—a mere fable.	Lactantius.
Alaric.		Phœbadius, bishop of Agen.			Jamblichus.
		Eunomius.		The miraculous defeat of Eugenius by Theodosius.	Ælius Lampridius.
		Zeno, bishop of Verona.			Eusebius of Cæsarea.
		Titus, bishop of Bostra.		Julian's attempt to invalidate the predictions of the prophets, by encouraging the Jews to rebuild the temple of Jerusalem, defeated by an earthquake and fiery eruption. See the learned bp. Warburton's interesting and ingenious work, entitled *Julian.*	Jul. Firmicus Maternus.
		Damacus, bishop of Rome.			Chalcidius.
		Epiphanius, bishop of Salamis.			Pomponius.
		Optatus, bishop of Milevi.			Festus.
		Pacianus.			Quintus Curtius.
		Marius Victorinus.			Macrobius.
		Liberius, bishop of Rome.		Theodosius the Great is obliged by Ambrose, bishop of Milan, to do public penance for the slaughter of the Thessalonians.	
		Ephraim the Syrian.			
		Didymus of Alex.		The Eucharist was, during this century, administered in some places to infants and persons deceased.	
		Basil, bishop of Cæsarea.			
		Gregory, bishop of Nazianzum.		Something like the doctrine of Transubstantiation is maintained, and the ceremony of the elevation used in the celebration of the Eucharist.	
		Gregory, bishop of Nyssa.			
		Amphilochius, bishop of Iconium.			
		Hegesippus.			
		Apollinaris, Father and Son.			
		Eusebius, Bishop of Verceil.			
		Diodore, bishop of Tarsus.			
		Proba Falconia.			
		The three Macarii.			
		Ambrose.			
		Jerome.			
		Ruffinus.			
		Philastrius.			
		Paulinus, bishop of Nola.			
		Augustin.			
		John Chrysostom.			

The council of Elvira in Spain, held in the year 305, not only solemnly forbids the adoration of pictures or images, but even prohibits the use of them.

The use of incense and of the censer, with several other superstitious rites, introduced. — The churches are considered as externally holy, the saints are invoked, images used, and the Cross worshipped.

The clerical order augmented by new ranks of ecclesiastics, such as archdeacons, country bishops, archbishops, metropolitans, exarchs, &c.

CENTURY V.

Sovereign Princes.	*Popes, or Bishops of Rome.*	*Ecclesiastical and Theological writers.*	*Heretics real or reputed.*	*Remarkable Events.*	*Profane Authors.*
Emperors of the West. A. D.	Anastasius 402	Gaudentius, bishop of Bresse.	Vigilantius.	Foundation of the French monarchy by Pharamond, or rather by Clovis.	Anienus.
Honorius 423	Innocent 417	Sulpicius Severus.	Pelagius, Cœlestius, Julian, authors of what is called the Pelagian Heresy.	An earthquake swallows up several cities in Palestine.	Martianus Capella.
Valentinian III. 455	Zosimus 418	Palladius.	John Cassian.	A third General Council held at Ephesus, at which Nestorius was deposed, in the year 431.	Claudian.
Maximus 455	Boniface I. 423	Heraclides.	Faustus.	A fourth General Council held at Chalcedon against Eutyches in the year 451.	Eunapius.
Avitus 456	A schism between this pope and Eulalius	Innocentius.	Gennadius, Vincent of Lerins, Semi-Pelagians.	Progress of Christianity among the Franks and Germans.	Macrobius.
Majorianus 461	Celestine I. 432	Polybius.	Nestorius.	The conversion of the Irish to the Christian faith attempted in vain by Palladius, but effected by St. Patrick, whose original name was Succathus, who arrived in Ireland in the year 432.	Olympiodorus.
Severus 465	Sixtus III. 440	Pelagius.	Theodoret.	Terrible persecutions carried on against the Christians in Britain, by the Picts, Scots, and Anglo-Saxons,—in Spain, Gaul, and Africa, by the Vandals—in Italy and Pannonia, by the Visigoths—in Africa, by the Donatists and Circumcellians—in Persia, by Isdegerdes—beside the particular persecutions carried on alternately against the Arians and Athanasians.	Orosius.
Anthemius 472	Leo the Great 461	Cœlestius.	Theodore of Tarsus.	The extinction of the western empire.	Peutinger.
Olybrius 472	Hilarius 467	Theodore, bishop of Mopsuesta.	Theodore of Mopsus.	The Theodosian Code drawn up.	Rutilius Claudius.
Glycerius deposed in 474	Simplicius 483	Polychronius.	Nestorians.	The city of Venice founded by the inhabitants of the adjacent coast, who fled from the incursions of the Barbarians.	Numantianus.
Julius Nepos deposed in 475	Felix III. 492	Nonnus.	Eutyches.	Felix III. bishop of Rome (whom Bower and others look upon as the second pope of that name) is excommunicated, and his name struck out of the diptychs, or sacred registers, by Acacius, bishop of Constantinople.	Servius Honoratus.
Romulus Augustulus, who reigned till the 23d of August, when Odoacer took the title of king of Italy, and put an end to the western empire.	Gelasius 496	Synesius.	Dioscorus.	Many ridiculous fables are invented during this century; such as the story of the vial of oil, brought from heaven by a pigeon at the baptism of Clovis—the vision of Attila, &c.	Sidonius Apollinaris.
Kings of Italy:	Anastasius II. 498	Isidore of Pelusium.	The Acephali.—Monophysites.—Jacobites.—Armenians.—Theopaschites.—Predestinarians.—Cœlicolæ.		Candidus, the Isaurian.
Odoacer 493	Symmachus I. A schism between him and Laurentius.	Cyril of Alexandria.	Peter, the Fuller.		Zosimus, the historian.
Theodoric		Orosius.	Xenaias.		Idacius.
Emperors of the East:		Marius Mercator.			Quintus, or Cointus.
Arcadius 408		Maximus, bishop of Turin.			Priscus.
Theodosius II. 450		Theodoret.			Musæus.
Marcianus 457		Cassian.			Proclus.
Leo I. 474		Peter Chrysologus.			Simplicius.
Leo II. 474		Hilarius.			
Zeno Isaur 491		Philostorgius.			
Anastasius		Vincent of Lerins.			
Gothic kings of Spain:		Socrates.			
Alaric 411		Sozomenes.			
Ataulphus 415		Leo the Great.			
Sigeric 415		Prosper.			
Vallia 420		Idacius.			
Theodoric 451		Basil.			
Thorismond 452		Seleucus.			
Theodoric II. 466		Arnobius the Younger.			
Euric 484		Claudian Mamertus.			
Alaric II.		Faustus.			
Kings of France:		Felix, the Roman pontiff.			
Pharamond, first king, 420		Vigilius Tapsensis, supposed by some learned men to have been the author of what is commonly called the Athanasian Creed.			
Clodion 451		Victor the African.			
Meroveus 456		Gennadius.			
Childeric 481		Zosimus.			
Clovis I.		Prosper.			
The Kings of the Vandals in Africa, where they settled in the year 429		Sidonius Apollinar.			
Genseric 466		Æneas Gaza.			
Huneric 484					
Gontamond 496					
Thrasamond					
Kings of England:					
Vortigern					
Kingdom of Kent founded by Hengist the Saxon, in 457, and that of Sussex by Ælla, in 499					

CENTURY VI.

Sovereign Princes.

Kings of Italy. A. D.
Theodoric 526
Athalaric 534
Amalasuntha 534
Theodatus 536
Vitiges 540
Idebald 541
Totila 553
Teias 554
Emperors of the East:
Anastasius 518
Justin I. 527
Justinian 565
Justin II. 578
Tiberius II. 586
Mauritius
Gothic Kings of Spain:
Alaric 507
Gesalric 512
Amalaric 531
Theudis 548
Theodegesil 548
Agila 552
Athanagilda 567
Leuva 568
Leuvigild 585
Recared
These princes were masters also of Narbonne and Aquitaine.
Kings of England:
The third Saxon kingdom is founded in England by Cerdic, in 519, and is called the kingdom of the West Saxons.
The fourth, or that of the East Saxons, by Erchenwin, in 527
The fifth, that of Northumberland, by Ida, in 547
The sixth, that of the East Angles, by Uffa, in 573
The seventh, that of Mercia, by Crida, in 585
Thus was successively formed the Saxon Heptarchy.
Kings of France:
Clovis I. 511
The kingdom is divided among his four sons, viz.
Thierry, Metz, 534
Clodomir, Orleans 534
Childebert, Paris 558
Clotaire, Soisons 562
A second division of the kingdom among the four sons of Clotaire I. viz. Cherebert, Paris 566
Gontran, Orleans 593
Chilperic, Soissons 584
Sigebert, Metz 575
Kings of the Vandals in Africa:
Thrasamond 523

Popes, or Bishops of Rome.

Symmachus 514
Hormisdas 523
John I. 526
Felix IV. 529
Boniface II. 531
A schism between Boniface and Dioscorus
John II. 535
Agapetus I. 536
Sylverius 540
A schism between Sylverius and Vigilius.
Vigilius 555
Pelagius I. 558
John III. 572
Benedict I. 577
Pelagius II. 590
Gregory I.

Sovereign Princes. Concluded.

A. D.
Hilderic 530
Gilimer, defeated and taken prisoner by Belisarius, in the year 534
By this event Africa became again subject to the Emperors of the East.
Kings of the Lombards, who entered Italy in the year 568
Alboinus 571
Clephis 573
Antharis 590
Agilulph
Exarchs of Ravenna:
Lingonus 583
Smaragdus 588
Romanus 598
Callinicus

Ecclesiastical and Theological Writers.

Cæsarius, bishop of Arles.
Fulgentius, bishop of Ruspa.
Boëthius.
Timothy of Constantinople.
Emodius.
Severus.
Cassiodorus.
Procopius.
Peter, the deacon.
Maxentius, a Scythian monk.
Dionysius, the Little.
Fulgentius Ferrandus.
Marcellinus.
Zachary, the schoolman.
Hesychius.
Facundus Hermian.
Pope Vigilius.
Rusticus, a Roman deacon.
Junilius.
Victor of Capua.
Primasius.
Jornandes.
Liberatus.
Victor the African.
Venantius Fortunatus.
Anastasius of Mount Sinai, afterwards bishop of Antioch.
John the schoolman.
Cosmas.
Gildas.
Leander.
John of Constantinople.
Columbanus.
Leontius Byzant.
Leontius of Cyprus.
Gregory the Great.
Isidore of Seville.
Lucius Carinus.
Proclus Diadochus.

Heretics.

Deuterius.
Severus, leader of the Acephali.
Themistius, chief of the Agnoites, who maintained that Christ was ignorant of the day of judgment.
Barsanians, or Semidulites, who maintained that Christ had suffered only in appearance.
Jacob Zanzale, the chief of the Jacobites, or Monophysites.
John Philopomus, the chief of the Tritheites.
Damianists.
Origenists.
Corrupticolæ.
Acœmetæ.
The Arians, Nestorians, Eutychians, and Pelagians, continued to raise troubles in the church.

Remarkable Events.

Several nations converted to Christianity.
The canon of the mass established by Gregory the Great.
The Benedictine Order founded.
Forty Benedictine monks, with Augustine at their head, are sent into Britain by Gregory the Great, in the year 596; who convert Ethelbert, king of Kent, to the Christian faith.
The Ostrogothic kingdom is destroyed by Justinian, who becomes master of Italy.
The Lombards invade Italy in the year 568, and erect a new kingdom at Ticinum.
The Christians are persecuted in several places.
The orthodox are oppressed by the emperor Anastasius, Thrasamond, king of the Vandals, Theodoric, king of the Ostogoths, &c.
Female convents are greatly multiplied in this century.
Litanies introduced into the church of France.
The Arians are driven out.
Superstition of the Stylites introduced by Simeon, the head of that crazy sect, who spent his life on the top of a pillar, and foolishly imagined, that he would, by this trick, render himself agreeable to the Deity. The Romish writers say, he chose this lofty habitation (for the pillar was 36 cubits high) to avoid the multitude which crowded about him to see his miracles.
The Christian æra is formed in this century by Dionysius the Little, who first began to reckon the course of time from the birth of Christ.
The Justinian code, Pandect, Institutions, and Novels, collected and formed into a body.
Antioch, that was destroyed by an earthquake, is rebuilt by Justinian.
The fifth general council assembled at Constantinople in the year 553, under Justinian I. in which the Origenists and the Three Chapters were condemned.

Learned Men, Historians, Philosophers, and Poets.

Justinian Boëthius.
Trebonian.
Agathias, who continued the history composed by Procopius.
Jornandes.
Gregory of Tours.
Marius, bishop of Avranches, an eminent historian.
Menander, the historian.
Stephen of Byzantium.
Magn. Aurelius Cassiodorus.
Dionysius the Little.

CENTURY VII.

Sovereign Princes.	*Popes, or Bishops of Rome.*	*Archbishops of Canterbury.*	*Ecclesiastical and Theological Writers.*	*Heretics, real or reputed.*	*Remarkable Events.*	*Profane Authors.*
Emperors of the East:	Gregory I. 604	Augustine, first archbishop of Canterbury was nominated to that high office in the year 597 by Gregory the Great, bishop of Rome, with the consent of Ethelbert, king of Kent: he died in year 611, or, as some say, in 605.	John Philonus.	The ancient heresies were still in vigour during this century; to these were added the sects of the Paulicians and Monothelites.	An extraordinary progress is made in the conversion of the English.	The author of the Alexandrian Chronicle.
A. D.	Sabinianus 605		John Malela.		The archbishoprics of London and York are founded, with 12 bishoprics under the jurisdiction of each.	Isidore of Seville, who, beside his theological productions, composed a History of the Goths and Vandals, and a work entitled Etymologicon Scientiarum, in which he gives an account of the origin and nature of the different sciences.
Mauritius 602	Boniface III. 606		Hesychius of Jerusalem.		The archbishopric of London is translated to Canterbury.	
Phocas 610	Boniface IV. 614		Theophylact.		The Gospel is propagated with success in Holland, Friseland and Germany.	
Heraclius 641	Deodatus 617		Simocatta.		The schism, between the Greek and Latin churches, commences in this century.	In this century commenced that long period of ignorance and darkness, which remained until the light of the Reformation arose.
Constantine III. 641	Boniface V. 625		Antiochus.		The rise of Mohammed, and the rapid progress of his religion, which is propagated by fire and sword.	
Heraclianus 642	Honorius I. 630		Modestus.		The Mohammedan æra, called the Hegira, commences with the year of Christ 622.	
Constans II. 668	Severinus I. 639		Cyrus of Alexand.		The destruction of the Persian monarchy under the reign of Isdegerdes III.	
Constantine IV. 685	John IV. 641		Jonas.		Boniface IV. receives from that odious tyrant Phocas (who was the great patron of the popes and the chief promoters of their grandeur) the famous Pantheon, which is converted into a church. Here Cybele was succeeded by the Virgin Mary, and the Pagan deities by Christian martyrs. Idolatry still subsisted; but the objects of it were changed.	
Leontius 698	Theodore I. 648		Gallus.		Ina, king of the West Saxons, resigns his crown, and assumes the monastic habit in a convent at Rome. During the Heptarchy, many Saxon kings took the same religious turn, Pope Agatho discontinued the payment of the tribute which the see of Rome had been accustomed to pay the emperor at the election of its pontiff.	
Tiberius III. 703	Martin I. 655		John Moschus.		The Sixth General council is held at Constantinople, under Constantine Pogonatus, against the Monothelites, in the year 680.	
Justinian II.	Eugenius I. 656		Andreas Damascenus.		The Seventh, which is looked upon by some as a kind of supplement to this, was held in the Trullus, under Justinian II. in the year 692, and is called Quinisextum.	
Kings of the Goths in Spain:	Vitalianus 671		George Pisides.			
Victeric	Adeodatus 676		Eligius.			
Gondemar	Domnus 678		The two Theodores.			
Sisebut 621	Agatho I. 682		Paulus.			
Recared II. 621	Leo II. 684		The emp. Heraclius.			
Suinthila 631	Benedict II. 685		Maximus Conf.			
Sizenand 636	John V. 686		Theodore the monk.			
Chintila 640	Conon 687		The emp. Constans II.			
Tulga 642	Sergius I. 701		Martin, bishop of Rome.			
Chindasuinthe 649	A schism occasioned by the pretensions of Theodore and Paschal.		Maurus of Ravenna.			
Recesuinthe 672			Anastasius a monk — a Rom. presb.			
Vamba 680			Fructuosus.			
Ervige 687			Peter, metropolitan of Nicomedia.			
Egica			Julian Pomerius.			
Kings of France:			Agatho.			
Clotaire II. 628			John of Thessalonica.			
Dagobert 638			Cresconius.			
Sigebert II. 654			Ildefonsus.			
Clovis 660			Marculph.			
Clotaire III. 668			John Climachus.			
Childeric II. 673			Fortunatus Venant.			
Dagobert II. 679			Isidore of Seville, who composed Commentaries on the Historical Books of the old Testament, and is acknowledged to have been the principal author of the famous Mosarabic Liturgy, which is the ancient Liturgy of Spain.			
Theodoric 690			Dorotheus.			
Clovis III. 695			Sophronius, bishop of Jerusalem.			
Childebert III.						
The race of the weak kings begins with Theodoric III. and ends with Childeric III.						
England:						
The Heptarchy.						
Kings of the Lombards in Italy:						
Agilulph 616						
Adaloaldus 626						
Ariovaldus 638						
Rotharis 653						
Rodoald 656						
Aripert 662						
Gondipert 662						
Grimoald 673						
Garibald 673						
Bertharit 689						
Cunipert 706						
Exarchs of Ravenna:						
Smaragdus 610						
John 615						
Eleutherius 617						
Isaac 618						
Theodore Calliopa 649						
Olympius 650						
Theodore Calliopa II. 686						
Theodore 687						
ohn ato 702						

CENTURY VIII.

Sovereign Princes.

Emperors of the East A. D.
Justinian II. 711
Philippicus 713
Anastasius II. 714
Theodosius III. 716
Leo III.
Isaur 741
Constantine V.
Copron. 775
Leo IV. 780
Constantine VI.
Porphyr. 797
Irene.

Kings of the Visigoths in Spain:
Egica 701
Vitiza 710
Roderic, the last king of the Goths 713

Kings of Leon and the Asturias:
Pelagius 737
Favila 739
Alphonso 757
Froila 768
Aurelio 774
Silo 783
Maurregato 789
Veremond 791
Alphonso II.

Kings of France:
ChildebertIII. 711
Dagobert III. 715
Chilperic II 720
TheodoricIV. 736
Interregnum, fromthe year 737 to 743, during which time Carloman and Pepin, sons of Charles Martel, govern without the regaltitle.
Childeric III. dethroned in 750
The last king of the first race.

Second race:
Pepin 768
Charlemagne

England:
The Heptarchy.

Kings of the Lombards in Italy:
Luitpert 704
Ragombert 704
Aripert 712
Ansprand 712
Luitprand 744
Rachis 750
Aistulphus 756
Desiderius 773
The kingdom of the Lombards, which subsisted during the space of 206 years, was overturned by Charlemagne, who, having defeated Desiderius, caused himself to becrowned king of the Lombards, in the year 774.

Popes, or Bishops of Rome.

John VI. 705
John VII. 707
Sisinnius 708
Constantine 714
Gregory II. 731
Gregory III. 741
Zachary 752
Stephen II. 752
Stephen III. 757
Paul 767
A schism betweenPaul and Theophylact.
Stephen IV. 772
A schism between Constantine, Philip, and Stephen IV.
Adrian 797
Leo III.

Exarchs of Ravenna.

Theophylact 710
Jo. Procopius 712
Paul 729
Eutychius 752
The Exarchate subsisted during the space of 185 years.
It endedin thereign of Aistulphus, king of the Lombards, who reduced Ravenna, and added it to his dominions. But this prince was obliged by Pepin, king of France,to surrender theExarchate, with all its territories,castles, &c. to be for ever held by Stephen III. and his successors in the see of Rome.
This is the true foundation of the temporal grandeur of the popes.

Archbishops of Canterbury.

Brithwald 731
Tatwin 734
Nothelm 741
Cuthbert 758
Bregwin 762
Lambert
Athelard.

Ecclesiastical and Theological Writers.

Venerable Bede.
JohnDamascenus.
The anonymous author of a Book entitled, Ordo Romanus de Divinis Officiis, published in the Bibl. Patr.
Charlemagne: see the Capitularia, published by Baluze at Paris, in 1677, and the Codex Carolinus, published at Ingolstadt, in 1634, by Gretzer.
Ambrosius Authpertus.
The popes Gregory I. Gregory II. and Adrian.
Paul the Lombard.
Paulinus, bishop of Aquileia.
Alcuin, a native of England, and one of the principal instruments employed byCharlemagne for the restoration of learning. He is considered by M. Du-Pin as the person that first introduced polite literature into France; and it is to him that the universities of Paris, Tours, Soissons,&c. owe their origin.
Felix, archbishop of Ravenna.
Germanus, bishop of Constantinople.
The unknown author of a book entitled, Liber Diurnus PontificumRomanorum.
Egbert archbishop of York.
Bartholomew, a monk of Edessa, who refuted the Koran.
Boniface, archbishop of Mentz, commonly called the Apostle of Germany.
Anastasius, abbot in Palestine.
Theophanes
Aldhelm, bishop of Sherborne, under the heptarchy, and nephew to Ina, king of the West Saxons.

Heretics real or reputed.

The Eutychains, Monothelites,and Jacobites, continue to propagate their doctrines.
The Paulo-Johannists, who were so called from their leaders Paul and John, and embraced the pernicious errors of Valentine and Manes.
The Agonoclites, a wrong headed set of people who prayed dancing.
Adelbert.
Felix, bishop of Urgel.
Elipand, bishop of Toledo.
Leo, the Isaurian, who destroyed the images in the churches, and was the chief of the Iconoclastes; andClement, who preferred the decisions of Scripture to the decrees of councils; are reputed heretics by the church of Rome. Virgilius was also accused of heresy, by pope Zachary, because he was a good mathematician, and believed the existence of Antipodes.
Those who promoted the worship of images and relics in this century deserve much more justly the denomination of Heretics.

Remarkable Events. Religious rites.

Rapid progress of the Saracens in Asia and Africa.
The subversion of the kingdom of the Lombards and of the exarchate of Ravenna, the latter of which is granted to the see of Rome, by Pepin, king of France. Charlemagne adds to the grant of Pepin several provinces, though the titles and acts of this grant have not been produced by the Roman Catholic historians.
The ceremony of kissing thepope's toe introduced.
The Saxons, with Witekind, their monarch, converted to Christianity.
The Christians persecuted by the Saracens, who massacred five hundred monks in the abbey of Lerins.
The Saracens take possession of Spain.
Controversy between the Greek and Latin churches, concerning the Holy Ghost's proceeding from the Son.
The Germans converted by Boniface.
The Gospel propagated in Hyrcania and Tartary.
The right of election to the see of Rome conferred upon Charlemagne and his successors by pope Adrian, in a council of bishops assembled at Rome.
The worship of images authorised by the second council of Nice, in the year 787, which is improperly called the seventh general council.
The reading of the epistles and gospels introduced into the service of the church.
Solitary or private masses instituted.
Churches built in honour of saints.
Masses for the dead.
Willebrod sent to convert the Frisons; he was the first bishop of Utrecht.

Profane authors.

Alcuin—see the fourth column.
Bede.
Fredegarius.
John Damascenus.
George Syncellus.
Virgilius.

CENTURY IX.

Sovereign Princes.	*Popes, or Bishops of Rome.*	*Archbishops of Canterbury.*	*Ecclesiastical and Theological Writers.*	*Heretics, real or reputed.*	*Remarkable Events. Religious Rites.*	*Profane Authors.*
Emperors of the East:	Leo III. 816	Athelard 806	Nicephorus, patriarch of Constantinople.	Paulicians, a branch of the Manicheans.	The conversion of the Swedes, Danes, Saxons, Huns, Bohemians, Moravians, Sclavonians, Russians, Indians, and Bulgarians: by the last a controversy is occasioned between the Greek and Latin churches.	Photius.
A. D.	Stephen V. 817	Wulfred 830	Amalarius, bishop of Treves.	Iconoclastes	The rise of transubstantiation and the sacrifice of the mass.	Smaragdud.
Irene 802	Paschal I. 824	Theogild 830	Theodore Studita.	Iconolatræ, or image worshippers.	The cause of Christianity suffers in the east under the Saracens, and in Europe under the Normans.	Eginhard.
Nicephorus 811	Eugenius II. 827		Agobard, archbishop of Lyons.	Prædestinarians.	The power of the pope increases; that of the bishops diminishes; and the emperors are divested of their ecclesiastical authority.	Rabanus Maurus.
Stauratius 811	A schism between Eugenius II. and Zizinnus.		Eginhard.	Adoptians.	The Decretals are forged, by which the popes extended the limits of their jurisdiction and authority.	Abbon.
Michael Curopolites 813	Valentine 827		Claudius.	Transubstantiarians.	The fictitious relics of St. Mark, St. James, and St. Bartholomew, are imposed upon the credulity of the people.	Herempert.
Leo Armen. 820	Gregory IV. 844		Clement, bishop of Turin.		Monks and abbots now first employed in civil affairs, and called to the courts of princes.	Leon.
Michael Balb. 829	Sergius II. 847		Jonas, bishop of Orleans.		The festival of All-Saints is added, in this century, to the Latin calendar by Gregory IV. though some authors of note place this institution in the seventh century, and attribute it to Boniface IV.	Sergius.
Theophilus 842	Leo IV. 855		Freculph, bishop of Lysieux.		The superstitious festival of the Assumption of the Virgin Mary, instituted by the council of Mentz, and confirmed by pope Nicolas I. and afterwards by Leo X.	Methodius.
Michael III. 867	Pope Joan		Moses Barcepha.		The trial by cold water introduced by pope Eugenius II. though Le Brun, in his Histoire des Pratiques Superstitieses, endeavours to prove this ridiculous invention more ancient.	Walafridus Strabo.
Basil I.	Bened. III. 858		Photius, patriarch of Constantinople.		The emperor Louis II. is obliged by the arrogant pontiff Nicolas I. to perform the functions of a groom, and hold the bridle of this pope's horse, while his pretended holiness was dismounting.	John Scot Erigena.
Macedo 886	A schism between Benedict and Anastasius.		Theod. Abucara.		The first Legends or Lives of the Saints appear in this century.	Alfred the Great, king of England.
Leo VI.	Nicolas I. 867		Petrus Siculus.			His Saxon version of Orosius was never published.
Philos.	Adrian II. 872		Nicetas David.			Abon-Nabas, an Arabian poet.
Emperors of the West:	John VIII. 882		Rabanus Maurus, archbishop of Mentz.			The khalif al-Mamoun, an eminent mathematician and astronomer. N. B. Haroun, the father of this prince, sent to Charlemagne a striking clock, with springs and wheels, which was the first ever seen in France, and shows that, at this period, the arts were more cultivated in Asia than in Europe.
The Western Empire was restored in the year 800, in favour of Charlemagne, who died in 814	Marimus I. 884		Hilduin.			
	Adrian III. 885		Servatus Lupus.			
	Formosus 897		Drepanius Florus.			
	A schism between him and Sergius.		Druthmar.			
Louis, the Debonnaire 840	Boniface VI. 897		Godeschalcus.			
Lothaire 855			Paschasius Radbert, the chief of the Transubstantiarians.			
Louis II. 875			Bertram or Ratram of Corby, who refuted the monstrous errors of Radbert, and was at the head of those who denied the corporal presence of Christ in the Eucharist.			
Charles II. surnamed the Bald 877			Haymo, bishop of Halberstadt.			
Louis III. 879			Walafridus Strabo.			
Carloman 880			Hincmar, archbishop of Rheims.			
Charles III. deposed 887			John Scot Erigena.			
After the death of this prince, (who was the last king of France that was emperor) Germany and Italy were entirely separated from the French monarchy.			Ansegisus.			
			Florus, the deacon.			
			Prudens, bishop of Troyes.			
Arnolph 899			Remy of Lyons.			
Louis IV.			Nicolas.			
Kings of Spain, i. e. of Leon and the Asturias.			Adrian.			
			John VIII. Pope.			
Alphonso the Chaste 824			Anastasius, Bibl.			
Ramiro 851			Auxilius.			
Ordogno 862			Theodulph, bishop of Orleans.			
Alphonso III.			Smaragdus.			
Kings of France:			Aldric, bishop of Mans.			
Charlemagne 814			Ado of Vienna.			
Louis the Debonnaire 840			Isidore Mercator, author of the False Decretals.			
Charles the Bald 877			Jesse, bishop of Amiens.			
Louis III. 879			Dungale.			
Carloman 884			Halitgaire, bishop of Cambray.			
Charles III. 888			Amulo, archbishop of Lyons.			
Eudes 889			Vandalbert.			
Charles the Simple.						
Kings of England:						
The Heptarchy finished by the union of the seven kingdoms un-						

Sovereign Princes.	*Popes, or Bishops of Rome.*	*Archbishops of Canterbury.*	*Ecclesiastical and Theological Writers.*	*Heretics, real or reputed.*	*Remarkable Events. Religious Rites.*	*Profane Authors.*
A. D.	Stephen VII. 901	Celnoth 871	Angelome.	Clement, bishop of Turin, who followed the sentiments of Felix of Urgel.	The Apostles' Creed is sung in the churches.—Organs, bells, and vocal music, are introduced in many places.—Festivals multiplied.	Albategni, the mathematician.
der the government of Egbert.	A schism between Stephen VII. John IX. Romanus I. and II. and Theodore II.	Ethelred 889	Epiphanes, archbishop of Constantia, in the island of Cyprus.		The order of St. Andrew, or the Knights of the Thistle in Scotland.	Albumasar, or Abou Mashar, the Arabian astronomer.
Egbert 836		Plegmund.	Regino.		Michael I. emperor of the East, abdicates the throne, and retires into a monastery, with his wife and six children.	
Ethelwolf 857			Abbo.		Photius, patriarch of Constantinople, excommunicates the pope.	
Ethelbald 860			William, the librarian.		The canonization of saints introduced by Pope Leo II.	
Ethelbert 866			Pope Formosus.		The university of Oxford founded by Alfred.	
Ethelred I. 871			Pope Stephen.		The sciences are cultivated among the Saracens, and, particularly encouraged by the khalif Al-Mamoun.	
Alfred the Great 901			Methodius, who invented the Sclavonian characters, and made a translation of the Bible for the Bulgarians, which was used by the Russians.		Theophilus, from his abhorrence of images, banishes the painters out of the Eastern Empire.	
Kings of Scotland:			Alfred the Great, king of England, composed a Saxon Paraphrase on the Ecclesiastical History of Bede, a Saxon Version of Orosius, and a Saxon Psalter.		Harold, king of Denmark, is dethroned by his subjects, on account of his attachment to Christianity.	
The history of Scotland is divided into four great periods. The first, which commences with Fergus I. 330 years before Christ, and contains a series of 68 kings, ending with Alpinus, in the year 823, is looked upon as entirely fabulous. We shall therefore begin this chronological list with the second period, which commences with Kenneth II.			The emperor Basil Maced.		The university of Paris founded.	
Kenneth II. 854			The emperor Leo, surnamed the Wise.			
Donald V. 858						
Constantine II. 874						
Ethus 875						
Gregory 893						
Donald VI.						
Kings of Sweden:						
The origin of this kingdom is covered with uncertainty and fables.						
Some historians reckon 36 kings before Biorno III., but it is with this prince that chronologers generally begin their series.						
Biorno III. 824						
Brantamond 827						
Sivard 842						
Heroth 856						
Charles VI. 868						
Biorno IV. 883						
Ingo, or Ingeld 991						

CENTURY X.

Sovereign Princes.	*Popes, or Bishops of Rome.*	*Archbishops of Canterbury.*	*Ecclesiastical and Theological Writers.*	*Heretics real or reputed.*	*Remarkable Events. Religious rites.*	*Profane authors.*
Emperors of the East: A. D. Leo, the philosopher 911 Alexander 912 Constantine VII. surnamed Porphyrogenitus 959 Romanus Lecapenus took advantage of the youth of this prince, and seized the imperial throne, but was deposed by his son Stephen, and and died in 948 Romanus, first or second son to Constantine VII. 963 Nicephorus Phoc. 970 John Zimisces 975 Basil III. Constantine VIII. *Emperors of the West:* Louis IV. 912 Conrad I. 919 Henry I. surnamed the Fowler 936 Otho I. 973 Otho II. 983 Otho III. *Kings of Spain* i.e. *Leon and Asturias:* Alphonso III. surnamed the Great, abdicates the crown in the year 910 Garcias 913 Ordogno II. 923 Froila II. 924 Alphonso IV. 931 Ramiro II. 950 Ordogno III. 955 Ordogno IV. 956 Sanchez the Fat 967 Ramiro III. 982 Bermudo, called, by some, Veremond II. 999 Alphonso V. *Kings of France:* Charles the Simple 929 Ralph usurps the throne Louis d'Outremer 954 Lothaire II. 986 Louis the Idler, the last king of the line of Charlemagne 987 *Third Race:* Hugh Capet 996 Robert.	John IX. 905 A schism between John IX. and Sergius. Benedict IV. 906 Leo V. 906 A schism between Leo V. and Christopher. Christopher 907 A schism between Christopher and Sergius. Sergius III. 910 Anastasius III. 912 Lando 913 John X. 928 Leo VI. 929 Stephen VIII. 931 John XI. 936 Leo VII. 939 Stephen IX. 943 Marinus II. 946 Agapetus II. 955 John XII. 964 A schism between John XII. and Leo. Leo VIII. 964 Benedict V. 965 John XIII. 972 Domnus II. 972 Benedict VI. 975	Plegmund 917 Athelm 924 Wolfhelm 934 Odo 959 Dunstan 988	Simeon Metaphrastes. Leontius of Byzantium. Odo of Clugni. Ratherius, bishop Verona and Liege. Hippolytus, the Theban. Odo, archbishop of Canterbury. Eutychius, patriarch of Alexandria. Said, patriarch of Alexandria. Flodoard. Joseph Genesius Atto, bishop of Verceil. Dunstan, archbishop of Canterbury. Luitprand, abbot of Fleury. Notger, bishop of Liege. Suidas. Roswida, a poetess. Edgar, king of England. Ælfridus. Heriger. Olympiodorus. Œcumenius. Odilo. Burchard.	No new heresies were invented during this century. That of the Anthropomorphites was revived, and the greatest part of the others were continued. Thus we find Nestorians, Eutychians, Paulicians, Armenians, Anthropomorphites, and Manichæans, making a noise in this century.	Irruption of the Huns into Germany, and of the Normans into France. The Danes invade England. The Moors enter Spain. The Hungarians, and several northern nations, are converted to Christianity. The pirate Rollo is made duke of Normandy, and embraces the Christian faith. The Polanders are converted to Christianity under Micislaus, in the year 965. The Christian religion is established in Moscovy, Denmark, and Norway. The plan of the holy war is formed in this century, by pope Sylvester II. The baptism of bells; the festival in remembrance of departed souls; the institution of the Rosary; and a multitude of superstitious rites, shocking to common sense, and an insult upon true religion, are introduced in this century. Fire-ordeal introduced. The Turks and Saracens united. The Danish war continues to convulse England. Feudal tenures begin to take place in France. The influence and power of the monks increase greatly in England.	This century, by way of eminence, is styled the age of barbarism and ignorance. The greatest part of the ecclesiastical and theological authors mentioned in the column were mean, ignorant, and trivial writers, and wrote upon mean and trivial subjects. At the head of the learned men of this age we must place Gerbert otherwise known by the papal denomination of Sylvester II. This learned pontiff endeavoured to revive the drooping sciences; and the effects of his zeal were visible in this, but still more in the following century. Suidas. Geber, an Arabian chemist, celebrated by the learned Boerhaave. Constantine Porphyrogen. Mohammed Ebn Jaber Al-Batani, an Arabian astronomer.

Sovereign Princes.	*Popes, or Bishops of Rome.*	*Archbishops of Canterbury.*	*Ecclesiastical and Theological Writers.*	*Heretics, real or reputed.*	*Remarkable Events. Religious Rites.*	*Profane Authors.*
Kings of England: A. D.	Boniface VII. 984	Ethelgar 989	Valerius of Astorga in Spain. His Lives of the Fathers, very different from those that are published, are still in MS. in the library of Toledo.		The kingdom of Italy is united by Otho to the German empire.	Razi, a celebrated Arabian chemist and physician.
Edward 925	Benedict VII. 984	Siricius 994			Pope Boniface VII. is deposed and banished for his crimes.	Leontius, one of the Byzantine historians.
Athelstan 941	John XIV. 985	Aluric, or Alfric.			Arithmetical figures are brought from Arabia into Europe by the Saracens.	Joseph Genesius.
Edmund 946	John XV. 985				The empire of Germany is rendered elective by Otho III.	
Edred 955	John XVI. 996		John Malela.			
Edwy 959	Gregory V. 999		Constantine Porphyrogenitus.			
Edgar 975	A schism between John and Gregory V.		John of Capua.			
Edward the Martyr 979	Sylvester II.		Nicholas, patriarch of Constantinople.			
Ethelred II.			Gregory of Cæsarea.			
Kings of Scotland:			Epiphanes.			
Donald VI. 903			Severus.			
Constantine III. 943			Alfric, archbishop of Canterbury.			
Malcolm I. 958			Pope Gerbert.			
Indulf 967			Oswald.			
Duff 972			Sisinnius.			
Cullen 976			Hubald.			
Kenneth III. 994			Luitprand.			
Constantine IV. 995						
Grime						
Kings of Sweden:						
Ingeld II. 907						
Eric VI. 926						
Eric VII. 940						
Eric VIII. 980						
Olaus II. the Tributary.						
The beginnings of the Danish monarchy are so fabulous that we shall begin with Harold, who died in 980						
Sweyn						
Poland:						
Micislaus, the first Christian duke dies 999						

CENTURY XI.

Sovereign Princes.	*Popes, or Bishops of Rome.*	*Archbishops of Canterbury.*	*Ecclesiastical and Theological Writers.*	*Heretics, real or reputed.*	*Remarkable Events. Religious Rites.*	*Profane Authors.*
Emperors of the East: A. D.	Sylvester II. 1003	Aluric or Alfric. 1006	Dithmar, bishop of Mersburg.	Berenger, famous for his opposition to the monstrous doctrine of transubstantiation.	The Crusades are carried on with all the enormities that usually attend a blind, extravagant, and inhuman zeal.	Leo, the Grammarian.
Basil III. 1025	John XVII. 1003	Elphegus, massacred by the Danes in 1012	Leo the Grammarian.	Roscelin, a Tritheite	Godfrey of Bouillon takes possession of Jerusalem in the year 1099.	Adelbord.
Constantine VIII. 1028	John XVIII. 1009	Livingus 1020	Aimon.		A contest between the emperors and popes, in in which the latter discover a most arrogant and despotic spirit.	Michael Psellus.
Romanus II. Argyr. 1034	Sergius IV. 1012	Agelnoth 1038	Fulpert, bishop of Chartres.		The dignity of cardinal is first instituted in this century.	Anselm, archbishop of Canterbury.
Michael IV. Paphl. 1041	Benedict VIII. 1024	Eadsius 1050	Adelbold, bishop of Utrecht.		The Moors are driven by degrees from several parts of Spain; hence arose the division of that country into so many little kingdoms.	Guido Aretino, inventor of musical notes.
Michael V. Calaphates 1051	A schism between Gregory and Benedict.	Robert Gemeticensis 1052	Alexis, patriarch of Constantinople.		Matilda, daughter of Boniface, duke of Tus-	Wippo.
Constantine IX. Monomach. 1054	John XIX. 1033		Berno, of Augsburg.			John Scylitzes.
Theodora 1056	Benedict IX. 1044		Ademar.			Avicenna, or Ebn Sina, an Arabian philosopher.
Michael VI. Strat. 1057	A schism between the two Johns and Benedict.		The Brunos.			Stephen, the first Christian king of Hungary.
Isaac I. Comn. 1059	Gregory VI. 1046		Lanfranc, archbishop of Canterbury.			Alphes, a Jew.
Constantine X. Ducas 1067	Clement II. 1048		Theophanes Cerameus.			Josippon, or the false Josephus.
Romanus III.	Damasus II. 1049		Nilus Doxopatrius.			Ferdousi, a Persian Poet.
Diogenes 1071	Leo IX. 1054		Michael Psellus.			Roscellin.
Nicephorus II.	Victor II. 1057					
	Stephen X. 1059					
	Benedict X. 1059					

Sovereign Princes.	*Popes, or Bishops of Rome.*	*Archbishops of Canterbury.*	*Ecclesiastical and Theological Writers.*	*Heretics real or reputed.*	*Remarkable Events. Religious rites.*	*Profane authors.*
A. D.	Nicolas II. 1061	Stigand, deposed in 1070	Michael Cerularius.	A sect of French Manichæans, condemned in the council of Orleans.	cany, leaves all her possessions to the church of Rome, in consequence of her passionate attachment to Hildebrand, otherwise known by the papal name of Gregory VII. with whom she lived in a licentious commerce.	John the philosopher.
Botoniates 1081	A schism between Nicolas and Benedict.	Lanfranc 1089	Simeon the Younger.		Sicily, Castile, Poland, and Hungary, are erected into kingdoms.	John Curopalata, one of the Byzantine historians.
Alexis I. Comnen.	Alexander II. 1073	Anselm	Theophylact, a Bulgarian.		The kingdom of Burgundy and Arles is tranferred to the emperor Conrad II. by Rondolph king of Burgundy.	
Emperors of the West:	A schism between Alexander and Cadalous.		Cardinal Humbert.		Several of the popes are looked upon as magicians, as, in these times of darkness, learning, and more especially philosophy and mathematics, were considered as magic.	
Otho III. 1002	Gregory VII. 1086		Petrus Damianus.		Investitures introduced in this century.	
Henry II. 1024	A schism between Gregory and Guy, bishop of Ravenna.		Marianus Scotus.		Papal tyranny is nobly opposed by the emperors Henry I. II. and III. by William I. king of England, and other monarchs of that nation, by Philip, king of France, and by the British and German churches.	
Conrad II. 1039	Victor III. 1088		Anselm, archbishop of Canterbury.		Baptism is performed by triple immersion.	
Henry III. 1056	Urban II. 1099		Ivo, bishop of Chartres.		The Sabbath Fasts introduced by Gregory VII.	
Henry IV.			Hildebert, archbishop of Tours.		The Cistercian, Carthusian, and Whipping Orders, with many others, are founded in this century.	
Kings of Spain, i. e. of Leon and the Asturias.			Pope Gregory VII.		The emperor Henry IV. goes barefooted to the insolent pontiff Gregory VII. at Canusium, and does homage to this spiritual tyrant in the most ignominious manner. The same emperor, however, beseiges Rome soon after, and makes a noble stand against the pontiff.	
Alphonso V. 1027			Gerhard.		Domesday-book is compiled from a survey of all the estates in England.	
Veremond III. 1037			Hugh of Breteuil.		Jerusalem is taken by the Crusaders.	
Kings of Leon and Castile united:			Berthold.			
Ferdinand I. surnamed the Great 1065			Hermannus Contract.			
Sancho II. 1073			Peter, patriarch of Antioch.			
Alphonso VI.			Glaber Radulphus.			
Kings of France:			Deoduinus bishop of Liege.			
Robert 1031			Adelman.			
Henry I. 1060			Nicetas Pectoratus.			
Philip I.			Leo of Bulgaria.			
Kings of England:			Guitmund.			
Ethelred II. 1016			Manasses, archbishop of Rheims.			
Edmond Ironside 1017			John, patriarch of Antioch.			
Canute the Great, king of Denmark 1035			Sigefrid.			
Haro'd Harefoot 1039			Samon of Gaza.			
Hardicanute 1041			Samuel of Morocco, a converted Jew.			
Edward the Confessor 1066			John Xiphilin.			
Harold 1066			Lambert.			
Norman line:			Adam of Bremen.			
William the Conqueror 1087			John Curopalata.			
William Rufus 1100			Benno of Ravenna.			
Kings of Scotland:			Nicholas of Methrone.			
Grime 1003			Philip the Solitary.			
Malcolm II. 1033			Othlon of Fulda.			
Donald VII. by some called Duncan 1040			Tangmar.			
Macbeth 1057			Guido Aretino.			
Malcolm III. 1093			Eugesippus.			
Donald VIII. dethroned 1094			A famous, but anonymous work, called Micrologus, appeared in this century.			
Duncan II. 1096			Dominic of Grado.			
Donald again 1097			Alberic.			
Kings of Sweden:			Osborn, a monk of Canterbury.			
Olaus II. 1019						
Asmund 1035						
Asmundslem 1041						
Hakon 1059						
Stenchil 1061						
Ingo III. 1064						
Alstan 1080						
Philip.						
Kings of Denmark:						
Sweyn 1014						
Canute the Great, king of England 1035						
Hardicanute 1041						
Magnus 1048						
Sweyn II. 1074						
Harold 1076						
St. Canute 1085						
Olaus 1093						
Eric II.						

Sovereign Princes: Concluded.	
Kings of Poland:	
Boleslaus, first king,	A. D. 1025
Micislaus	1034
Interregnum.	
Casimir	1058
Boleslaus II.	1081
Uladislaus.	
Kings of Jerusalem.	
Godfrey, chosen king in 1099, dies in	1100
Baldwin I.	

CENTURY XII.

Sovereign Princes.	*Popes, or Bishops of Rome.*	*Archbishops of Canterbury.*	*Ecclesiastical and Theological Writers.*	*Heretics, real or reputed.*	*Remarkable Events. Religious Rites.*	*Profane Authors.*
Emperors of the East:	Pascal II. 1118	Anselm 1109	Gilbert, abbot of Westminster.	The Bogomiles and Catharists were a kind of Manicheans.	The Sclavonians and the inhabitants of the island of Rugen receive the light of the Gospel, and their example is followed by the Livonians and Finlanders.	Anselm of Leon.
A. D.	Anti-Popes.	Ralph 1122	Guibert.	The Pasaginians were a kind of Arians, who also discovered a strange attachment to the ceremonial law of Moses.	The state of affairs in Asiatic Tartary changes in favour of the Christians, by the elevation of Prester-John.	Vacarius.
Alexis I. Comnen. 1118	Clement, Albert, Theodore, and Maginulph.	William de Corboil 1136	Sigebert of Gembloux.	Eon, a madman, rather than a heretic.	The Crusade is renewed.	Leoninus, the supposed introducer of Latin rhymes.
John II. Comnen. 1143	Gelasius II. 1119	Theobald 1161	Peter Alphonso.	The same thing may be said of Tranquillinus.	The kingdom of Jerusalem is overturned, and the affairs of the Christians in Palestine decline.	Roger Hoveden.
Emanuel Comnen. 1180	Calistus II, 1124	Thomas Becket 1170	Odo of Orleans.	As to Arnold of Brescia, the Petrobrussians, Henricians, Waldenses, and Apostolics, if allowance be made for some few points, they rather deserve the title of Reformers and Witnesses to the Truth, than that of Heretics.	A third Crusade undertaken.	John of Salisbury.
Alexis II. Comnen. 1183	Honorius II. 1130	Richard 1183	Godfrey of Vendôme.	Peter Abelard and Gilbert de la Porrée differed from the notions commonly received with respect to the Holy Trinity.	The three famous military orders instituted, viz. The Knights of St. John of Jerusalem — The Knights Templars — The Teutonic Knights of St. Mary.	William of Malmesbury.
Andronicus Comnen. 1185	Innocent II. 1143		Rupert of Duitz.		The original MS. of the famous Pandect of Justinian is discovered in the ruins of Amalphi, or Melfi, when that city was taken by Lothaire II. in 1137, and this emperor makes a present of it to the city of Pisa, whose fleet had contributed, in a particular manner, to the success of the siege.	John Zonaras.
Isaac II. Ang. 1195	Celestine II. 1144		Baldric.			George Cedrenus.
Alexis III.	Lucius II. 1145		Arnulph, bishop of Lisieux.			John Cinnamus.
Emperors of the West:	Eugenius III. 1153		Bernard of Clairval.			Silvester Girald, bishop of St. David's.
Henry IV. 1106	Anastasius IV. 1154		Abelard.			Godfrey of Viterbo.
Henry V. 1125	Adrian IV. 1159		Athelred.			William of Newburgh, an English historian.
Lothaire II. 1138			Baldwin, archbishop of Canterbury.			Pelagius, bishop of Oviedo.
Conrad III. 1152			Euthymius Zigab.			John of Milan, author of the poem called Schola Salermitana.
Frederic I. surnamed Barbarossa 1190			William of Malmesbury.			Robert Pullein, an English cardinal.
Henry VI. 1198			John of Salisbury.			Abraham Eben-Ezra.
Philip.			Thomas Becket, archbishop of Canterbury.			John and Isaac Tzetzes.
Kings of Spain, i. e. of Leon and Castile:			Gervase, a monk of Canterbury.			Henry of Huntingdon.
Alphonso VI. 1109			Nicephorus of Brienne.			Nicetas.
Alphonso VII. 1134			Anselm, bishop of Havelberg.			Werner.
Alphonso VIII. 1157			Jo. Zonaras.			Moses Maimonides.
Sancho III. 1158			Mich. Glycas.			Anvari, a Persian astronomer.
Ferdinand II. 1175			Hugo Victorinus.			Portius Azo.
Alphonso IX.			Eadmerus.			Nestor, a Russian historian.
Kings of France:			George Cedrenus.			Falcandus.
Philip I. 1108			Peter, the Venerable.			Benjamin of Tudela, a Spanish Jew, whose Travels were translated by Baratier.
Louis VI. surnamed the Gross 1137			Honorius of Autun.			Averroes, or Ebn-Zohr.
Louis VII. surnamed the Young 1180			Foucher.			Eustathius, bishop of Thessalonica.
Philip Aug.			Alger.			Solomon Jarchi.
Kings of England:			Gratian.			
Henry I. 1135			Peter Lombard.			
Stephen 1154			Henry of Huntingdon.			
Henry II. 1189			William bishop of Rheims.			
Richard I. 1199			Constantine Harmen.			
John.			Orderic Vital.			
Kings of Scotland:			Constantine Manass.			
Edgar 1106			Zacharias Chrysop.			
Alexander 1124			Peter of Blois.			
David 1153			Peter Comestor.			
Malcolm IV. 1165			Peter de Cellus.			
William.			Peter of Poictiers.			
Kings of Sweden:			John Cinnamus.			
Philip 1110			John Beleth.			
Ingo IV. 1129			Helmold.			
Ragwald 1140			Gislebert, bishop of London.			
Magnus, deposed in 1148			Stephen Harding.			
Suercher 1160			George Xiphilin.			
Eric, the Holy 1161			Alexan. Arist.			
Charles VII. 1168						
Canute 1192						
Suercher II.						
Kings of Denmark:						
Eric II. 1101						
Nicolas 1135						
Eric III. 1138						
Eric IV. 1147						
Canute V. 1155						

Learning revives and is

Sovereign Princes.	*Popes, or Bishops of Rome.*	*Archbishops of Canterbury.*	*Ecclesiastical and Theological Writers.*	*Heretics, real or reputed.*	*Remarkable Events. Religious Rites.*	*Profane Authors.*
A. D.	Alexander III. 1181	Baldwin 1191	Godfrey of Viterbo.	The Albigenses, a branch of the Waldenses, are branded with the denomination of Manichæans.	encouraged in the university of Cambridge.	Al-Hasen, an Arabian, who composed a large work on Optics.
Sweyn III. 1157	Lucius III. 1185	Reginald Fitz-Jocelin 1191	Theod. Balsamon.		The pope declares war against Roger king of Sicily, who takes from his holiness Capua and Beneventum.	George Al-Makin, author of the History of the Saracens translated by Erpenias.
Waldemar 1182	Ur III. 1187	Hubert Fitz Walter.	Richard of St. Victor.		The council of Clarendon held against Becket.	Geoffrey of Monmouth.
Canute VI.	Gregory VIII. 1188		William of Auxerre.		The kings of England and France go to the Holy Land.	
Kings of Poland:	Clement III. 1191		Bruno of Asti.		Henry II. of England, being called by one of the Irish kings to assist him, takes possession of Ireland.	
Uladislaus 1102	Celestine III. 1199		Simeon of Durham.			
BoleslausIII. 1139						
UladislausII. 1146						
BoleslausIV. 1173						
Micislaus 1178						
Casimir II. 1195						
Lescus or Lecho V.						
Kings of Jerusalem:						
Baldwin I. 1118						
Baldwin II. 1131						
Foulques or Fulk 1141						
Baldwin III. 1162						
Almeric 1173						
Baldwin IV. 1185						
Baldwin V. 1186						
Guy of Lusignan.						
Jerusalem was retaken by the Infidels in 1187						
Almeric from 1196 to 1205						
Kings of Portugal:						
Alphonso I. proclaimed king in 1139 dies in 1185						
Sancho I.						

CENTURY XIII.

Sovereign Princes.	*Popes, or Bishops of Rome.*	*Archbishops of Canterbury.*	*Ecclesiastical and Theological Writers.*	*Heretics, real or reputed.*	*Remarkable Events. Religious Rites.*	*Profane Authors.*
Emperors of the East:	Innocent III. 1216	Hub. Fitz-Walter 1204	Joachim.	The Waldenses.	The Moslem religion triumphs over Christianity in China and the northern parts of Asia, by flattering the passions of voluptuous princes.	Roger Bacon, one of the great restorers of learning and philosophy.
A. D.	Honorius III. 1226	Stephen Langton 1228	John, bishop of Macedonia.	Nestorians.	A papal embassy is sent to the Tartars by Innocent IV.	Saxo Grammaticus.
Alexis III. dethroned in 1203	Gregory IX. 1241	Richard Le Grand 1231	DemetriusChomatenus. Mark, patriarch of Alexandria.	Jacobites.	A fourth crusade is undertaken by the French and Venetians, who make themselves masters of Constantinople, with a design to restore the throne to Isaac Angelus, who had been dethroned by his brother Ducas.	Ralph de Diceto.
Alexis IV. dethroned in 1204	Celestine IV. 1243	St. Edmund 1242	Malachy, archbishop of Armagh.	The Brethren and Sisters of the Free Spirit, otherwise called Beghards and Beguttes, Beghins and Turlupins.	The emperor Isaac is put to death in a sedition, and his son Alexis strangled by Alexis Ducas, the ringleader of this faction.	Walter of Coventry.
Alexis Ducas, surnamed Murzurphle. 1204	Innocent IV. 1254	Boniface 1270	Nicetas Choniata.	Amalric. Joachim.	The crusaders take Constantinople a second time, dethrone Ducas, and elect Baldwin, count of Flanders, emperor of the Greeks.	Alexander of Paris, the founder of French poetry.
Latin Emperors of the East residing at Constantinople:	Alexander IV. 1261		François d'Assise.	Wihelmina.		Villehardouin, an historian.
Balduin I. 1205	Urban IV. 1264		Alan de l'Isle.	The sect of the Apostles.		Accursi of Florence.
Henry 1216	Clement IV. 1268		Jacobus de Vitriaco.			Kimchi, a Spanish Jew
Peter 1221	Gregory X. 1276		Peter, the monk.			Conrad de Lichtenau.
Robert 1229	Innocent V. 1276		Antony of Padua.			John Holywood, called De Sacro Bosco, author of the Sphæra Mundi.
Balduin II. 1259	Adrian V. 1276		Germanus.			Actuarius, a Greek physician.
Greek Emperors residing at Nice.	John XX. 1277		Cæsarius.			Rod. Ximenes, archbishop of Toledo.
Theodore Lascaris 1222	Nicolas III. 1280		William of Paris.			Michael Coniat, bishop of Athens.
John Ducas III. 1255	Martin IV. 1285		Raymond of Pennafort.			Ivel.
Theodore Lascaris 1259			Alexander Hales.			Rigord, an historian.
John Lascaris IV. 1259			Edmund Rich, archbishop of Canterbury.			Pierre de Vignes.
Michael Palæolo-			Thomas of Spalatro.			Matthew Paris.
			John Peckham, archbishop of Canterbury.			Suffridus.
			Roger Bacon.			Sozomen, author of the Universal Chronolo-

Sovereign Princes.	*Popes, or Bishops of Rome.*	*Archbishops of Canterbury.*	*Ecclesiastical and Theological Writers.*	*Heretics real or reputed.*	*Remarkable Events. Religious rites.*	*Profane authors.*
A. D.	Honorius IV. 1288	Robert Kilwardby 1278	Albert, the Great.	John of Parma, author of the everlasting gospel.	The empire of the Franks in the East, which had subsisted fifty-seven years, is overturned by Michael Palæologus.	gy, which is yet in MS. in the possession of the Regular Canons of Fesoli, near Florence.
gus retakes Constantinople in the year 1261, and thus unites, in his person, the Latin and Greek empires; he dies in 1283	Nicolas IV. 1292	John Peckham 1291	Rob. Grossetête.	Flagellants.	A fifth crusade, which is carried on by the confederate arms of Italy and Germany.	Barthol. Cotton, of Norwhich; see Wharton's Anglia Sacra.
Andronicus. II.	Celestine V. 1294	Robert Winchesley.	Vincent de Beauvais.	Circumcelliones.	The fleet of the crusaders ruined by the Saracens.	Engelbert.
Emperors of the West:			Robert of the Sorbonne.		The fifth crusade undertaken by Louis IX. who takes Damietta, but is afterwards reduced, with his army, to extremities; dies of the plague in a second crusade, and is canonized.	Thomas Wicke, an English historian.
Philip 1208			George Acropolita.		The knights of the Teutonic Order, under the command of Herman de Saliza, conquer and convert to Christianity the Prussians, at the desire of Conrad, duke of Masovia.	Vitellio, a Polish mathematician.
Otho IV. 1218			Hugo de St. Caro.		Christianity is propagated among the Arabians in Spain.	Albert the Great.
Frederic II. 1250			George Metochita.		The philosophy of Aristotle triumphs over all the systems that were in vogue before this century.	Colonna, archbishop of Messina.
Civil wars and an interregnum, during which Conrad of Suabia, William count of Holland, Richard king of England, Alphonso of Spain, Ottocar of Bohemia, appear on the scene of action.			Guillaume de St. Amour.		The power of creating bishops, abbots, &c. is claimed by the Roman pontiffs, whose wealth and revenues are thereby greatly augmented.	Michael Scot, the translator of Aristotle.
Rodolphus of Hapsburg is elected emperor in 1273, and dies in 1291			Nicephorus Blem.		John, king of England, excommunicated by pope Innocent III. is guilty of the basest compliances, through his slavish fear of that insolent pontiff.	Gregory Abulfaragius.
Adolphus of Nassau, deposed in 1298			Thomas Aquinas.		The inquisition established in Narbonne Gaul, and committed to the direction of Dominic and his order, who treat the Waldenses, and other reputed heretics, with most inhuman cruelty.	Foscari of Bologna.
Albert I.			Bonaventura.		The adoration of the Host is introduced by Pope Honorius III.	Alphonso, king of Castile.
Kings of Spain, i. e. of Leon and Castile:			Gilbert of Tournay.		The Magna Charta is signed by king John and his barons on the 15th of June, at Runemede, near Windsor.	Cavalcanti of Florence.
Alphonso IX. 1214			John of Paris, an opposer of transubstantiation and papal tyranny.		A debate arises between the Dominicans and Franciscans concerning the immaculate conception of the Virgin Mary.	Dinus, a famous jurist.
Henry I. 1217			John Beccus.		Jubilees instituted by pope Boniface VIII.	Marco Polo, a Venetian, whose travels in China are curious.
Ferdinand III. 1252			Nicetus Acominatus.		The Sicilian Vespers—when the French in Sicily, to the number of 8000, were massacred in in one evening, at a signal given by John of Prochyta, a Sicilian nobleman.	Francis Barberini, an Italian poet.
Alphonso X. 1284			Theodore Lascaris.		Conrad, duke of Suabia, and Frederic of Austria, beheaded at Naples by	
Sancho IV. 1295			Arsenius.			
Ferninand IV.			George Pachymer.			
Kings of France:			George the Cyprian.			
Philip Aug. 1223			Stephen Langton, archbishop of Canterbury.			
Louis VIII. 1226			Robert Capito.			
Louis IX. sainted 1270			Thomas Cantiprat.			
Philip III. the Hardy 1285			Richard Middleton.			
Philip IV. the Fair.			William Durand.			
Kings of England:			Ægidius de Columna.			
John 1216			Guil. Peraldus.			
Henry III. 1272			Martin Polon.			
Edward I.			Raymond Martin.			
Kings of Scotland:			Jacob de Voragine.			
William 1214			Guillaume de Seignelai, bishop of Auxerre.			
Alexander II. 1249			William of Auvergne, bishop of Paris.			
Alexander III. 1285			Henry of Ghent.			
Interregnum.			Pope Boniface VIII.			
John Baliol.						
Kings of Sweden:						
Suercher II. 1211						
Eric X. 1218						
John I. 1222						
Eric XI. 1250						

Sovereign Princes.	*Popes, or Bishops of Rome.*	*Archbishops of Canterbury.*	*Ecclesiastical and Theological Writers.*	*Heretics, real or reputed.*	*Remarkable Events. Religious Rites.*	*Profane Authors.*
A. D.					the counsel of pope Clement IV.	
Waldemar 1276					The Jews are driven out of France by Louis IX. and all the copies of the Talmud, that could be found, are burned.	
Magnus 1390					The college of electors founded in the empire.	
Birger.					The association of the Hans-Towns.	
Kings of Denmark:					The Dominicans, Franciscans, Servites, Mendicants, and the Hermits of St. Augustin, date the origin of their orders from this century.	
Canute VI. 1202					The fables concerning the removal of the chapel of Loretto; the vision of Sim. Stockius, the Wandering Jew, and St. Antony's obliging an ass to adore the sacrament, are invented about this time.	
Waldemar II. 1241					The festivals of the Nativity of the blessed Virgin, and of the Holy Sacrament or Body of Christ, instituted.	
Eric VI. 1250					The rise of the house of Austria is referred to this century.	
Abel 1252					Wales is conquered by Edward, and united to England.	
Christopher 1259					There is an uninterrupted succession of English parliaments from the year 1293.	
Eric VII. 1286						
Eric VIII.						
Kings of Poland:						
Lescus V. 1203						
Uladislaus III. 1226						
Boleslaus V. 1279						
Lescus VI. 1289						
Boleslaus, Henry, and Uladislaus, take the title of Governors.						
Premislaus. 1296						
Uladislaus IV. deposed in 1300						
Wenceslaus, king of Bohemia.						
Kings of Portugal:						
Sancho I. 1212						
Alphonso II. 1223						
Sancho II. 1246						
Alphonso III. 1279						
Denis.						

CENTURY XIV.

Sovereign Princes.	*Popes, or Bishops of Rome.*	*Archbishops of Canterbury.*	*Ecclesiastical and Theological Writers.*	*Heretics, real or reputed.*	*Remarkable Events. Religious Rites.*	*Profane Authors.*
Emperors of the East:	Boniface VIII. 1303	Robert Winchelsey 1313	Nicephorus Callistus.	Waldenses.	Fruitless attempts made to renew the crusades.	Dante, the principal restorer of philosophy and letters, and also one of the most sublime poets of modern times.
A. D.	Benedict XI. 1304	Walter Raynold 1327	Raymond Lully.	Palamites, Hesychasts, and Quietists, three different names for one sect.	Christianity encouraged in Tartary and China: but loses ground towards the end of this century.	
Andronicus II. 1332	Clement V. 1314	Simon Mepham 1333	Matthæus Blastares.	Spiritual Franciscans.	The Lithuanians and Jagello, their prince, converted to the Christian faith in the year 1386.	Petrarca.
Andronicus, the Younger 1341	John XXI. 1334	I. Stratford 1348	Greg. Acindynus.	Ceccus Asculanus, who was burned at Florence by the Inquisition for making some experiments in mechanics that appeared miraculous to the vulgar.	Many of the Jews are compelled to receive the Gospel.	Boccaccio.
John Cantacuzenus usurps the government under John Palæologus, and holds it till the year 1355	A schism between Peter and John.	Thomas Bradwardine 1349	John Cantacuzenus.		Philosophy and Grecian literature are cultivated with zeal in this century.	Chaucer.
John VI. Palæol. 1390	Benedict XII. 1342	Simon Islip 1365	Nicephorus Greg.		The disputes between the Realists and Nominalists revive.	Matthew of Westminster.
Andronicus IV. 1392	Clement VI. 1352	Simon Langham 1374	Duns Scotus.	Beghards, and Beguines.	Philip the Fair, king of France, opposes with spirit the tyrannic pretensions of the pope to a temporal jurisdiction over kings and princes, and demands a general council to depose Boniface VIII. whom he ac-	Nicolas Trivet.
Emanuel II.	Innocent VI. 1362		Andrew of Newcastle.	As to the Cellites or Lollards, they cannot be deemed heretics.		Nicephorus Gregoras a compiler of the Byzantine History.
Emperors of the West:	Urban V. 1372		Francis Mayron.	The followers of John Wickliffe deserve an eminent place, with their leader, in		Theodore Metochita.
Albert I. 1308	A schism between Urban and Clement.		Durand of St. Portian.			Guillaume de Naugis, historian.
Henry VII. of Luxemburg 1313	Gregory XI. 1378		Nicolas de Lyra.			Henry Stero, historian.
Louis V. Bav. 1347	The death of Gregory XI. occasioned that violent schism which threw the western church into the utmost confusion.		John Bacon.			Dinus Mugellanus.
Charles IV. 1378	The church of Rome had		Willam Occam.			Evrard, historian.
			Nicolas Trivet.			Hayton an Armenian historian.
			Andrew Horne.			Albertino Mussato.
			Richard Bury.			Oderic de Forli.
			Walter Burley.			Leopold, bishop of Bamberg.
			Richard Hampole.			
			Robert Holkot.			
			Thomas Bradwardine, archbishop of Canterbury.			
			John Wickliffe.			

Sovereign Princes.	*Popes, or Bishops of Rome.*	*Archbishops of Canterbury.*	*Ecclesiastical and Theological Writers.*	*Heretics real or reputed.*	*Remarkable Events. Religious rites.*	*Profane authors.*
A. D.	two popes, one residing at Rome, the other at Avignon.	Simon Sudbury 1381	Thomas Stubbs.	the list of Reformers.	cuses of heresy, simony, and several enormities.	Peter of Duisburg, an historian.
Wenceslaus 1406	*At Rome:*	W. Courtenay 1396	John de Burgo.	Nicolas of Calabria.	The papal authority declines.	Albert of Strasburg, an historian.
Kings of Spain i. e. *Leon and Castile:*	Urban VI. 1389	Thomas Arundel.	William Wolfort.	Martin Gonsalvo.	The residence of the popes removed to Avignon.	Balaam of Calabria, master of Petrarch.
Ferdinand IV. 1312	Boniface IX.		The last thirteen all English authors.	Bartold de Rorbach.	The universities of Avignon, Perugia, Orleans, Angers, Florence, Cahors, Heidelberg, Prague, Perpignan, Cologne, Pavia, Cracow, Vienna, Orange, Sienna, Erfort, Geneva, founded.	Joinville.
Alphonso XI. 1350	*At Avignon:*		Peter Aureolus.	The Dancers.	The rise of the great western schism, which destroyed the unity of the Latin church, and placed at its head two rival popes.	Peter de Apono, physician and astronomer.
Pedro the Cruel 1369	Clement VII. not acknowledged 1394		John Bassolis.		John Wickliff opposes the monks, whose licentiousness and ignorance were scandalous, and recommends the study of the Holy Scriptures.	Marsigli of Padua, a famous lawyer.
Henry II. 1379	Benedict XIII.		Bernard Guido.		A warm contest arises among the Franciscans about the poverty of Christ and his Apostles. Another between the Scotists and Thomists, about the doctrines of their respective chiefs.	John Andre, an eminent jurist.
John I. 1390			Alvarus Pelagius.		Pope Clement V. orders the Jubilee which Boniface had appointed to be held in every hundredth year to be celebrated twice within that period.	Leontius Pilato, one of the restorers of learning.
Henry III.			Theophanes, bishop of Nice.		The Knights Templars are seized and imprisoned; the greatest part of them put to death, and their order suppressed.	Gentiles de Foligno.
Kings of France:			Philotheus.		The Golden Bull, containing rules for the election of an emperor of Germany, and a precise account of the dignity and privileges of the electors, is issued by Charles IV.	Ismael Abulfeda, an Arabian prince.
Philip the Fair 1314			Antonius Andreas.		Clement VI. adds the country of Avignon to the papal territories.	Peter of Ferrara.
Louis X.			Herveus Natalis.		The emperor Henry VII. dies, and is supposed by some authors to have been poisoned by a consecrated wafer, which he received at the sacrament, from the hands of Bernard Politian, a Dominican monk. This account is denied by authors of good credit. The matter, however, is still undecided.	Arnold of Villa-Nova.
Hutin 1316			Thomas of Strasburg.		Gunpowder is invented by Schwartz, a monk.	William Grisant, an English mathematician.
Philip V. 1322			Raynerius of Pisa.		The mariner's compass is invented by John Gioia, or as others allege, by Flavio.	Homodi of Milan.
Philip VI. of Valois 1350			John of Fribourg.		The city of Rhodes is taken from the Saracens, in the year 1309, by the Knights Hospitalers, subsequently called the Knights of Malta.	Albergotti of Arezzo.
John 1364			Pope Clement VI.			Philip of Leyden.
Charles V. 1380			Thomas Joysius.			Baldus de Ubaldis.
Charles VI.			John of Naples.			Froissart, a French historian.
Kings of England:			Albert of Padua.			
Edward I. 1307			Michael Cesenas.			
Edward II. 1327			Gregory Palamas.			
Edward III. 1377			Andronicus.			
Richard II. 1399			Peter of Duisburg.			
Henry IV.			Ludolf Saxon.			
Kings of Scotland:			Cardinal Caietan.			
John Baliol 1306			James of Viterbo.			
Robert Bruce 1329			Cardinal Balde.			
David II. 1370			George of Rimini.			
Robert II. 1390			The popes Benedict XI. and XII.			
Robert III.			Gui of Perpignan.			
Kings of Sweden:			Nicolas Cabasilas, archbishop of Thessalonica.			
Birger 1326			Richard, bishop of Armagh.			
Magnus 1363			Demetrius Cydonius.			
Albert, defeated by Margaret queen of Denmark in 1387, dies in the year 1396			Petranch.			
Margaret.			Peter Berchorius.			
Sovereigns of Denmark:			John Cyparissotes.			
Eric VIII. 1321			Nicolas Oresme.			
Christopher II. 1333			Philip Ribot.			
Waldemar III. 1375			Nilus Rhodius.			
Olaus 1387			Maximus Plan.			
Margaret.			John Taulerus.			
Kings of Poland:			Greg. Palamas.			
Wenceslaus 1305			Nic. Eymericus.			
Uladislaus reascends the throne, and dies in 1333			John Rusbroch.			
Casimir III. the last of the Piasts 1370			Manuel Caleca.			
Louis, king of Hungary 1381			Catharine of Sienna.			
Interregnum.			St. Bridget.			
Uladislaus Jagellon, duke of Lithuania.			Gerard of Zutphen.			
Kings of Portugal:			Pierre Ailli.			
Denis 1325			Francis Zabarella.			
Alphonso IV. 1357			Marsigli of Padua, who wrote against the papal jurisdiction.			
Pedro, the Justiciary 1367			Philippe de Mazieres.			
Ferdinand 1383			Jordan of Quedinburg.			
Interregnum.			Barth. Albizi of Pisa, author of the famous book of the Conformities of St. Francis with Jesus Christ.			
John I.			Fabri, bishop of Chartres.			
			Michael Anglianus.			
			Raymond Jordan.			

Sovereign Princes.	*Popes, or Bishops of Rome.*	*Archbishops of Canterbury.*	*Ecclesiastical and Theological Writers.*	*Heretics, real or reputed.*	*Remarkable Events. Religious Rites.*	*Profane Authors.*
A. D. *Ottoman Emperors:* The ancient history of the Turks extends from the beginning of the seventh to the commencement of the fourteenth century. The modern commences about the beginning of the fourteenth century. Othman 1327 Or Khan 1359 Amurath, or Morad 1389 Bajazet or Ba-yezid.			Jac. de Theramo. Manuel Chrysoloras. Cardinal Francis Zabarella, with many others, too numerous to mention.		Timour extends his conquests in the East. The Bible is translated into French by the order of Charles V. The festival of the holy lance and nails that pierced Jesus Christ instituted by Clement V.—Such was this pontiff's arrogance, that once, while he was dining, he ordered Dandolo, the Venetian ambassador, to be chained under the table like a dog. The beginning of the Swiss Cantons. The emperor Louis of Bavaria, Philip the Fair, king of France, Edward III., king of England, who opposed the tyranny of the popes, may be looked upon as witnesses to the truth and preparers of the Reformation. To these we may add Duraud, Gerson, Olivus, who called the pope Anti-christ, and Wickliff, who rejected transubstantiation, the sacrifice of the mass, the adoration of the host, purgatory, meritorious satisfactions by penance, auricular confession, the celibacy of the clergy, papal excommunications, the worship of images, of the Virgin and relics. The order of the Garter is instituted in England by Edward III.	

CENTURY XV.

Sovereign Princes.	*Popes, or Bishops of Rome.*	*Archbishops of Canterbury.*	*Ecclesiastical and Theological Writers.*	*Heretics, real or reputed.*	*Remarkable Events. Religious Rites.*	*Profane Authors.*
Emperors of the East: A. D. Emanuel II. 1425 John VI. Palæologus 1448 Constantine Palæologus, so far down as the year 1453, when Constantinople was taken by Mohammed II. *Emperors of the West:* Rupert or Robert 1410 Jodocus not acknowledged.	Boniface IX. 1404 Innocent VII. 1406 Gregory XII. deposed 1409 Alexander V. 1410 John XXII. deposed 1417 Martin V. 1431 Eugenius IV. 1447 A schism.—The council of Basil depose Eugenius, and elect Amadeus, first duke of Savoy, who assumes the title of Felix V. Eugenius, how-	Thomas Arundel 1413 H. Chichele 1443 John Stafford 1452 John Kemp 1453	John Huss. Jerome of Prague. Paulus Anglicus. John Gerson. Herman de Petra. Theod. de Niem. bishop of Cambray. Tho. Valdensis. Pope Alexander V. John Capreolus. Peter de Ancharano. Nicolas de Clemangis. Theod. Urias. Alphons. Tostat. John, patriarch of Antioch. Mark of Ephesus.	The Waldenses. The Wickliffites. The White Brethren. The men of understanding, who were headed by Ægidius Cantar, and William of Hildernissen. Picard, an Adamite. The following deserve rather the denomination of Reformers than Heretics, viz. John Huss, Jerome of Prague. Branches of the Hussites, the Calixtines.	The Moors and Jews are converted in Spain, by force. In the year 1492, Christopher Columbus opens a passage into America, by the discovery of the islands of Hispaniola, Cuba, and Jamaica. Constantinople taken by the Turks in the year 1453. Letters flourish in Italy, under the protection of the house of Medici and the Neapolitan monarchs of the house of Arragon. The calamities of the Greeks under the Turkish government, conduce to the advance-	Laurentius Valla, the great restorer of Latin elocution. Leonard Aretin Gasparini. William Lyndewood. Alexander Chartier Fr. Frezzi. Christina of Pisa. Paul de Castro. Poggio of Florence. John Fortescue, high chancellor of England. Theod. Gaza. Bart. Facio. Dluglossus, a Polish historian. R. Sanc. de Arevallo. Chalcondylas. J. Savonarola. Marcilius Ficinus.

Sovereign Princes.	*Popes, or Bishops of Rome.*	*Archbishops of Canterbury.*	*Ecclesiastical and Theological Writers.*	*Heretics, real or reputed.*	*Remarkable Events. Religious Rites.*	*Profane Authors.*
A. D.	ever, triumphs in the	Thomas Bouchier 1486	Cardinal Bessarion.	Orebites.	ment of learning among	John Picus de Mirandula.
Sigismund 1437	issue.	J. Morton 1500	G. Scholarius.	Orphans.	the Latins.	Marc. Coc. Sabellicus
Albert II. of	Nicolas V. 1455		G. Gemistus.	Taborites.	The council of Constance	Forestus.
Austria 1439	Calistus III. 1458		John de Turrecremata.	Bohemian Brethren; also John Petit.	is assembled by the emperor Sigismond in the	Ant. Bonfinius.
Frederic III. 1493	Pius II. 1464		George of Trapezond.	John Wellus.	year 1414.	Jovian.
Maximilian I.	Paul II. 1471		John Capistran.	Peter Osma.	John Huss, and Jerome	Pontanus.
Kings of Spain, i. e. of Leon and Castile:	Sixtus IV. 1484		Laurentius Valla.	Matth. Grabon.	of Prague, are committed to the flames, by a	G. Gemistus.
Henry III. 1406	Innocent VIII. 1492		John of Segovia.		decree of that council.	J. Alvarot.
John II. 1454	Alexander VI.		Franc. de la Place.		The council of Basil is	Guarini of Verona.
Henry IV. 1474			Reginald, bishop of St. Asaph.		opened in the year 1431,	J. Juv. des Ursins.
Ferdinand, in right of Isabella.			Antoninus, archbishop of Florence.		and in it the reformation of the church is attempted in vain.	Mass. Vegio.
Kings of France:			Nicolas de Cusa, bishop of Brixen, and cardinal.		Horrible enormities are committed by the popes of this century, and more especially by Alexander VI.	Flavio Bindo.
Charles VI.			Thomas à Kempis.			J. Argyropulus.
Charles VII. 1461			Anton. de Rosellis.			Dr. Thomas Linacre
Louis XI. 1483			Rickel.			The Strozzi.
Charles VIII. 1498			Ducas.			Bon. Monbritius.
Louis XII.			Bened. de Accoltis.			P. Callim.
Kings of England:			Guill. d'Aoupelande.		The council of Constance remove the sacramental cup from the laity, and declare it lawful to violate the most solemn engagements when made to heretics.	Esperiente.
Henry IV. 1413			James Paradise, an English Carthusian.			Jul. Pompon Lætus.
Henry V. 1422			Æneas Sylvius Picolomini, or pope.			Angelo.
Henry VI. dethroned in 1461			Pius II. Lorenzo Justiniani.			Politiano.
Edward IV. 1483			John Gobelin.			Fulgosi.
Edward V. 1483			Alphonso de Spina.		The war of the Hussites in Bohemia.	A. Urceus Codrus.
Richard III. 1485			Greg. of Heimburg.		Institution of the Order of the Golden Fleece.	Mich. Marullus.
Henry VIII.			Theod. Lelio.			Oliver de la Marche.
Kings of Scotland:			Henry of Gorcum.		The Moors and Jews driven out of Spain.	Caiado.
Robert III. 1406			I. Ant. Campanus.			Abrabanel.
James I. 1437			Alex. de Imola.		The Massacre of Varna, in the year 1444.	Calepin.
James II. 1460			Henry Harphius.			Rebel.
James III. 1488			J. Perez.		The order of Minimes instituted by Franc. de Paulo.	Martial de Paris.
James IV.			P. de Natalibus.			Phil. de Comines.
Sovereigns of Sweden and Denmark:			B. Platina.			Al. Achillini.
Margaret 1412			P. Niger.		Exploits of the Maid of Orleans.	Scipio Carteromaco.
Eric IX. deposed in 1438			John de Wesalia.			John Baptista Porto.
Christopher III. 1448			Hermol.		The art of printing with moveable wooden types, is invented by Coster at Haerlem; and the farther improvements of this admirable art are owing to Gensfleisch and Guttemberg, of Mentz, and Schœffer of Strasbourg.	Aldus Manutius.
Charles Canutson 1471			Barbarus.			Cherefeddin Ali, a Persian historian.
An interregnum until the year 1483			Michael of Milan.			Arabshah, an Arabian historian.
John.			Stephen Brulefer.			J. Whethamsted.
Kings of Poland:			Cardinal Andr. du St. Sixte.			Ulug-beg, a Tartar prince.
Uladislaus, Jag. 1434			Savanarola.			J. Braccelli.
Uladislaus, king of Hungary. 1444			Marsilius Ficinus.			Palmieri. Villon, otherwise Corbueil.
An interregnum of three years.			John Tritheme.			Muller, surnamed Regiomontanus.
Casimir IV. 1492			Picus, or Pico of Mirandula.		The universities of Leipsic, Louvaine, Fribourg, Rostock, Basil, Tubingen, Wurtzburg, Turin, Ingolstadt, St. Andrew's in Scotland, Poictiers, Glasgow, Gripswald in Pomerania, Pisa, Bourdeaux, Treves, Toledo, Upsal, Mentz, Copenhagen, founded in this century.	Calentius, a Latin poet.
John Albert.			Ant. de Lebrixa.			Dom. Calderini.
Kings of Portugal:			Boussard.			Barth. Fontius.
John I. 1433			J. Reuchlin, otherwise called Capnio.			Enguerr. de Monstrelet.
Edward 1438			Jovianus Pontanus.			Andronicus of Thessalonica.
Alphonso V. 1481			Nicolas Simonis.			Er. Philelphi.
John II. 1495			Claude de Seyssel.			Alex. Imola.
Emmanuel the Great.			Simeon of Thessalonica.			J. Ant. Campani.
Ottoman Emperors:			Gobelin Persona.			Nich. Perotti.
Ba-yezid, taken prisoner by Timour in 1402			Henry of Hesse.			Th. Littleton.
			George Phranza.			Ant. of Palermo.
			Vincent Ferrieres.			Constant.
Solyman 1410			Julianus Cæsarinus.			Lascaris.
Mousa 1413			Nich. Tudeschus.			A. Barbatius.
Mohammed I. 1421			Raymond de		The first book printed with types of Metal; which was the Vulgate Bible, published at Mentz in 1450: a second edition of the same book appeared at Mentz in 1642, and has been mistaken for the first.	Gobelin Persona.
Morad II. 1451						Bern. Justiniani.
						Dieb.
						Schilling.
						Ralph Agricola.
						I. Andreas.
						Alex. ab. Alexandro.
						G. Merula. M. M.
					The famous Pragmatic Sanction established in France.	Boiardo.
						A. Mancinelli.
						Rob. Gaguin.
					The university of Caen in Normandy is founded by the English in the year 1437.	Bern. Corio.
						Garbr. Altilius.
						Gul. Caoursin.
						J. Nai.
					The Portuguese sail, for the first time, to the East	Al. Ranuccini.
						P. Crinitus.

Sovereign Princes.	*Popes, or Bishops of Rome.*	*Archbishops of Canterbury.*	*Ecclesiastical and Theological Writers.*	*Heretics real or reputed.*	*Remarkable Events. Religious rites.*	*Profane authors.*
Mohammed II. who takes Constantinople in 1453 and dies in 1481 A. D. Bayezid II. *Czars, or Emperors of Russia:* There reigns, in the chronology of these princes, an uncommon degree of confusion, suitable to the barbarism of that nation. In the year 1732, they began to publish, at Petersburg, a series of their sovereigns, beginning with duke Ruric, who is supposed to have reigned in the ninth century. From that time downward, all is darkness and perplexity, until we come to the reign of John Basilowitz I. who, in the fifteenth century, shook off the yoke of the Tartars, and assumed first the title of Czar, after having conquered the kingdom of Casan. We therefore begin with this prince, and shall follow the chronology observed by the authors of the Modern Universal History, in their History of Russia. The reader may, however, consult the Tablettes Chronologiques de l'Histoire Universelle of Lenglet, who places this prince in the 16th. century.* John Basilowitz.	* He died in that century, but flourished chiefly in the fifteenth. EDIT.		Sabunde, or Sebeyde. Catharine of Bologna. Gregorius Melissen. Marcus Eugenius. Sylvester Syropul. Ambrose, general of the Camaldolites. George Codinus. Onuphr. Panvinius. Gabriel Biel. John Nauclerus. John Nieder.		Indies, under Vasquez de Gama. Maximilian divides the empire into six circles.	Molines. Cettes. John Murmelius. Mark Musurus. Jason Mainus. Pandolfo Collenucio. R. Langius. Pietro Cosimo. Abraham Zachut.

CENTURY XVI.

Sovereign Princes.	*Popes, or Bishops of Rome.*	*Archbishops of Canterbury.*	*Ecclesiastical and Theological Writers.*	*Heretics, real or reputed.*	*Remarkable Events. Religious Rites.*	*Profane Authors.*
Emperors: A. D. Maximilian I. 1519 Charles V. abdicates the empire in 1556, and dies in 1558 Ferdinand 1564	Alexander VI 1503 Pius III. 1503 Julius II. 1513 Leo X. 1521 Adrian VI. 1523 Clement VII. 1534 Paul III. 1549	Henry Dean 1504 W. Warham 1532 Thomas Cranmer 1555 Reginald Pole 1558 Matthew Parker 1575	John Sleidan. William Budæus. Desiderius Erasmus. Martin Luther. Ph. Melancthon. John Brentius. Martin Bucer.	Schwenckfeld. Andr. Osiander. Stancarus. The Adiaphorists. Interimists. Agricola of Eisleben, the chief of the Antinomians.	The Reformation is introduced into Germany by Luther, in the year 1517; into France by Calvin about 1529; into Switzerland by Zuingle, in 1519. Henry VIII. of England,	*British Authors.* Sir Thomas More. Thomas Linacre. S. Purchas. Thomas Elliot. Hect. Boethius. J. Leland, the antiquary.

Sovereign Princes.	*Popes, or Bishops of Rome.*	*Archbishops of Canterbury.*	*Ecclesiastical and Theological Writers.*	*Heretics, real or reputed.*	*Remarkable Events. Religious Rites.*	*Profane Authors.*
A. D.	Julius III. 1555	Edmund	Ulric Zuingle.	George Major.	throws off the papal yoke, and becomes supreme head of the church.	Ed. Wotton.
Maximilian II. 1576	Marcellus II. 1555	Grindal 1583	Peter Galatin.	N. Amsdorff.	Edward VI. encourages the Reformation in England.	J. Christophorson.
Rodolph II.	Paul IV. 1559	John Whitegift.	Fr. Ximenes.	The Synergists.	The reign of queen Mary restores Popery, and exhibits a scene of barbarous persecution that shocks nature.	Cuth. Tonstal.
Kings of Spain:	Pius IV. 1566		Thomas More.	M. Flacius.	The name of Protestants given to the Reformed at the Diet of Spire, in 1529.	R. Ascham.
Ferdinand V. surnamed the Catholic, king of Arragon, in consequence of his marriage with Isabella, becomes king of Castile; and the kingdoms of Arragon and Castile remain united. Isabella died in 1504, and Ferdinand in 1516	Pius V. 1572		John Whitegift, archbishop of Canterbury.	The Crypto-Calvinists.	The league of Smalcald is formed in 1530.	J. Kaye.
	Gregory XIII. 1585		John Fisher.	Anabaptists.	The Reformation introduced into Scotland by John Knox, about the year 1560; and into Ireland by George Brown, about the same time; into the United Provinces, about the year 1566.	Thomas Smith.
	Sixtus V. 1590		John Œcolampadius.	Mennonites.	Gustavus Ericson introduces the Reformation into Sweden, by the ministry of Olaus Petri, in 1530.	George Buchanan.
	Urban VII. 1590		And. Carolostadius, or Carlstadt.	Theoph. Paracelsus.	It was received in Denmark, in 1521.	Alex. Arbuthnot.
	Gregory XIV. 1591		John Tiligius.	Postellus.	The Gospel is propagated by the papal missionaries in India, Japan, and China.	Sir Phil. Sidney.
	Innocent IX. 1592		James Faber.	David Georgius.	The Jesuit order is founded, in 1540, by Ignatius Loyola.	John Fox.
	Clement VIII.		Matthew Flacius.	Franc. Pucius.	The famous council of Trent is assembled.	Fr. Walsingham.
			John Calvin.	Defid. Erasmus.	The Pragmatic Sanction is abrogated by Leo X. and the Concordat substituted for it. Pope Julius III. bestows a cardinal's hat upon the keeper of his monkeys.	Ed. Grant.
			Martin Chemnitz.	Agrippa.	The Inquisition is established at Rome by Paul IV.	Ed. Anderson.
			James Andreas.	Cassander and Wicelius.	The war of the Peasants.	John Dee.
			David Chytræus.	Conr. Vorstius.	The universities of Wittenberg, Francfort on the Oder, Alcala, Saragossa, Marpurg, Seville, Compostella, Oviedo, Grenada, Franeker, Strasbourg, Parma, Macerata, Tortosa, Coimbra, Konigsberg, Leyden, Florence, Rheims, Dillingen, Mexico, St. Domingo, Tarragona, Helmstadt, Altorf, Paderborn, Sigen, founded in this century.	Thomas Craig.
			William Farel.	Sam. Huberus.	The treaty of Passau, in 1552.	G. Creighton.
			Thedore Beza.	Mich. Servetus.	The Paris massacre of the Protestants on St. Bartholomew's day.	Ed. Brerewood.
			Faustus Socinus.	Valent. Gentilis.	The republic of the United Provinces formed by the union of Utrecht.	*French Authors:*
			Bened. Arias Montanus.	Lælius Socinus.	The edict of Nantes granted to the Protestants by Henry IV. of France.	William Budæus, or Bude.
			And. Osiander.	Faustus Socinus.		Clement Marot.
			Ægid.	Quintin, the chief of the Libertines.		Fr. Rabelais.
			Hunnius.			Ja. Dubois (Sylvius.)
			Melchior Canus.			Pierre Gilles.
			Polyc.			Or. Finée.
			Lyserus.			Robert Etienne, or Stephens.
			George Wicellus.			P. Belon.
			Cardinal Bellarmine.			William Morel.
			Stella.			Adr. Turnebus.
			Crantzius.			Ch. Du Moulin.
			Thomas Illyricus.			Gilb. Cousin.
			Jacob Ben-Chaim, who gave an edition of the Hebrew Bible.			Mich. de l'Hopital.
			Sanderus.			L. Le Roy (Regius.)
			Isid. Clarius.			Hub. Languet, author of the Vindiciæ contra Tyrannos.
			John Major.			Laur. Joubert.
			Andrew Vega.			James Pelletier.
			Franc. Vatable.			Fr. Belleforest.
			Cardinal Sadolet.			M. A. Fr. Muret.
			Cardinal Cortesius.			P. Ronsard.
			John Cochlæus.			J. Dorat.
			Alphons. Zamora.			James Cujas.
			Vivaldi.			Fr. Hotoman.
			J. Almain.			James Amyot.
			Spagnoli.			Mich. de Montagne.
			Aug. Dathus.			Mich. de Castelnau.
			Pope Adrian VI.			P. Pithou.
			Petro de Monte.			J. Bodin.
			Pope Leo X.			Nic. Vignier.
			Alb. Pighius.			Bl. de Vigenere.
			Henry VIII. king of England.			Henri Etienne, commonly called Stephens.
			Louis Vives.			J. De Serres (Serranus.)
			S. Pagninus.			Cl. Fauchet.
			Leo de Castro.			J. Passerat.
			Matth. Ugonius.			J. J. Boissard.
			Cardinal Caietan.			P. Daniel d'Orleans.
			James Hoogstraat.			Francis Victe.
			Ambr. Catharini.			Cardinal d'Ossat.
			John Faber.			Rob. Constantin.
			Ortuin Gratius.			P. Morin.
			John Eckins.			Jos. Just. Scaliger.
			Leander Alberti.			Nic. Rapin.
			Nic. Serrarius.			J. Papire. Masson.
			Pet. Canisius.			P. B. Brantome
			Cæsar Baronius.			St. Pasquier.
			Fran. Ribera.			*Italian Authors:*
			Pierre Pithou.			Americo Vespucci.
			Mich. Baius.			J. Jocondi of Verona, who discovered the Letters of Pliny.
			W. Alan, English cardinal.			A. F. Grazzini.
			Dr. John Colet.			Leonicini, the translator of Galen.
			Mercator.			Pomponace.
						M. A. Casanova.
						P. Gravina.

Sovereign Princes.	*Popes, or Bishops of Rome.*	*Archbishops of Canterbury.*	*Ecclesiastical and Theological Writers.*	*Heretics, real or reputed.*	*Remarkable Events. Religious Rites.*	*Profane Authors.*
A. D.	Julius III. 1555	Edmund	Ulric Zuingle.	George Major.	throws off the papal yoke, and becomes supreme head of the church.	Ed. Wotton.
Maximilian II. 1576	Marcellus II. 1555	Grindal 1583	Peter Galatin.	N. Amsdorff.	Edward VI. encourages the Reformation in England.	J. Christophorson.
Rodolph II.	Paul IV. 1559	John Whitegift.	Fr. Ximenes.	The Synergists.	The reign of queen Mary restores Popery, and exhibits a scene of barbarous persecution that shocks nature.	Cuth. Tonstal.
Kings of Spain:	Pius IV. 1566		Thomas More.	M. Flacius.	The name of Protestants given to the Reformed at the Diet of Spire, in 1529.	R. Ascham.
Ferdinand V. surnamed the Catholic, king of Arragon, in consequence of his marriage with Isabella, becomes king of Castile; and the kingdoms of Arragon and Castile remain united. Isabella died in 1504, and Ferdinand in 1516	Pius V. 1572		John Whitegift, archbishop of Canterbury.	The Crypto-Calvinists.	The league of Smalcald is formed in 1530.	J. Kaye.
	Gregory XIII. 1585		John Fisher.	Anabaptists.	The Reformation introduced into Scotland by John Knox, about the year 1560; and into Ireland by George Brown, about the same time; into the United Provinces, about the year 1566.	Thomas Smith.
	Sixtus V. 1590		John Œcolampadius.	Mennonites.	Gustavus Ericson introduces the Reformation into Sweden, by the ministry of Olaus Petri, in 1530.	George Buchanan.
	Urban VII. 1590		And. Carolostadius, or Carlstadt.	Theoph. Paracelsus.	It was received in Denmark, in 1521.	Alex. Arbuthnot.
	Gregory XIV. 1591		John Tiligius.	Postellus.	The Gospel is propagated by the papal missionaries in India, Japan, and China.	Sir Phil. Sidney.
	Innocent IX. 1592		James Faber.	David Georgius.	The Jesuit order is founded, in 1540, by Ignatius Loyola.	John Fox.
	Clement VIII.		Matthew Flacius.	Franc. Pucius.	The famous council of Trent is assembled.	Fr. Walsingham.
			John Calvin.	Defid. Erasmus.	The Pragmatic Sanction is abrogated by Leo X. and the Concordat substituted for it. Pope Julius III. bestows a cardinal's hat upon the keeper of his monkeys.	Ed. Grant.
			Martin Chemnitz.	Agrippa.	The Inquisition is established at Rome by Paul IV.	Ed. Anderson.
			James Andreas.	Cassander and Wicelius.	The war of the Peasants.	John Dee.
			David Chytræus.	Conr. Vorstius.	The universities of Wittenberg, Francfort on the Oder, Alcala, Saragossa, Marpurg, Seville, Compostella, Oviedo, Grenada, Franeker, Strasbourg, Parma, Macerata, Tortosa, Coimbra, Konigsberg, Leyden, Florence, Rheims, Dillingen, Mexico, St. Domingo, Tarragona, Helmstadt, Altorf, Paderborn, Sigen, founded in this century.	Thomas Craig.
			William Farel.	Sam. Huberus.	The treaty of Passau, in 1552.	G. Creighton.
			Thedore Beza.	Mich. Servetus.	The Paris massacre of the Protestants on St. Bartholomew's day.	Ed. Brerewood.
			Faustus Socinus.	Valent. Gentilis.	The republic of the United Provinces formed by the union of Utrecht.	*French Authors:*
			Bened. Arias Montanus.	Lælius Socinus.	The edict of Nantes granted to the Protestants by Henry IV. of France.	William Budæus, or Bude.
			And. Osiander.	Faustus Socinus.		Clement Marot.
			Ægid.	Quintin, the chief of the Libertines.		Fr. Rabelais.
			Hunnius.			Ja. Dubois (Sylvius.)
			Melchior Canus.			Pierre Gilles.
			Polyc.			Or. Finée.
			Lyserus.			Robert Etienne, or Stephens.
			George Wicellus.			P. Belon.
			Cardinal Bellarmine.			William Morel.
			Stella.			Adr. Turnebus.
			Crantzius.			Ch. Du Moulin.
			Thomas Illyricus.			Gilb. Cousin.
			Jacob Ben-Chaim, who gave an edition of the Hebrew Bible.			Mich. de l'Hopital.
			Sanderus.			L. Le Roy (Regius.)
			Isid. Clarius.			Hub. Languet, author of the Vindiciæ contra Tyrannos.
			John Major.			Laur. Joubert.
			Andrew Vega.			James Pelletier.
			Franc. Vatable.			Fr. Belleforest.
			Cardinal Sadolet.			M. A. Fr. Muret.
			Cardinal Cortesius.			P. Ronsard.
			John Cochlæus.			J. Dorat.
			Alphons. Zamora.			James Cujas.
			Vivaldi.			Fr. Hotoman.
			J. Almain.			James Amyot.
			Spagnoli.			Mich. de Montagne.
			Aug. Dathus.			Mich. de Castelnau.
			Pope Adrian VI.			P. Pithou.
			Petro de Monte.			J. Bodin.
			Pope Leo X.			Nic. Vignier.
			Alb. Pighius.			Bl. de Vigenere.
			Henry VIII. king of England.			Henri Etienne, commonly called Stephens.
			Louis Vives.			J. De Serres (Serranus.)
			S. Pagninus.			Cl. Fauchet.
			Leo de Castro.			J. Passerat.
			Matth. Ugonius.			J. J. Boissard.
			Cardinal Caietan.			P. Daniel d'Orleans.
			James Hoogstraat.			Francis Victe.
			Ambr. Catharini.			Cardinal d'Ossat.
			John Faber.			Rob. Constantin.
			Ortuin Gratius.			P. Morin.
			John Eckins.			Jos. Just. Scaliger.
			Leander Alberti.			Nic. Rapin.
			Nic. Serrarius.			J. Papire. Masson.
			Pet. Canisius.			P. B. Brantome
			Cæsar Baronius.			St. Pasquier.
			Fran. Ribera.			*Italian Authors:*
			Pierre Pithou.			Americo Vespucci.
			Mich. Baius.			J. Jocondi of Verona, who discovered the Letters of Pliny.
			W. Alan, English cardinal.			A. F. Grazzini.
			Dr. John Colet.			Leonicini, the translator of Galen.
			Mercator.			Pomponace.
						M. A. Casanova.
						P. Gravina.

Sovereign Princes.	*Popes, or Bishops of Rome.*	*Archbishops of Canterbury.*	*Ecclesiastical and Theological Writers.*	*Heretics, real or reputed.*	*Remarkable Events. Religious Rites.*	*Profane Authors.*
A. D.			Nic. Harpfield.			Sannazarius.
land, depos-			Leunclavius.			Machiavel.
in 1599			Molina.			Vida.
Charles IX.			Salmeron.			J. A. Lascaris.
Kings of Denmark:			Maldonat.			Alcyonius, translator of
Christiern II.			J. Natalis.			Aristotle.
deposed in 1522			J. P. Maffei.			Ariosto.
Frederic I. 1533			Cardinal Hosius.			Bern. Maffei.
Christiern			Jansenius.			Fr. Guicciardini.
III. 1559			John Tillet.			Cardinal Bembo.
Frederic II. 1588			James Naclantus.			Cardinal Sadolet.
ChristiernIV.			De Vargas.			And. Alciat.
Kings of Poland:			Cardinal Seri-			M. A.Flaminio d'Imola.
John Albert, 1501			pand.			Lilius Giraldus.
Alexander 1506			And. Masius.			J. Fracastor.
Sigismund I. 1548			Pope Paul IV.			Polydore Virgil.
Sigismund II. 1572			Widmanstadt.			M. A. Majoragio.
Henry of An-			Cassander.			P. Aretino.
jou, until the			Stapleton.			J. de la Casa.
year 1574			Mercerus.			L. Alamanni.
Stephen Ba-			F. Xavier.			N. Tartaglia.
thori 1587			Ign. Loyola.			Palingenius.
Sigismond			Bishop Gardiner.			Jul. Cæsar Scalierg.
king of Swe-			Jer. Oleaster, with			Zanchius.
den.			many others too			Gab. Faerno.
Kings of Portugal:			numerous to men-			Gab. Fallopius.
Emanuel the			tion.			J. Acronius.
Great 1521			N. B. It is remark-			Lodovico Cornaro.
John III. 1557			able that, among			Robertello.
Sebastian 1578			the ecclesiastical			Palearius.
Henry, Card. 1580			writers of this			Onuph. Panvini.
Portugal is			century, there are			Argentieri.
reduced un-			above 55 who em-			J. Bar de Vignole.
der the do-			ployed their la-			Paul Manutius.
minion of			bours in the ex-			Jerome Cardan.
Spain by			position and illus-			A. Palladio.
Philip II.			tration of the			C. Sigonius.
Ottoman Emperors:			Scriptures; and			P. Victorius.
Ba-yezid II. 1512			this happy cir-			Oct. Ferrari.
Selim I. 1520			cumstance con-			James Zabarella.
Solyman II. 1566			tributed, without			L. Guicciardini.
Selim II. 1574			doubt, to prepare			A. de Costanzo.
Morad III. 1595			the minds of ma-			Torq. Tasso.
Mohammed			ny for the Re-			Fr. Patritius, or Patrizi.
III.			formation, and			Ant. Riccoboni.
Czars of Muscovy:			thus rendered its			G. Panciroli.
John Basilo-			progress more			And. Cesalpino.
witz 1505			rapid.			Natalis Comes.
Basil Ivano-						Aldrovandi.
witz, who re-						Gratiani.
ceived from						B. Guarini.
Maximilian						*Swiss Authors:*
I. the title of						Aur. Ph. Paracelus.
Emperor 1533					*Profane Authors:* Concluded.	Theod. Bibliander.
John Basilo-					P. Lotichius.	Theod. Swinger.
witz II. 1584					Conrad Gesner.	Isaac Casaubon.
TheodoreIva-					G. Fabricius.	*German, Dutch, and Flemish Authors:*
nowitz 1597					A. Masius.	J. Reuchlin.
Boris Gode-					Joach. Camerarius.	P. Mosellan.
now.					Virgilius of Zuichem.	M. Aurogallus, who as-
Stadt-holders of the United Provinces:					Hubert Goltzius.	sisted Luther in the
William I.					John Sturmius.	translation of the Bible.
the glorious					J. Sambuc.	H. C. Agrippa.
founder of					A. G. de Busbec.	D. Erasmus of Rotter-
their liberty 1584					J. Leunclavius.	dam.
Maurice.					G. Mercator.	Luscinius.
					Læv. Torrentius.	Simon Grynæus.
					Raphelengius.	Adr. Barland of Zea-
					Ortelius.	land.
					Heurnius of Utrecht.	Nic. Copernicus, a Prus-
					Justus Lipsius.	sian.
					Paul Merula of Leyden.	J. Secundus of the
					A. Gorlæus.	Hague.
					Schonæus.	J. Olaus Magnus.
					Em. van Meteren.	Peutinger.
					Dom. Baudius.	Paul Fagius.
					Danish Authors:	Sebastian Munster.
					Tycho Brahe, the astro-	G. Agricola.
					nomer.	John Sleidan.
					Nicolas Craig.	Gasp. Bruschius.

CENTURY XVII.

Sovereign Princes.	*Popes, or Bishops of Rome.*	*Archbishops of Canterbury.*	*Ecclesiastical and Theological Writers.*	*Heretics real or reputed.*	*Remarkable Events. Religious rites.*	*Profane authors.*
Emperors: A. D.	Clement VIII. 1605	Dr. J. Whitgift 1604	*Protestant Writers:*	The doctrine of the Jesuits, concerning philosophical sin, condemned by pope Alexander VIII. in 1690.	The congregation *de propaganda Fide*, founded at Rome in 1622, by pope Gregory XV.	No century has been so fertile in authors as this before us. Their number amounts to above 850. We shall confine ourselves to those who were most eminent in each country.
Rodolph II. 1612	Leo XI. 1605	Dr. R. Bancroft 1610	Archbishop Abbot.	The Probabilists (so the Jesuits were called from their odious doctrine of probability,) condemned by the Sorbonne.	Christianity is propagated in the kingdoms of Siam, Tonquin, and Cochin-china, by the Jesuit missionaries.	
Matthias 1619	Paul V. 1621	Dr. George Abbot 1633	John Lightfoot.	The Franciscans are judged heretics on account of their doctrine concerning the immaculate conception of the Virgin Mary.	The thirty years' war breaks out.	
Ferdinand II. 1637	Gregory XV. 1623	Dr. W. Laud 1645	Matthew Poole.	Jansenius, Quesnel, and Arnauld, as also Fenelon, Molinos, and the pietists, are condemned in France.	The Moors are driven out of Spain.	
Ferdinand III. 1657	Urban VIII. 1644	Dr. W. Juxon 1663	Bishop Pearson.	Arminius, and his followers, the Universalists.	The Protestants are persecuted in France.	
Leopold I.	Innocent X. 1565	Dr. Gil. Sheldon. 1677	Bishop Fell.	Bekker, the Cartesian divines, Labadie.	The Gunpowder-Treason discovered in England.	
Kings of Spain:	Alexander VII. 1667		Gataker.	Bourignon, Poiret, Leehoff, and Claude Pajon, are regarded as heretics by the reformed churches in France and Holland.	A rupture between pope Paul V. and the Venetians.	
Philip III. 1621	Clement IX. 1669		Bishop Ward.	The Independents, Antinomians, Ranters, and Quakers, and among the latter, Fox, Barclay, Keith, and Penn, are looked upon in the same light.	The Royal Society is founded in the year 1662.	
Philip IV. 1665	Clement X. 1676		Owen.		A Jubilee is celebrated by pope Clement VIII. in the year 1600.	
(Portugal throws off the Spanish yoke, and recovers its independence, in the year 1640.)			Edward Pocock.		In 1605, Maurice, landgrave of Hesse Cassel, introduces the reformed religion into Marpurg.	
Charles II. 1700			Dr. Goodwin.		Paul V. excommunicates the Venetians, whose cause is defended by Fra. Paolo.	
Sovereigns of France:			Dr. Manton.		In the year 1606, Rodolph II. allows the Hungarians the free exercise of the Protestant religion, formerly granted by Ferdinand I. but abolished by his successor.	
Henry IV. 1610			Richard Baxter.		In 1608, the Socinians publish their Catechism at Cracow.	
Louis XIII. 1643			Dr. Calamy.		The Silesians, Moravians, and Bohemians, are allowed by Rodolph II. the free exercise of their religion in 1609.	
Louis XIV.			Howe.		The Protestants form a confederacy at Heilbron, in 1610; and the Roman catholics form a league at Wurtzburg in opposition to it.	
Sovereigns of England:			Bates.		The Bohemians choose Frederic V. elector Palatine, for their king, in order to maintain them in the free exercise of the Protestant religion; —but he is conquered, and they are forced to embrace popery.	
Elizabeth 1603			Bishop Bull.		In 1625, the princes of Lower Saxony enter into a league with Christian IV. of Denmark, which concludes by the peace of Lubeck.	
James I. (VI. of Scotland.) 1625			Grew.		Ferdinand II. publishes, in 1629, an edict, ordering the Protestants to surrender and restore all the ecclesiastical domains and possessions of which they had become masters after the	
Charles I. beheaded in the year 1649			Bishop Burnet.			
Cromwell usurps the government under the title of Lord Protector, and dies in 1658			Jo. Forbes.			
Charles II. 1685			J. Baxter.			
James II. abandons his kingdom in the year 1688, and dies in 1701			Archbishop Tillotson.			
William III. and Mary 1694			Dr. Sherlock.			
Kings of Scotland:			Archbishop Wake.			
James VI. 1625			Chillingworth.			
This prince and his successors were kings both of England and Scotland so far down as the year 1707, when these kingdoms were united into one monarchy.			Henry Hammond.			
Kings of Sweden:			Thomas Hyde.			
Charles IX. 1611			William Cave.			
Gustavus Adolphus 1632			Brian Walton.			
Christina abdicates the crown in 1654, and dies in 1689			Drusius.			
Charles Gustavus 1660			Hospinian.			
Charles XI. 1697			Trigland.			
			Ittigius.			
			Fr. Spanheim.			
			R. Cudworth.			
			Ed. Stillingfleet.			
			H. Prideaux.			
			J. Locke.			
			W. Lloyd, bishop of Worcester.			
			J. Milton.			
			St. Nye.			
			Claude.			
			Daille.			
			J. Morin.			
			Amyrault.			
			Samuel and James Basnage.			
			Jurieu.			
			Benoit.			
			Turretin.			
			Elias Saurin.			
			Morus.			
			Le Cene.			
			Mesterzat.			
			Le Blanc.			
			Arminius.			
			Grotius.			
			Episcopius.			
			Curcellæus.			
			Limborch.			
			Sleidan.			
			Coccelus.			
			Voetius.			
			Gomar.			
			Lud. Capellus, or Louis Capel.			
			S. Bochart.			
			Gerhard.			
			Hoe.			
			Calixtus.			
			G. and Fred. Heilbronner.			
			Haffenreffer.			

In Great Britain and Ireland:

Sir John Harrington.
James Harrington.
J. Pitt.
R. Stanihurst.
Sir Henry Saville.
Thomas Hariot, the inventor of Algebra.
W. Camden.
Nicolas Fuller.
Benjamin Jonson.
Shakespear, or Shakspeare.
Henry Wotton.
Thomas Lydiat.
Joseph Hall, called the English Seneca.
Lord Herbert of Cherbury.
Thomas Gataker.
W. Habington.
Archbishop Usher.
W. Harvey, who first discovered the circulation of the blood.
Sir Ken. Digby.
Sir James Ware.
John Milton.
Abraham Cowley.
The Chancellor Clarendon.
Sir Matthew Hale.
Fr. Glisson.
Thomas Stanley.
Joseph Glanvil.
Samuel Butler.
Algernon Sidney.
John Collins, mathematician.
Robert Morison.
William Dugdale.
Ralph Cudworth.
J. Rushworth.
Robert Boyle,
John Locke.
W. Molyneux.
Sir Paul Ricaut.
H. Hody.
Bishop Beverege.
Sir Samuel Garth.
Thomas Gale.
John Philips.
Bishop Sprat.
Thomas Dempster.
John Fletcher.
Ph. Massinger.
Edm. Gunter.
Francis Bacon, lord Verulam.
Thomas Ridley.
John Speed.
John Donne.
Bishop Godwin, th annalist.
Edward Coke.
Thomas Randolph.
Thomas Farnaby.

Sovereign Princes.	*Popes, or Bishops of Rome.*	*Archbishops of Canterbury.*	*Ecclesiastical and Theological Writers.*	*Heretics, real or reputed.*	*Remarkable Events. Religious Rites.*	*Profane Authors.*
A. D.	Innocent XI. 1689	Dr. W. Sancroft, deprived in 1690, died 1693	Thummius.	Add to these, Enthusiasts, and Fanatics of various kinds such as Jacob Behmen, Valentine Weigel, Nic. Drabicius, Seidel.	pacification of Passau.—This edict is disobeyed.	John Napier, inventor of logarithms.
Charles XII.	Alexander VIII. 1691	Dr. John Tillotson. 1694	The Osianders.	Stifelius, and the Rosecrucians.	Gustavus Adolphus enters Germany.	G. Keating.
Kings of Denmark:	Innocent XII. 1700	Dr. Thomas Tenison.	Musæus.		The peace of Munster and Osnabrug concluded, by which the three religions are tolerated in the empire.	John Greaves.
Christiern IV. 1648			Hutter.		The synod of Dordrecht assembled in the year 1618.	Edward Simson.
Frederic III. 1670			Hunnius, Guy and Nic.		Henry IV. of France is assassinated by Ravaillac.	John Selden.
Christian V. 1699			The Mentzers.		This event exposes the Protestants to new persecutions.	William Burton.
Frederic IV.			Godfrey Olcarius.		The edict of Nantes is perfidiously revoked by Louis XIV. and the Protestants are treated with the utmost barbarity.	Richard Zouch.
Kings of Poland:			Fred. Baldwin.		A contest between Louis XIV. and pope Innocent XI., concerning the collation of benefices, and the privileges and pretensions of the crown during their vacancy.	W. Oughtred.
Sigismond III. 1632			Alb. Grawer.		The French clergy, in a general assembly at St. Germain's, declare the pope's pretensions to temporalities null and void; place the authority of a general council above that of the pope, and maintain that his decisions are not infallible, unless they be attended with the consent of the church.	B. Walton.
Uladislaus Sig. 1648			Carpzovius.		The Irish massacre in 1641, in which above 40,000 (some say 150,000) Protestants are murdered.	P. Heylin.
John Casimir 1669			Tarnovius.		Charles I. king of England, beheaded in the year 1649.	James Howel.
Michael I. 1674			J. and Paul John Asselman.		A sort of common-wealth introduced by Cromwell, under which episcopacy suffers, and the Presbyterians, or rather the Independents, flourish.	Sir John Denham.
John Sobieski 1696			Eilhart Luber.		Charles II. restored, and with him episcopacy re-established.	Sir John Marsham.
Frederic Augustus, elector of Saxony.			The Lysers.		The glorious Revolution renders memorable the year 1688.	Bishop Wilkins.
Kings of Portugal:			Michael Walter.		The Protestants are oppressed and persecuted in many places.	James Gregory.
John, duke of Braganza, chosen king in 1640, dies in 1656			Joach. Hildebrand.		Several false Messiahs discovered, particularly Sabbati Levi, who, to avoid death, embraces the Moslem faith.	Thomas Willis.
Alphonso VI. dethroned in 1667			J. Val. Andreas.		The universities of Lunden in Sweden, Giessen, Pampeluna, Saltzburg, Derpt in Livonia, Utrecht, Abo, Duisburg, Kiel in Holstein, Inspruck, Halle. The academies of Inscriptions and of Sciences founded at Paris.	Bulst. Whitelocke.
Pedro II.			Solomon Glassius.			John Price.
Ottoman Emperors:			Ab. Calovius.			Isaac Barrow.
Mohammed III. 1604			Theod. Hachspan.			Thomas Hobbes.
Ahmed I. 1617			J. Hulseman.			Thomas Brown.
Mustapha 1617			Jacob Weller.			Thomas Marshal.
Osman 1622			J. Conr. Danhauer.			Edmund Castel.
Mustapha restored. 1623			J. G. Dorschæus.			Thomas Otway.
Morad IV. 1640			John Arndt.			Ed. Waller.
Ibrahim 1649			Martin Geyer.			Dr. Sydenham.
Mohammed IV. 1687			Schertzer.			Anthony Wood.
Solyman III. 1691			Balthasar and John Meisner.			Ed. Bernard, professor of astronomy.
Ahmed II. 1695			Aug. Pfeiffer.			Bishop Stillingfleet.
Mustapha II.			Muller.			William Somner.
Czars of Moscovy:			H. and J. Just. Chr. Schomer.			John Dryden.
Boric 1605			Sebast.			John Wallis.
Theodore Borissowitz 1605			Schmidt.			John Ray.
The false Demetrius 1606			Christ.			D. Gregory.
Basil Zuski 1610			Horsholt.			M. Lister.
Demetrius II. 1610			Ph. Jac. Spener.			Henry Dodwell.
Demetrius III. 1610			G. Th. Mayer.			N. Grew.
Uladislaus of Poland 1613			Fred. Bechman.			Sir H. Spelman.
Demetrius IV. 1613			From Gerhard to Fred. Bechman inclusively, all are Lutherans.			*French Authors:*
Michael Theodorowitz 1645			*Roman Catholic Authors:*			J. Aug. de Thou.
Alexis Michaelowitz 1676			Baronius.			Pineau.
Theodore Alexiowitz 1682			Bellarmine.			Gilot.
Ivan, or John, and Peter I. jointly.			Serrarius.			Mornac.
Ivan died in 1696			Fevardentius.			P. Matthieu.
Stadt-holders of the United Provinces:			Possevin.			Du Vair.
Maurice 1625			Gretser.			Fr. Pithou.
Frederic Henry 1647			Combesis.			J. Barclai.
			Nat. Alexander.			Savaron.
			J. Sirmond.			Pr. Jeannin.
			Petau.			Godefroi.
			Cellot.			Bergier.
			Caussin.			Le Mercier.
			Renaud.			Boulanger.
			Fra. Paolo.			Goulart.
			Pallavicini.			Malherbe.
			Labbé.			Marillac.
			Maimbourg.			N. and C. Le Bois.
			Thomassin.			J. B. Le Menestrier.
			Sfondrat.			J. Bap. Duval.
			Aguirre.			P. Haye du Chastelet.
			Henry Noris.			R. Des Cartes.
			D'Achery.			N. Fab. de Peiresc.
			Mabillon.			Henr. duc de Rohan.
			Hardouin.			De Meziriac.
			Simon.			J. Bourdelot.
			Ruinart.			J. Guthieres.
			Montfaucon.			And. du Chesne.
			Galloni.			Louis Savot.
			Cornelius a Lapide.			Val. Conrart.
			Bonfrere.			Cardinal Richelieu.
			Menard			Rochemallet.
						Philip Monet.
						Nicholas Bourbon.
						Augustus Galland.
						J. F. Niceron.
						Edm. Merille,
						Samuel Petit.
						M. Mersenne.
						Voiture.

Sovereign Princes.	*Popes, or Bishops of Rome.*	*Archbishops of Canterbury.*	*Ecclesiastical and Theological Writers.*	*Heretics, real or reputed.*	*Profane Authors.*	
A. D.			Segenot.		De Vaugelas.	Vaillant.
William II. 1650			Bernard.		Ch. Justel.	P. Silv. Regis.
The dignity of Stadt-holder remains vacant during the space of 22 years.			Lamy.		Did. Herault.	Theod. Agrip. d'Aubigné.
			Bollandus.		J. Baudouin.	*Italian Authors:*
			Henschen.		P. du Puy.	Prosper Alpini.
			Papebroch.		G. and L. de St. Marthe.	B. Baldi.
			Perron.		Denis Petau.	J. A. Magini.
			Estius.		G. Fournier.	A. Morosini.
			Launoy.		Cl. Saumaise.	Luc. Valeri.
			Tillemont.		G. Naude.	Paul Beni.
			Godeau.		N. Rigault.	Davila.
			Albaspinæus.		J. L. de Balzac.	L. Pignoria.
			Richelieu.		G. B. de Gramont.	Salvador.
			Holstenius.		Sarasin.	Sanctorius.
			Baluzius.		D. Blondel.	Thomas Campanella.
			Bona.		P. Gassendi.	Alexander Donato.
			Huet.		J. Bignon.	Mascardi Galilei.
			Bossuet.		C. H. Fabrot.	Bentivoglio.
			Fenelon.		L. Ch. Le Fevre.	Strozzi.
			Thiers.		N. Perrot d'Ablancourt.	Leo de Modena.
			Du-Pin.		N. Sanson.	Bonav.
			Leo Allatius.		Briet.	Cavalieri.
			Zaccagni.		Tan. Le Fevre.	Ev. Torricelli.
			Cotelier.		La Mothe Vayer.	J. V. Rossi.
			Filesac.		Moliere.	Fam. Strada.
			Visconti.		G. M. le Jay.	T. Galluzzi.
			Molina.		Roberval.	Martini.
			Arriaga.		Rohault.	Imperiali.
			Rigault.		H. and Adr. de Valois.	Tomassini.
			Richer.		F. H. d'Aubignac.	Virgilio Malvezzi.
			Pererius.		J. Esprit.	Molinetti.
			Mariana.		L. Moreri.	Sert. Orsato.
			Fr. Pithou.		Duc de Rochefoucault.	J. B. Nani.
			Fr. de Sales.		R. le Bossu.	J. A. Borelli.
			M. de Calafio.		F. E. de Mezeray.	Ricci.
			Lessius.		P. Corneille.	Oct. Ferrari.
			Pineda.		Ed. Mariotte.	Bartalocci.
			C. Jansenius.		J. Spon.	M. Malpighi.
			Bentivoglio.		G. d'Estrades.	Bellori.
			Sponde.		Charles and Perrault.	Viviani.
			Bzovius.		P. Bayle.	Bellini.
			H. de Valois.		Vauban.	Bocconi.
			P. de Marca.		Tournefort.	Averani.
			Arnaud d'Andilly.		Th. Corneille.	Cassini.
			Du Cange.		Boileau.	Magalotti.
			Pascal.		Ren. Rapin.	*Spanish and Portuguese Authors:*
			Du Boulay.		Jean Doujat,	Cervantes.
			A. Arnaud.		Fr. Bernier.	Antonio de Ledesma.
			Vavasseur.		Ch. Du Fresne.	J. Mariana, the historian.
			Neercassel.		Du Cange.	Antonio Herrera, the historian.
			J. Le Maitre de Sacy.		Is. de Benserade.	Aldrete, the antiquarian.
			Pagi.		Thevenot.	Balbuena.
			Pezron.		G. Menage.	J. L. de la Cerda.
			Gerberon.		De St. Real.	Lopez de Vega, the Spanish Homer.
			Quesnel.		Pelisson.	Nic. de Antonio.
			These are the most distinguished writers of the Romish church during this century.		Bussy Rabutin.	Balth. Gracian.
					Ch. Patin.	Diego de Coutu.
					B. d'Herbelot.	Jos. Texeira.
					Cl. Lancelot.	Rod. Lobo.
					St. Evremond.	Eman. Faria è Sousa.
					Amelot de la Houssaye.	Ant. Perez.
					Louis Cousin.	Man. Alvarez.
					F. S. Regn.	Pegase.
					Des Marais.	*German, Dutch, Swiss, Swedish, &c. Authors:*
					A. Felibien.	Pauw, Anatomy.
					Jean de la Bruyere.	Aiguillon.
					Sim. Foucher.	Emmius.
					J. Domat.	Gruterus.
					J. B. Santeuil.	Bertius.
					C. P. Richelet.	Andr. Schott.
					P. J. d'Orleans	Martinius.
					J. Racine.	Snellius of Leyden
					J. Barbeyrac.	James and Adrian Metius.
					J. B. Morin.	Cunæus.
					Baudrand.	J. Meursius.
					Segrais.	
					Chevreau.	
					Charpentier.	
					Bouhours.	
					Marquis de l'Hopital.	

Sovereign Princes.	*Popes, or Bishops of Rome.*	*Archbishops of Canterbury.*	*Ecclesiastical and Theological Writers.*	*Heretics, real or reputed.*	*Profane authors.*	
					Louis de Dieu.	Hoffman.
					J. B. van Helmont.	Scioppius.
					Hugo Grotius.	G. J. Vossius.
					Louis de Dieu.	Barthius.
					Erycius Puteanus.	Freinsheim.
					Gasp. Barlæus.	Schrevelius.
					Van Hooft.	J. Gerard.
					Const. Imperator.	Hornius.
					Manasseh Ben-Israel.	Etmuller.
					B. Varenius.	Olaus Rudbeck. [son.
					Sanderus.	Bartholinus, father and
					Vander-Linden.	Isaac Pontanus.
					J. Golius.	Chr. Longomontanus.
					Aitzema.	J. Rhodius.
					Hæschelius.	Bangius.
					Ch. Helvicus.	Ad. Olearius.
					Melchior Adam.	Graaf.
					Cluverius.	Swammerdam.
					Hospinian.	Ath. Kircher.
					Rosinus.	Anna Maria Schurman.
					Buxtorf, father and son.	Ab. de Wicquefort.
					Kepler.	J. Kunckel.
					Goldast.	Ludolf.
					Horstius.	J. G. Grævius.
					Sennert.	Burchard de Volder.
					Erasmus Schmidt.	Varenius.
					Alstedius.	Dodonæus.
					J. F. Gronovius.	Otto Guerick, inventor
					Meric Casaubon.	of the air-pump.
					Fr. Junius.	Morhoff.
					Conringius.	Isaac Vossius.
					R. Heinsius.	Olaus Borrichius.
					Noldius.	G. Sagittarius.
					H. Meibomius.	J. Tollius.
					Olaus Wormius.	Huygens.
					Jos. Arndius.	Pufendorff.
					J. G. Suicer.	Leusden.
					Wetstein.	Wagenseil.
					Gurtler.	Brockhuisen.
					Thomasius.	Cellarius.
					J. P. Pareus.	Ezekiel Spanheim.

CENTURY XVIII.

Sovereign Princes.	*Popes, or Bishops of Rome.*	*Archbishops of Canterbury.*	*Ecclesiastical and Theological Writers.*	*Heretics, and Free Thinkers.*	*Remarkable Events in the Church.*	*Profane Authors.*
Emperors of Germany: A. D.	Clement XI. 1721	Dr. Thomas Tenison 1715	N. B. In this list, only deceased authors are mentioned.	John Toland.	The French missionaries make many converts to popery in the eastern parts of the world; in the Carnatic, on the coast of Malabar, in China, &c.	Sir Isaac Newton.
Leopold 1705	Innocent XIII. 1724	Dr. William Wake 1737		Matthew Tindall.		J. Flamsteed.
Joseph 1711	Benedict XIII. 1730	Dr. John Potter 1747		Ant. Collins.		J. Keill.
Charles VI. 1740	Clement XII. 1740	Dr. Thomas Herring 1757	*Protestant Writers:*	Thomas Woolston.		Maclaurin.
Charles VII. (elector of Bavaria) 1745	Benedict XIV. 1758	Dr. Matthew Hutton 1758	Sir Isaac Newton.	Charles Blount.		Bradley.
Francis of Lorrain 1765			Dr Bentley.	Thomas Chubb.		Dr. Clarke.
Joseph II. 1790			Archbishops Wake, Potter, and Secker.	Thomas Morgan.		Dr. Bentley.
Leopold II. 1792			Bishops Hare, Cumberland, Atterbury, Berkeley, Butler, Benson, Smallridge, Sherlock, Conybeare, Warburton, Lowth, Hurd, Horsley, and Porteus.	Bernard de Mandeville.	A great controversy is occasioned by the indulgence of the Jesuits towards the Chinese, in allowing them to retain the religious ceremonies of paganism.	Bishop Hare.
Francis II.				Lord Bolingbroke, and others less worthy of notice.		Addison.
Kings of Spain:						Pope.
Philip V. resigns the crown in 1724						Gay.
Louis dies in 1724						Prior.
Philip reascends the throne; and dies in 1746						Dr. Swift.
Ferdinand VI. 1759						Sir R. Steele.
Charles III. 1788						Dr. Arbuthnot.
Charles IV.					Protestant missionaries are sent to India by the English, Dutch, and Danes.	Dr. Friend.
Kings of France.						Dr. Mead.
Louis XIV. 1715			Wesley.			Dr. Woodward.
			Dr. Mill.		The bull *Unigenitus*, issued by Clement XI. in 1713, condemns Quesnel's edition of the New Testament, and, produces violent debates and divisions in the Gallican church, more especially between the Jesuits and the Jansenists.	Sir Hans Sloane.
			Dr. Edwards.			Sir Christopher Wren.
			Dr. Whitby.			Dr. Halley.
			Dr. Clarke.			Dr. Hutcheson, the metaphysician.
			W. Whiston.			Dr. Middleton.
			Wollaston.			Dr. Berkeley, bishop of Cloyne.
						The lords Shaftsbury and Bolingbroke.

Sovereign Princes.	*Popes, or Bishops of Rome.*	*Archbishops of Canterbury.*	*Ecclesiastical and Theological Writers.*	*Heretics, and Free Thinkers:*	*Remarkable Events in the Church.*	*Profane Authors.*
A. D.	Clement	Dr. Thomas	The lord chancellor King.	Among the sects of this century we may reckon the Herrenhutters, or Moravian brethren, and the followers of Swedenborg.	The latter endeavour to support their declining credit by fictitious miracles, said to be wrought at the tomb of the abbé Paris.	Congreve.
Louis XV. 1774	XIII. 1769	Secker 1768	Dr. J. Leland.		The study of philosophy is placed on a new footing in Germany, by Leibnitz and Wolff; and their method of demonstration is transferred by some divines to theology.	Wycherly.
Louis XVI. deposed in 1792 and beheaded in 1793	Clement XIV. 1774	Dr. Frederic Cornwallis 1783	Dr. Derham.			Sir John Vanbrugh.
After several changes of government, Bonaparte became sovereign of France in 1799 under the denomination of first consul, for which he afterwards substituted the more dignified title of emperor.	Pius VI. 1799	Dr. John Moore.	Jeremiah Seed.			Lord Somers.
	Pius VII.		James Hervey.			Mrs. Cockburn.
			Balguy.			Nicholas and Thomas Rowe.
			Chapman.			Mrs. Rowe.
			Dr. Jortin.			Thompson.
			Dr. Paley.			Dr. Young.
			Dr. Blair.			Akenside.
			Dr. Hickes.			Armstrong.
			Abernethy.			Collins.
			Dr. George Benson.			Gray.
			Dr. Chandler.			Lord Lyttleton.
			Dr. James Foster.			Glover.
			Dr. Watts.			Goldsmith.
			Dr. Doddridge.			Churchill.
			Dr. Taylor, of Norwich.			Cowper.
			Pierce.			Burns.
			Hallet.			Foote.
			Grove.			Colman.
			Lardner.			The earl of Chesterfield.
			Dr. Priestley.			Horace, earl of Orford.
			French, Swiss, German, and Dutch Writers.			Sir William Blackstone.
			Abbadie.			Hume.
			Pictet.			Robertson.
			James Saurin.			Stuart.
			Oudin.			Gibbon.
			Ostervald.			Burnet, or lord Monboddo.
			Jurieu.			Home, or lord Kames.
			Turretin.			Sir William Jones.
			Werenfels.			Harris.
			Vitringa.			Dr. Johnson.
			Leydeiker.			Adam Smith.
			Marck.			Burke.
			Braun.			Richardson.
			Jablonski.			Fielding
			Mosheim.			Smollett.
			Witsius and Trigland of Leyden.			Dr. Moore.
			Spener.			Dr. William Hunter.
			Pecht.			John Hunter.
			Mayer.			Pott.
			Masius.			Dr. Heberden.
			Wandalinus.			Sir John Pringle.
			Wincler.			Dr. Cullen.
			Fabricius.			Dr. Brown.
			Schmidt.			Dr. Darwin.
			Rechenberg.			Dr. Black.
			Ittigius.			Stephen Hales.
			Seeligman.			Henry Cavendish.
			Loscher			Dr. Priestley.
			Foertsch.			*French Authors.*
			Buddeus.			Malebranche.
			Luthenius.			B. Lany.
			Antonius.			Lemery.
			Franckius.			Fenelon.
			Langius.			Sauveur.
			Maius.			P. de la Hire.
			Pritius.			Flechier.
			N. B. The twenty writers last mentioned are Lutherans.			Le Vassor.
			Romish Authors:			J. F. Simon.
			Gonsalez.			Isaac de Larrey.
			Beaugendre.			J. F. Felibien.
			Papin.			Andrew and Anne Dacier.
			Van Espen.			Claudius and William de l'Isle.
			F. Lami.			Renaudot.
			Pouget.			Tarteron.
			Des-Marets.			Huet.
			D. de St. Marthe.			J. le Long.
			Hyac. Serri.			Boulainvilliers.
			G. Helyot.			Louis and John Boivin.
						Rapin de Thoyras.
						James Basnage.
						J. and P. L. Savary.
						Louis de Sacy.
						Du Resnel.
						N. L. de la Caille.
Sovereigns of Great Britain:						
William III. 1702						
Anne 1714						
George I. 1727						
George II. 1760						
George III.						
Sovereigns of Sweden:						
Charles XII. 1718						
Ulrica Eleonora 1751						
Frederic of Hesse Cassel 1751						
Adolphus of Holstein 1771						
Gustavus III. —assassinated in 1792						
Gustavus IV. deposed by his uncle in 1809						
Kings of Denmark:						
Frederic IV. 1730						
Christiern VI. 1746						
Frederic V. 1766						
Christiern VII.						
Kings of Poland:						
Frederic Augustus 1733						
Stanislaus is twice elected, but abdicates the crown.						
Frederic Augustus II. 1764						
Stanislaus, count Poniatowski, succeeds; but he is deposed by foreign powers in 1794, and the kingdom is dismembered.						
Sovereigns of Portugal:						
Pedro II. 1706						
John V. 1750						
Joseph 1777						
Maria.						

Sovereign Princes.	*Popes, or Bishops of Rome.*	*Archbishops of Canterbury.*	*Ecclesiastical and Theological Writers.*	*Heretics, and Free Thinkers:*	*Profane Authors.*	
Turkish Emperors: A. D.			F. Timoleon de Choisi.		B. de la Monnoye.	Micheli.
Mustapha II. 1703			Huet.		The abbé Fraguier.	Manfredi.
Ahmed III. —deposed in 1730			J. Martiany.		Gabriel Daniel.	Giannone.
Mahmoud 1754			Hure.		G. J. du Verney.	Muratori.
Osman III. 1757			Habert		Valincourt.	Zeno.
MustaphaIII. 1774			Fleuri.		Geoffroy.	Maffei.
Abdul-hamed 1789			Massillon.		De la Mothe.	Cardinals Quirini and Passionei.
Selim III.			Eusebius Renaudot.		Joachim le Grand.	Buonamici.
Russian Sovereigns:			Houdry.		Sanadon.	Cassini.
Peter the Great 1725			P. Constant.		Dumon.	Beccaria.
Catharine I. 1727			Baltus.		Vertot.	Spalanzani.
Peter II. 1730			P. de la Broue.		Catrou.	Metastasio.
Anne 1740			G. Daniel.		Rouillé.	*Swiss Writers.*
Ivan, or John —deposed in 1741, and assassinated in 1762			Hardouin.		Beausobre.	D. and J. le Clerc.
Elizabeth 1762			J. J. Boileau.		The abbé de la Bleterie.	Konig.
PeterIII. murdered in 1762			Marsollier.		Niceron.	Burlamaqui.
Catharine II. 1796			Garnier.		De la Barre.	Schenchzer.
Stadt-holders of the United Provinces:			Le Bœuf.		Melon.	Crousaz.
William III. 1702			Anselme.		De la Croze.	The Bernouillis.
This dignity remained vacant for 45 years.			Joubert.		Vanier.	Euler.
William IV. 1751			Tournemine		Montfaucon.	De Saussure.
William V. deposed by the French in 1795.			Duguet.		Rollin.	De Luc.
Kings of Prussia:			Longuerue.		Longuerue.	Haller.
Frederic I. 1713			Le Quien.		Banier.	Mallet.
Frederic William I. 1740			Longueval.		Cardinal Polignac.	Sol. Gesner.
Frederic II. 1786			Vertot.		J. J. Rousseau.	*German Authors:*
Frederic William II. 1797			Gibert.		Du-Bois.	Leibnitz.
Frederic William III.			Martenne.		Brumoy.	Wolff.
Kings of Sardinia:			Boursier.		Velley.	Krosig.
Victor Amadeus I. 1730			Blondel.		Villaret.	Kuster.
Charles Emanuel 1773			Montfaucon.		Bourget.	Moller.
Victor II. 1796			C. de la Rue.		Bignon.	J. A. Schmidt.
			Sabatier.		Goguet.	Eccard.
			Benoit.		Abbé de St. Pierre.	Mencke.
			Colbert.		Fontenelle.	Hubner.
			Languet.		Du-Halde.	J. A. Fabricius.
			Dantine.		De Moivre.	Neumann.
			Houteville.		Bougeant.	Heineccius.
			Lenglet du-Fresnoi.		Folard.	C. Wormius.
			Martin.		Marquis de Puy-Segur.	Keysler.
			Berruyer.		M. D'Argens.	Doppelmaier.
			De Caylus.		Abbé Des-Fountaines.	Reiske.
			Bon. Racine.		Freret.	Werner.
			Calmet.		Le Sage.	Pallas.
			Celier.		The Fourmonts.	Zimmermann.
			Maran.		Montesquieu.	Herder.
			Des-Champs.		Mongault.	Gellert.
			Morvan de Bellegarde.		Gabrielle du Chastelet.	Mendelsohn.
			The popes Clement XI.		Des-touches.	Klopstock.
			Benedic XIII. and XIV.		Terrason.	Muller.
			Orsini.		Caylus.	*Dutch Writers:*
			Muratori.		Casp. de Real.	Adrian Reland.
			Bianchini.		Crevier.	J. F. Gronovius.
			Orsi.		Marmontel.	Cuper.
			Tomasi.		Reaumur.	Perizonius.
			Banduri.		Du-Hamel.	Nieuwentyt.
					Le Gendre.	Noodt.
					Morabin.	Hartsoeker.
					Helvetius.	Bynkershoek.
					Maupertius.	Boerhaave.
					Condillac.	W. J. Gravesande.
					D'Alembert.	Schultens.
					Voltaire.	Van Loon.
					The Crebillons.	Muschenbroek.
					Diderot.	Wesseling.
					Condorcet.	Havercamp.
					Clairault.	Hemsterhuis.
					Buffon.	Nieuland.
					Lavosier.	*Russian Writers:*
					Bailly.	Prince Cherbatoff.
					Mirabeau.	Lomonosoff.
					Italian Authors	Sumorokoff.
					Poli.	*Danish and Swedish Authors:*
					Magliabechi.	Baron Holberg.
					Musitani.	Fabricius.
					Battaglini.	C. von Linné, or Linnæus.
					Gravina.	Sir Torbern Bergman.
					Lancisi.	Scheele.
					Buonanni.	
					Zanicheli.	
					Fontanini.	

CENTURY XIX.

Sovereign Princes.	*Popes, or Bishops of Rome.*	*Archbishops of Canterbury.*	*Ecclesiastical and Theological Writers.*	*Sectaries.*	*Remarkable Events in the Church.*	*Profane Authors.*
Emperor of Germany or of Austria: A. D. Francis II. *Kings of Spain:* Charles IV. is deposedby Napoleon 1808 Ferdinand VII. succeeds; but he is inveigled into France. Joseph Bonaparte usurps the throne, and reigns over a part of the kingdom, while the other parts are ruled by a council of state and the Cortes. In1814, Ferdinand was liberated by the tyrant, and restored; and he still [in 1826] rules over a reluctant nation. *Sovereigns of Portugal:* Maria 1816 John VI. 1826 *Sovereigns of France:* Bonaparte or the emperor Napoleon, reigned until the year 1814: he was then deposed andbanished. In 1815, he regained his power, but lost it before the end of the year. Louis XVIII.1824 Charles X. *King of Holland.* Louis Bonaparte, from 1806 to 1810. *King of the Netherlands:* William VI. prince of Orange. *King of Prussia:* Frederic V. or Frederic William III. *Kings of Bovaria:* Maximilian 1824 Charles Louis. *King of Saxony:* Frederic Augustus. *Kings of Wurtemberg:* Frederic William 1817 His son. *King of Hanover.* George Augustus, also king of Great Britain.	Pius VII. 1823 Leo XII.	Dr. John Moore 1805 Dr. Charles Manners Sutton.	Dr. Richard Watson, bishop of Llandaff. Dr. GeorgeHorne, bishop of Norwich. Dr. Joseph White. Dr. Joshua Toulmin.	Joanna Southcott. The baroness von Krudener.	Napoleon concludes a treaty with the pope, in 1801, for the adjustment of the religious concerns of France. The French seize the pope's territories, confine his holiness, and leave him only a shadow of power. In 1809, by the new constitution of Sweden, a full religious toleration is allowed. Recovering his authority in 1814, the pope annuls theFrench regulations at Rome, re-establishes the monastic orders, and revives the Society of Jesuits. By the union of the Austrian Netherlands with Holland, in 1814, the catholics lose their sway in the former country. In several of the German states, the Lutherans and Calvinists, in 1817 and 1818, enter into a union. In 1817. Louis XVIII. concludes a concordat with the pope. The year 1825 is marked, at Rome, by the solemnity of a Jubilee.	Richard Porson Greek professor at Cambridge. Lord Byron. Elizabeth Carter. Anna Seward. Dr. Erasmus Darwin. Dr. James Beattie. Richard Cumberland. Richard Brinsley Sheridan. John Horne Tooke. John Wolcot. *French Writers* Madame de Stael. Madame Cottin. *German Authors:* Klopstock. Schiller. Wieland. Kotzebue.

Sovereign Princes. Concluded. A. D.
Kings of Sweden:
Gustavus IV. deposed in 1809
CharlesXIII.1818
Charles XIV.
Kings of Denmark:
Christiern VII. 1808
Frederic VI.
Emperors of Russia:
Paul, murdered in 1801
Alexander 1825
Nicolas.
Emperors of Turkey:
Selim III. dethroned in 1807
MustaphaIV. deposed in 1808
Mahmoud II.
Kings of Naples and Sicily:
Ferdinand IV. 1824
Francis.
Kings of Sardinia:
Charles Emanuel II. resigned 1802
Victor III. resigned 1821
Charles Felix.

INDEX.

INDEX.

ABBOT, archbishop of Canterbury, character and conduct of, 609.
Abelard, Peter, author of the Scholastic System, 282; he is condemned as a heretic, 284; attacks heresies in general, 285.
Abgarus, story of, 10.
Absalom, archbishop of Lunden, in Sweden, 260.
Abul-Faraj, an eminent Syrian writer, 298.
Abyssinia, Romish missions to, 547, 548, 777: Lutheran missions, 577.
Abyssinians embrace the Monophysite doctrine, 202; state of their church at different times, 445; 717, 744.
Acacius, bishop of Constantinople, is deposed, 128.
Academics, their impious notions, 4.
Academical institutions in Europe, 298, 454, 463, 474.
Acephali, a sect, 128.
Adalbert, bishop of Prague, a martyr, 206.
Adamites, tenets of, 55.
——— Bohemian, an account of, 377.
Adrian, the emperor, a persecutor of the Christians, 36.
——— I. pope, gratifies Charlemagne with the right of election to the see of Rome, 171.
——— IV., arrogance of, 273.
——— VI., good character of, 398.
Æon, the eternal nature, 18.
Ærian controversy, 95.
Africans, the nature of their conversion in xv. cent. examined, 358; in xvii. cent. 523.
Agnoëtæ, a sect, 144.
Agobard, archbishop of Lyons, account of, 184, 190.
Agricola, founder of the Antinomian sect in Germany, 461.
Albert the Great, character of, 300, 320; his system of divinity, 322.
Albigenses, or Paulician sect, 257; cruel persecution of them, 329.
Alcuin, character and works of, 172.
Aldhelm, account of, 154.
Alexander III. pope, confers on the cardinals the sole right of electing to the pontificate, 233, 275; orders schools to be erected 268; deposes the emperor Frederic I. 273; is driven from Rome ib.; retrieves his affairs, 274; extends the papal authority, 275.
——— VI. infamous character of, 370, 386.
——— VII. conduct of, 519; bull against Jansenius, 566.
——— VIII. character of, 638.
——— Natalis, writes against the popish claims, 550.
Alexandria, patriarch of, one of the heads of the Christian church, 88; extent of his authority in xvi. cent. 441.
Alfred, his taste for letters, 184; the most learned men under him, ib.
Allatius, Leo, his works for uniting the Greek and Romish churches, 574.
Almamoun, khalif of Bagdad, an eminent patron of science, 183.
Almeric, an account of, 300.
Alphonso, king of Leon, an eminent patron of letters, in xiii. cent. 298; the fame he acquired by his astronomical tables, ib.
Alphonso VI., king of Naples, a zealous promoter of learning, 360.
Altenburg, conference at, 465.
Alva, duke of, a cruel persecutor of the protestants, 416; effect of his tyranny, ib.
Amalric, the absurd and impious doctrine taught by him, 332.
Ambrose, bishop of Milan, his character, 89; his three books on the duty of ministers, 92.
——— of Camaldoli, his works, 372.
America, when first visited by the Europeans, 358; its inhabitants converted to Christianity, ib.; English and Dutch colonies there in xvi. cent. 522: Romish missions, 523, Protestant missions, 524; the ambition of the Jesuits in Paraguay, ib.; an episcopal church in North America, 733.
Ames, William, account of, 488; he treats morality as a separate science, 604.
Ammonius Saccus, founder of the new Platonists, 39; attempts a coalition of all sects with his own system, ib.; the principles of his philosophy, ib.; his moral discipline, 40; the pernicious effects of his philosophy to Christianity, and hence the foundation of the monks and mystics, ib.; the rapid progress of his sect, 61.
Amour, Guillaume de St., a strenuous opposer of the mendicant friars, 311; is banished, ib.; his works and great character, ib.
Amsterdam, clergy and magistrates of, oppose the toleration of the Mennonites, 500.
Amyrault, Moses, account of his works, 604; form of his doctrine and reconciliatory endeavours, 606; proceedings of the Swiss church against him, 622.
Anabaptists, their enthusiastic, seditious, and vile principles in xvi. cent. and punishments they undergo, 409.
Anabaptists (Mennonites,) their history, 490; maxim whence their peculiarities arose, 491; their progress, 492; crimes of many of them, ib.; points of doctrine maintained by the most rational of them, ib.; severe punishments inflicted on them, 493.
——— of Munster, their seditious madness, 493; measures taken to extirpate them, 494; plot against the magistrates defeated, ib.; how comforted by Menno, ib.; origin of the sects that started up among them, 495; warm contest, 496; new dissensions among them, ib.; their creed, confessions, and peculiar tenets, ib.; state of learning and philosophy among them, 499; their settlement in the United Provinces, 500; English, called Baptists, with an account of their various denominations, ib.; singular sect called Davidists, 501; various fortunes of the Anabaptists in xvii. cent. 636; union restored among them, 637; different sects, with their several characters and notions, ib.; external form of their church, ib.; three orders of ministers among them, ib.
Anachorets, a monastic order in iv. cent. 94.
Anastasius, gives rise to the Nestorian controversy, 124.
——— the emperor, protects the Acephali, 143.
Anchialus, patriarch of Constantinople, an eminent patron of letters in xii. cent. 267.
Andreas, James, employed in reconciling the Lutheran divines, 466.
Andronicus, the emperor, forbids all controversies concerning speculative points of theology, 280.
Angelome, a monk of Lisieux, an acute, but fantastic writer in ix. cent. 193.
Anglo-Saxons, oppress the Christians, 111; some few converted by Augustin, 131; a universal conversion among them in vii. cent. 146; the causes of this conversion considered, ib.
Anselm, archbishop of Canterbury, improves the science of logic, 229; inventor of the famous argument ascribed to Des-Cartes, 230; one of the first who composed a system of divinity, 250.
——— of Laon, his character, 279, 282.
——— of Havelberg, a strenuous advocate for the Latins against the Greeks, 285.
Ansgar, founder of the Cimbrian, Danish and Swedish churches, 180.
Anthropomarphites, a sect in x. cent. 220.
Antichrist, ensigns of, what so called by the Puritans, 480.
Antinomians, their rise among the Lutherans, 461; suppression by Luther, ib.; tenets, ib.; English, their rise, and pernicious tenets, 615; their modern state, 734.
Antioch, jurisdiction of its patriarch in iv. cent. 88; the extent of his power in xvi. cent. 441.
Antoninus, Marcus, a persecutor of the Christians, 36; his partiality to the Stoics, and its effects upon learning, 38.
——— Pius, persecution under him, 36.
Antonius Paulus, endeavours to correct the abuses among the clergy in xvii. cent. 591.
Antony, forms in Egypt the Monks into a body, 93; the rapid progress of this order in the east, and maxims of their philosophy which seduced Christians, ib.
——— of Vienne, order of, 247.
Apollinarian heresy, 104.
Apollonius Tyanæus, a knave, and an impostor, 60.
Apostles of Christ, why limited to twelve, 10; the success of their ministry, 11; their authority and office, 20; they and their disciples the principal writers, 23; the creed, by whom composed, 25.
——— a sect in xiii. cent. 333; their extirpation, ib.
Apostolics, a sect in xii. cent. 292; the remarkable purity of their lives, ib.
Aquinas, Thomas, a very powerful advocate for the philosophy of Aristotle, 300; his character, 320; method of explaining the Scriptures, 322; orthodoxy questioned, 323; famous sum, what 324; polemic work against the Gentiles, ib.; several of his doctrines opposed by John Duns Scotus, 353.
Arabian philosophers, tenets of some, 73; confuted by Origen, they abandoned their erroneous sentiments, ib; form schools in Spain and Italy, in x. cent. 212; source of knowledge among the Europeans, ib.; and 228; authors of divination and astrology in the West, ib.
Arbricelies, Robert, founds a monastery at Fontevraud in xii. cent. 277; one singularity in his rule, 278.
Archbishops, authority of, in iv. cent. 86.
Arianism, its rise in iv. cent. 102; the tenets of its author, ib.; its progress before the first Nicene council, ib.; its history after that time,

103, &c.; various sects of it, which may be reduced to three classes, 104; its state in vi. cent. 143; encouraged by the Lombards in vii. cent. 155.
Arians, two eminent writers among them in xvii. cent. 640; to whom the denomination of Arian is applicable, ib.; most eminent patrons in xviii. cent. 653; bad consequences of Arianism, ib.; points of its doctrine adopted by Mr. Whiston, and consequence, ib.; controversy occasioned by Dr. Clarke's opinions concerning the Trinity, and by whom opposed, 654.
Aristotelian philosophy, admired by the Nestorians in vi. cent. 135; its progress in viii. cent. 165; taught by the reformed church in xvi. cent. 486; introduced into theology, and bad consequence, 487; its state in xvii. cent. 532, 557, 583.
Aristotle, his notions of God and the human soul, 5; had many admirers in xiii. cent.—the prejudice done by them to Christianity, 296.
Arius, maintains the inferiority of the second person of the Trinity, 102; expelled from the church, ib.; condemned by the council of Nice, ib.; recalled from exile, 103; dies a miserable death, ib.
Armagh, Richard of, attacks the Mendicants, 345.
Armenia, Great and Less, Christianity established there, 82, 83.
Armenians, an account of, in xvi. cent. 445; their state in xvii. cent. 577; generous behaviour of the shah Abbas toward them, ib.; the advantages they received from the settlement of a great number of Armenians in different parts of Europe, ib.; state of their church in xviii. cent. 716.
Arminianism, its rise and progress, in xvii. cent. 622.
Arminius, James, founder of the Arminian church, 605; professes publicly his opinions about predestination, grace, &c. in opposition to those of Calvin, ib.; two favourable circumstances for him, 623; by whom opposed, and controversy thereupon, with his death, ib.; progress of his sect, ib.;
Arnauld, a patron of the Jansenists, 564; his dispute with Claude, concerning transubstantiation, 574.
Arndt, a moral writer in xvii. cent. 588; his good character and works, 597.
Arnobius, a defender of the Christians, 65.
Arnold, of Brescia, account of him and his sect, 290.
———, of Villa Nova, his extensive learning, 301.
———, Godfrey, disturbs the Lutheran church, 594: his ecclesiastical history censured, ib.
Artemon, a sectary, 55.
Arts, seven, the wretched manner of teaching them in viii. cent. 166.
Ascetics, their rise and principles, 45.
Asculanus, Ceccus, a famous philosopher in xiv. cent. 339; his fate, ib.
Asia, Protestant missions in, 522; English and Dutch colonies, 26.
Asiatic Gnostics, a sect in ii. cent. 50.
Asinus, John Pungens, substitutes consubstantiation for transubstantiation, in xiii. cent. 325.
Assemblies, the first Christian, 48.
Associations, religious, in Great Britain, 752.
Astesanus, his character, 352, 353.
Astrology, mixed with philosophy, considered as magic in xiv. cent. 399.
Asylum, right of, contested, 551.
Athanasius, account of, 88; he is deposed by the council of Tyre, 103.
Athenagoras, an excellent writer in ii. cent. 42.
Atto, bishop of Vercelli, his works useful in describing the genius of the people in x. cent. 216.
Audæus, forms a sect, 106.
Augsburg, conference at, between Luther and Caietan, 392; diet holden in that city by Charles V., 406; famous confession made by the protestants, ib.; a refutation of it attempted by the catholics, 407; three methods proposed for terminating these religious dissensions, ib.; a severe decree against the reformers, ib.; a religious peace concluded at the second diet, 413; acts favourable to the protestants passed, 414.
Augustin, bishop of Hippo, high character of, 89; his success against the Donatists, 101; he suppresses Pelagianism, 129; opposes the Predestinarians, 130.
———, a Benedictine monk, sent into Britain as a missionary, 131.
———, St., monks of, their rise in xiii. cent. 309.
Avignon, popes remove thither their residence in xiv. cent. 341; their power diminished, ib.; invent new schemes to acquire riches, ib.
Aurelian, state of the church under him, 60.
Aureolus, Peter, a scholastic doctor, 352.
Austria, commotions in, against the protestants in xvii. cent. 539; state of the Austrian church, 740.
Authbert, a converter of the pagans in ix. cent. 180.
Autherius, bishop of Bethlehem, founds the congregation of the Holy Sacrament, 514.
Bacon, John, a scholastic divine, 352.
———, Roger, his great character, 299, 301, 320.
———, lord Verulam, his character, 529.
Baius, disputes about grace in xvi. cent. 439; he is accused and stigmatised, ib.
Baldus, his character, 338.
Balsamon, Theodore, a Greek writer, 279.
Bangorian controversy, 724.
Baptism, not to be considered as a mere ceremony, 27; the manner of celebrating it in i. cent. 28; in ii. cent. 49; in iii. cent. 70; in iv. cent. 99.
Baptists, general and particular, doctrines and practices of, 500; farther account of both, vi. 728, 729.
Baradæus, Jacob, restores the Monophysites, 144; is acknowledged as their second founder, 145.
Barbarians, Western, persecute the Christians, 209.
Barcepha, Moses, his great character, 189.
Barclay, Robert, a defender of the Quakers, 630.
Barcochebas, a great enemy to the Christians, 36.
Bardesanes, founder of a sect. 51.
Barnabites, order of, founded in xvi. cent. 431; soon deviate from their first rule, ib.
Baronius' annals, an account of, 431.
Barsumas, a zealous promoter of Nestorianism, 125.
Bartolus, his character, 338.
Basil, bishop of Cæsarea, account of, 88.
——, the council of, 367; its decrees and acts, ib.
Basilides, chief of the Egyptian Gnostics, 52; enormous errors of his system, 53; his moral doctrine, ib.
Basilius, the Macedonian, under him the Sclavonians and Russians are converted, 180.
———, founder of a sect in xii. cent. 287; his tenets, ib.
Bassi, Matthew de, founder of the Capuchin order, 429.
Bayle, a sceptical philosopher, 536.
Becker, Balthasar, peculiar sentiments of, 621; contest occasioned by them, ib.
Becket, archbishop of Canterbury, subscribes, and afterwards rejects the constitutions of Clarendon, 274; is assassinated in his own chapel, 275; enrolled among the most eminent saints, ib.
Bede, the venerable, a celebrated Englishman, 172.
Beghards, austere sectaries, 316; harassed by Charles IV. in Germany, 349; corrupted by the Brethren of the Free Spirit, 356; persecution of them, 356, 377.
Beguines, a female sect, 318, 356.
Behmen, Jacob, one of the Rosecrucian brethren, 532; his chimerical notions, 598.
Believers, distinguished from catechumens, 21, 25.
Bell's scheme of education, 753.
Bellarmine, an eminent defender of the Romish church, 435.
Bellator, his character as a commentator, 139.
Bembo, cardinal, a supposed infidel writer, 419.
Benedict, of Nursia, founder of an order of monks, 137, 138.
———, abbot of Aniane, employed to reform the practices of the monks, 189; restores the monastic discipline, ib.; subjects the various monastic orders to that of Benedict of Mount-Cassin, ib.; his discipline soon declines, ib.
——— VI., pope, his character and fate, 213, 214.
——— VII., account of, 214.
——— IX., his infamous character, 231.
——— XII., his good character, 342.
——— XIII., anti-pope, an account of, 344, 362.
——— XIII., pope, his character, vi. 646, 706; his death, 707.
——— XIV., great character of, 646; his conduct and government, 708.
Benedictine order, rise of, in vi. cent. 137; the founder's views in this institution, ib.; degeneracy among the monks from his practice, ib.; its rapid progress in the West, ib.; the founder's discipline neglected and forgotten by the monks in x. cent. 215; literary fame of the order, 558.
Benefices, the right of nomination to them assumed by the Romish pontiffs, 302.
Berean sect in Scotland, 730.
Berenger, disputes with Lanfranc against the real presence of Christ's body and blood in the Holy Sacrament, 249; explains the doctrines of Scripture by logical and metaphysical rules, ib.; maintains his doctrine of the Eucharist against synodical decrees, and the threats of punishment from the civil power, 252; abjures his opinions, but teaches them soon afterwards, ib.; makes a public recantation with an oath, and yet propagates his real sentiments of the Eucharist, ib.; second declaration before Gregory VII., 253; subscribes a third confession with an oath, 254; yet retracts publicly, and composes a refutation, ib.; his fate, and the progress of his doctrine, ib.; his real sentiments, ib.; the weakness of the arguments used by the Roman catholic writers against the real sentiments of this divine, 255.
Berg, the famous form of concord reviewed there, and its contents, 467.
Bermudes, John, sent into Abyssinia with the title of patriarch, 424.
Bern, an account of the cruel and impious fraud acted upon one Jetzer, by the Dominicans, 388.
Bern, church of, opposes Calvinism, 476.
Bernard, St., abbot of Clairval, preaches up a crusade in xii. cent. 263; draws up a rule of discipline for the knights Templars, 264; considered as the second founder of the Cistertian monks, 276; combats the doctrine of the schoolmen, 284; his charge against Abelard, ib.; as

also against Gilbert de la Porrée, ib.; he combats the sect of the Apostolics, 292.
Bertram, Ratram, eminent for refuting Radbert's doctrine of the Eucharist, 190, 196; defends Godeschalcus, 197; his dispute with Hincmar, about the hymn, Trina Deitas, 198; maintains the cause of the Latin church against Photius, 200.
Berulle, cardinal, institutes the order of Oratorians, 555.
Bessarion, how employed by the Greeks in the council of Florence, 368; his character, 381.
Beza, Theodore, a translator of the New Testament, 486.
Bibliander, an eminent writer in xvi. cent. 490.
Biblical colleges, what so called, and their rise in xvii. cent. 591.
Biblicists, Christian doctors so called, flourish in xii. cent. 283; decline in xiii. cent. 322; they warmly oppose the scholastic divines, 323.
Biddle, John, a famous Socinian writer, 640.
Bishops, appointed first at Jerusalem, 22; their authority augmented by the councils, 41; their contentions with each other about the extent of powers in iv. and following centuries, produced violent commotions in the church, 88; disputes between the bishops of Rome and of Constantinople, 113; the prelates endeavour to extend their jurisdiction, 214; they aspire after, and obtain, temporal dignities, 215; oppose the arrogance of the pontiffs in xiii. cent. 302; disputes between them and the Mendicants, 310; sentiments of the Puritans concerning them, 478; a famous assembly of bishops at Paris, 551.
Blackburne, author of the Confessional, 730.
Blanc, Louis le, attempts to reconcile the Romish and Reformed churches, 607, 608.
Blandrata, George, propagates Socinianism in Transylvania, 508.
Blois, Peter of, an eminent writer, 280.
Blount, Charles, his oracles of reason, and death, 527.
Bockhold, John, mock king of Munster, an account of, 493; his short reign and ignominious death, ib.
Boethius, the philosopher, 134, 138.
Bogomiles, a sect in xii. cent. 287.
Bohemia, commotions excited by the ministry of John Huss, 363; terminated, 374; troubles there excited against the Protestants, 539; who defend themselves furiously, ib.; progress of the war unfavourable to them, ib.; Gustavus Adolphus intervenes, 540; end of the thirty years' war, ib.; the peace of Westphalia advantageous to the Protestants—the disappointment of the pope, 541.
Bohemian, or Moravian brethren, character of, 482.
Bohemians, converted to Christianity in ix. cent. 180; a religious war in Bohemia, 539.
Bois, abbé du, his ambition, a principal obstacle to the project of union between the English and French churches, 685; he oppresses the Jansenists, 705.
Bolingbroke, the infidel lord, character of, 728.
Bologna, the fame of its university in xii. cent. 267.
Bolsec, Jerome, character of, 489.
Bonaparte obtains the chief sway in France, 736; settles with the pope the affairs of the church, ib.; defies the authority of the pontiff, 737; deprives him of his temporal power, ib.; concludes a new agreement with him, ib.; is ruined and deposed, ib.
Bonaventura, an eminent scholastic divine, 312, 320.
Boniface III., pope, engages the emperor Phocas to deprive the bishop of Constantinople of the title of Universal Bishop, and to confer it upon the Roman pontiff, 151.
——— V. enacts the law for taking refuge in churches in vii. cent. 155.
———, Winfred, converts the Germans, 161; his other pious exploits, ib.
———, attempts the conversion of the Prussians in xi. cent. 221; his fate, 222.
——— VIII. domineers over the church and state, 307; institutes the jubilee, 307, 326; excommunicates Philip the Fair, 340; is seized by order of that prince, and dies, ib.
Borri, Joseph Francis, his romantic notions, 572; his fate, ib.
Bosius, George, his doctrine, 595.
Bossuet, bishop of Meaux, his character, and famous work for reconciling the French Protestants, 544; followed by others on their own private authority, ib.; his artful eloquence, 546; his defence of the *Regale*, 551; dispute with Fenelon, and the occasion, 571.
Boulainvilliers, count, character of, 529.
Bourignon, Antoinette, her main and predominant principle, 642.
Boyle, Robert, his lectures, 525.
Brachmans or Bramins, veneration paid to them in India, 515; their title assumed by the Jesuit missionaries, ib.
Bradwardine, archbishop of Canterbury, an eminent mathematician, 338; his book on Providence, 353.
Breckling, Frederic, his uncharitable writings, and character, 599.
Bredenberg, John, defends the doctrine of Spinosa, 641; debate between him and Cuiper concerning the use of reason in religious matters, ib.
Brethren and sisters of the Free Spirit, a sect in xiii. cent. 330; various names and singular behaviour, ib.; dangerous and impious conclusions drawn by them from their mystic theology, ib.; their shocking violation of decency, 331; execrable and blasphemous doctrine of some among them, ib.; their first rise seems to have been in Italy, 332; edicts against them in xiv. cent. 355; they undergo severe punishments from the court of Inquisition, 377; as also from Ziska, 378.
Brethren and Clerks of the Common Life, account of, 371; division into the lettered and illiterate, and their several employments, ib.; the fame of the schools erected by them, ib.
——— white, rise of, 378; suppression of the sect, ib.
British ecclesiastics, successful in their ministry among the Germans in viii. cent. 161.
Brito, character of, 299.
Brothers, Richard, an enthusiast, 734.
Brown, George, archbishop of Dublin, zealous in the cause of the Reformation in Ireland, 415; his character, ib.; he is deprived under queen Mary, 416; his singular account of the genius and spirit of the Jesuits, 427.
Brown, Robert, founder of the Brownists in xvi. cent. 480; his notions, ib.; he renounces his separation from the church of England, 481.
Bruno, founder of the Carthusians, 246.
———, a commentator, 249.
Bruys, Peter, attempts to reform the abuses and superstition of his times, and is charged with fanaticism, 289; is committed to the flames, ib.
Bryennius, Nicephorus, an eminent historian, in xii. cent. 267.
———, Josephus, his works, 372.
Bucer, Martin, endeavours to bring about a reconciliation between the Reformed and the Lutherans, 471; how defeated, 472.
Bugenhagius, draws up a form of religious government and doctrine for the Danes, 404.
Bulgarians, converted to Christianity in ix. cent. 180.
Bullinger, a distinguished reformer, 486.
Burchard, bishop of Worms, 216.
Burgundians, spontaneously embrace Christianity, 109.
Burley, Walter, the use of his works, 339.
Bus, Cæsar de, founder of the order of fathers of the Christian doctrine, iv. 430.
Buscher, Statius, opposes the pacific projects of Calixtus, 589; an account of his Crypto-Papismus, ib.
Cabbala, the source of many errors among the Jews, 8.
Cæcilianus, bishop of Carthage, condemned, 99.
Cæfarius, of Arles, his works, 138, 140.
Caietan, cardinal, an opponent of Luther, 392.
Calcutta, college of, 743.
Calistus, Nicephorus, an eminent writer, 338.
Calixtines, in Bohemia, their rise in xv. cent. 374; four demands, ib
Calixtus, George, his zeal for reconciling the Protestants and Catholics in xvii. cent. 545; as also the Lutherans and Reformed, 582; his peculiar method and form of theology, 587; author of Syncretism, and character, 588; his death, 589; doctrine condemned, and creed drawn up against it by the Lutheran doctors, ib.; opinions, 590; his real design, ib.
Calixtus II. pope, his great character, 272; disputes concerning investitures subside by his prudence, ib.
——— III. institutes the festival of the Transfiguration, 377.
Calovius, a Lutheran writer in xvii. cent. 589.
Calvin, John, a short character of him, 405; he commences the controversy about predestination, 473; establishes the reformed church, ib.; his grand views how in part executed, 474; his changes are not approved or received by all the Reformed, 475; his doctrine gains ground in Germany, 476; in France, ib.; and in Britain, 477; his system made the public rule of faith in England under Edward VI., ib.; adopted in the Netherlands, 481; his rigid discipline, and resolution in establishing it, 485; his scriptural commentary, why sharply censured, 486; his institutes of the Christian religion, 487; his contest with the spiritual libertines, 488; with those of Geneva, ib.; he puts Servetus to death, 503; his method of interpreting Scripture scrupulously followed by the members of the Reformed church, 602.
Calvinists, secret, or Crypto-Calvinists, in Saxony, 466.
Camaldolites, a monastic order in xi. cent. 245.
Cambalu, (now Pekin in China,) erected into an archbishopric in xiv. cent. 335.
Camerarius, Joachim, a learned commentator, 457.
Cameron, John, his reconciling doctrine, 606.
Campanella, a philosopher in xvi. cent. 420.
Campanus, his herctical notions, 502.
Canara, state of the Christians in, 743.
Canon of Scripture, supposed to be fixed about ii. cent. 23.
Canons, a religious order, 171; encouraged by Louis the Debonaire, who institutes the first canonesses, 189; degeneracy of the order, ib: reformation attempted, and new laws made, 247; distinction into regular and secular, ib; introduction into England, ib.
———, regular, their useful lives and manners in xii. cent. 277; contest with the monks, ib.
———, Roman, their luxurious lives, 428.
Cantacuzenus, John, the historian of his own times, 351.
Cantipratensis, Thomas, his character, 320.
Capistran, John, eminent for his defence of papal authority, 372.
Capito, Robert, an account of, 299, 320.

Capel, Louis, voluminous and elaborate work of, 607.
Capreolus, John, his character, 373.
Capuchins, rise of, 429; banished from Venice in xvii. cent. 549; but recalled, ib.
Caputiati, a sect of fanatics in xii. cent. 292.
Cardan, a philosopher in xvi. cent. 420.
Cardinals, the right of electing to the see of Rome, vested in them in xi. cent. 232; their origin and rights, 233; divided into two classes, ib.; their college augmented by Alexander III. 234.
Carey, a distinguished missionary, 752.
Cario, an eminent historian among the Lutherans, 454.
Carlostadt, the reformer, intemperate zeal of, 459; he propagates his doctrine in Switzerland, 460.
Carmelites, a monastic order, their rise in xii. cent. 278; their rule of discipline, ib.; reformation introduced among them in xvi. cent. 430; divisions among them, ib.
Carpathius, John, his moral writings, 175.
Carpocrates, an Egyptian Gnostic, 53; his impious tenets, ib.
Cartes, M. des, character of, 532; his philosophy, 533; strong opposition to it, ib.; his metaphysical system propagated with success, 535; improved by Malebranche and Leibnitz, with the character of each, ib.; its progress, 602.
Cartesian controversy in Holland, 619; philosophy, why considered as a system of impiety, ib.
Carthusians, a monastic order, its rise in xi. cent. 246; founder, and severe laws, ib.; why so few nuns of that order, ib.
Cassian, his character, 116.
Cassiodorus, his expositions of Scripture, 139.
Castalio, Sebastian, opposes Calvin, and his character, 488.
Castilians, the extraordinary method used by them to determine the superior excellence of the Roman or Gothic service in xi. cent. 256.
Castilione, Gilbert de, refutes the Jews, 285.
Casuists, ancient, not so good as the Lutherans, 458.
Catechumens, an order of Christians, 21.
Catharists, or Paulicians, a sect, 257; their unhappy state in xii. cent. 288.
Cedrenus, an historian in xi. cent. 227.
Celestine, I., pope, sends Palladius and Patrick to convert the Irish in v. cent. 109.
——— V. obnoxious to the clergy, 307; his resignation, ib.
Cellites, their rise at Antwerp in xiv. cent. 350; their fame and progress, ib.
Celsus, his objections against Christianity refuted by Origen, 37.
Celts, learning among them in i. cent. 19.
Cene, Charles le, denies original sin, 609; his singular translation of the Bible condemned, ib.
Century, i. its ecclesiastical history, 1, 7; ii. cent. 33; iii. cent. 57; iv. cent. 77; v. cent. 108; vi. cent. 131; vii. cent. 146; viii. cent. 161; ix. cent. 180; x. cent. 205; xi. cent. 221; xii. cent. 227; xiii. cent. 293; xiv. cent. 335; xv. cent. 358; xvi. cent. 385, and Appendix II. 670; xvii. cent. 513; xviii. cent. 644. and Appendix III. 675; xix. cent. 736.
Cerdo, founder of a sect in Asia, 51.
Ceremonies, two only instituted by Christ, 26; why multiplied in ii. cent. 47; the esteem of modern Platonism a cause of their increase in iii. cent. 69; their burthen in iv. cent. 97; how multiplied in v. cent. with a general view of the new rites, 121; additions to them by almost every pope, 155; a general account of them in ix. cent. 200; many of them drawn from Pagan rites, 201; their increase in x. cent. 219; their multiplication in xiii. cent. 325; many and useless ceremonies remain in xvi. cent. 440.
Cerinthus, founder of an heretical sect, 32; blends the doctrines of Christ with the errors of the Jews and Gnostics, ib.
Cerularius, Michael, patriarch of Constantinople, revives the controversy between the Greeks and Latins in xi. cent. 251; violent measures used on both sides, ib.
Chalcedon, fourth general council at, 126.
Chaldæan Christians, 742.
Chapters, controversy about the three, in vi. cent. 168.
Charenton, synod of, in xvii. cent. 580.
Charity, feasts of, called Agapæ, 28; suppressed in v. cent. 121.
Charlemagne, his expedition against the Saxons, 162; his design of propagating Christianity, ib.; his method of converting the Saxons, ib.; his attempts against the Saracens not very successful, 163; he revives learning among the Latins, 165; if founder of the university of Paris, considered, ib.; his grant to the see of Rome, 169; opportunity opened for the western empire, which he embraces, ib.; his supposed works, 172; his attachment to the Romish ritual, 173.
Charles, the Bald, a great patron of science, 183.
——— V. emperor, calls a diet at Worms, at which Luther is banished, 397; ratifies the sentence, ib.; is an advocate for papal authority at the diet of Augsburg, 406; concludes a peace with the Lutherans, 408; listens to the counsels of Paul III., 411; his designs give occasion to the Protestants to take up arms, ib.; he raises an army against them, ib.; his base and perfidious behaviour to the landgrave of Hesse, ib.; his real views, 413; disconcerted by Maurice of Saxony 413.
Charles I., of England, his character, 542; three principal objects of his administration, 611.
——— II., patron of science, 530; his character, 542; state of the church under him, 617.
Chemists, or Fire-Philosophers, 532.
Chemnitz, Martin, his examination of the council of Trent commended, 455.
Chillingworth, a leader of the Latitudinarians, his great character, 616.
China, Christianity planted there in vii. cent. 146; state of that religion among the Chinese in xiv. cent. 335; missions there in xvii. cent. 517; their astonishing success, ib.; a change of affairs, 716.
Choniates, Nicetas, a good historian, 297.
Chorepiscopi, their origin and office, 22.
Chosroes, king of Persia, a violent persecutor of the Christians, 133; a patron of the Aristotelian philosophy, 135.
Christ, his birth, 9; accounts of him in the four Gospels, 10; his choice of apostles and disciples, ib.; his death, 11; resurrection and ascension, ib.; his Gospel preached first to the Jews and Samaritans, ib; respected among the Gentiles, 12; he left the form of the church undetermined, 20; instituted only two sacraments, 26; comparison between him and the philosophers, and its consequences, 60; a parallel arrogantly drawn between him and Apollonius Tyanæus, 61; disputes about the nature of his body in vi. cent. 144; debates about the manner of his birth in ix. cent. 199; the festival of his body, or the Holy Sacrament, in xiii. cent. 325; controversy in xv. cent. concerning the worship due to his blood, 376; his divine nature denied by the Socinians, 502; omnipresence of his flesh, a subject of debate, 595; his generation according to Roell's sentiments, 620; his humanity denied by the Quakers, 633.
Christian religion, the whole comprehended in two great points, 24; ceremonies multiplied in ii. cent. and the reasons, 46; first reason, a desire to enlarge the borders of the church, 47; second reason, to refute calumnies and reproaches, ib.; third reason, the abuse of Jewish rites, ib.; fourth reason, the imitation of the heathen mysteries, ib.; fifth reason, the symbolic manner of teaching among the eastern nations, 48; sixth reason, prejudices of converted Jews and Gentiles, ib.; assemblies, where and when holden by the primitive Christians, ib.; the state of the Christian doctrine in iii. cent. 65; vicious method of controversy practised by the defenders of the church, and spurious writings among them, 67; progress of this religion in the east, in vi. cent. 131; in the west, ib.
Christianity, causes of its rapid progress supernatural, 13; its progress in the Roman empire, 33; in Germany, ib.; in Gaul, ib.; it is gradually corrupted, 42; its success in iii. cent. must be imputed partly to divine, partly to human causes, 57; embraced by the Goths, 58, 83; interpreted according to the principles of the Platonic philosophy, 65; Julian attempts its destruction, 81; the efforts of the philosophers against it, 82; it is established in Armenia, 83; its progress among the Abyssinians, ib.; the causes of the many conversions in iv. cent. ib.; corrupted by the introduction of various rites, 97; embraced by the Burgundians, 109; by the Franks, ib.; causes of the conversions in v. cent. examined, 110; attempts of the Pagans to destroy its credit, ib.; its decline in Britain, through the cruelty of the Anglo-Saxons, 111; opposed by secret enemies, ib.; its progress in the East, 131; the conversion of the Anglo-Saxons, ib.; it is introduced into China, 146; propagated in Hyrcania and Tartary, 161; suffers through the success of the Turks and Saracens, 163; embraced by the Danes and Swedes, 180; by the Bulgarians, Bohemians, and Moravians, 180; by the Sclavonians, ib.; by the Russians, 181; by the Poles and Hungarians, 205, 206; by the Danes and Norwegians, 207; by the Pomeranians, 260; by the Finlanders, ib.; by the Livonians, 261; its decline in Asia in xiv. cent. 336; it is propagated by Spanish and Portuguese missions, 418; preached in India, 515; its prosperous state in xviii. cent. 644; its enemies in Europe, and more especially in England, 645.
Christians, in the first cent. persecuted by the Romans, 14; loaded with opprobrious calumnies, 15; their persecution under Nero, 16; why persecuted by Domitian, ib.; divided into believers and catechumens, 25; their care in the education of their youth, ib.; secret doctrines, ib.; lives and manners, 26; controversies among them, ib.; churches established among them, and how the public worship was conducted, 27; the Lord's Supper, feasts of charity and baptism, 28; the persecution under Trajan, 35; under Adrian, ib.; under Antoninus Pius, 36; under Marcus Antoninus, ib.; the clemency of Commodus toward them, ib.; their calamities under Severus, 37, 58; their learning in ii. cent. 140; excommunication found necessary among them, 46; their penitential discipline gradually modelled by the Heathen mysteries, ib.; their immunities increased under various emperors in iii. cent. 57; their numbers increased, ib.; persecution under Maximin, 59; under Decius and Valerian, 59, 60; their state under Gallienus and Claudius tolerable, 60; attempts of the Jews against them, 61; their affairs reduced to a dangerous crisis under Diocletian, 77; miseries very great under Galerius, 78; happy state under Constantine the Great, ib.; revival of learning among them in iv. cent. 85; two most pernicious maxims adopted by their teachers, 94; controversies frequent among them, 95; suffer from the success of barbarous inva-

ders in v. cent. 110; the cruelty of the Goths and Vandals to them in Gaul, 111; their calamities from the Picts and Scots in Britain, ib.; misfortunes in Persia, ib.; sufferings from the Vandals, 122; from the Anglo-Saxons, Huns, and Lombards, 133; from Chosroes in Persia, ib.; they are oppressed by the Saracens in Spain and Sardinian, 163; their superstitious piety and morals in viii. cent. 173; persecuted in x. cent. by the barbarians in the west, 209; their affairs in Palestine in a declining state, 262; oppressed by the Saracens in xii. cent. and the cause, 265; an important division of their doctors, 283; a sect of free-thinking Christians, 486.

Christiern II. king of Denmark, promotes the Reformation, but from bad motives, 404; is deposed, ib.; the different conduct of his successor Frederic, ib.;

——— III. reforms the Danish church from Romish superstition, 404; he suppresses episcopacy, 405.

Christina, queen of Sweden, her change of religion and character, 546; joins with Louis XIV. against Innocent XI. 551.

Chrysoloras, Michael, his character, 338.

Chrysostom, account of, 89; the rigorous proceedings of Theophilus against him, 120; the injustice of his sufferings considered, 121.

Church, the first Christian, 12, Dr. Mosheim's ideas of the primitive church corrected, 655 to 670; prosperous state of the modern church, 644.

———, Arminian, its rise, 622; doctrine of Arminius, 623; progress of this church after his death, ib.; pacific methods used by its members, but in vain, ib.; their doctrine comprehended in five articles, 624; prince Maurice declares against them, 625; synod convoked at Dordrecht, to examine their doctrine, ib.; their tenets condemned by it, 626; they are persecuted variously, ib.; are invited into Holstein, and form themselves into a colony, ib.; recalled from exile, 627; their ancient and modern systems, ib.; their confession of faith, 628; united only in their opinions concerning predestination and grace, ib.; their success in England, ib.; their ecclesiastical government, 629.

——— —, Dutch, its state in xviii. cent. 653.

——— —, Eastern, its history in xvi. cent. 441; divided into three communities, ib.

——— —, of England at first inclined to the sentiments of Luther, 477; but changed after the death of Henry VIII. to Calvinism, ib.; received a new form of ceremonials and discipline under queen Elizabeth, 478; its controversy with the Puritans, ib.; revolution in favour of Arminianism, 605; its genius and spirit, ib.; state under James I. and changes made in it, 609, 610; state under Charles I., 611; under Cromwell, 615; Presbyterian government established, ib.; what sects flourished at this time, ib.; its state under Charles II. and his successors, 617; divisions, whence the terms of High-church, and Low-church, ib.; its state in xviii. cent. 652; established form of government, ib.; its division into two classes, ib.; warm disputes between them, with the principal champions, ib.; various sects in England, through the unbounded liberty of the press, ib.; scheme of union with the French church, ib.; history of our church in xviii. cent. 723; in xix. cent. 748.

———, Greek, its state in xvi. cent. 441; in xvii. cent. 574; its invincible aversion to the Latin church, ib.; its doctrine, if not corrupted by the Romish missionaries and doctors, ib.; its history in xviii. cent. 714; in xix. cent. 741.

———, Helvetic, what points first excited a difference between its members and the Lutherans, 474; the former adopt Zuingle's doctrine of the eucharist, ib.; oppose Bucer's endeavours to modify their doctrine to some degree of conformity with that of Luther, ib.; warm contests concerning the formulary of concord, 653.

———, Lutheran, its rise, 396; progress retarded by internal divisions relative to the eucharist, 399; and by a civil war, ib.; it was at length raised to the dignity of a lawful and complete hierarchy, 451; the sum of its doctrine, ib.; its ceremonies and public worship, 452; its visible head and form of government, ib.; liturgies, public worship, and method of instruction, ib.; holidays and ecclesiastical discipline, 453; state of learning among its members, 454; various fate of philosophy among them, 455; sects, ib.; science of theology corrected and improved, 456; respective merits of interpreters, 457; state of morality, 458; polemic or controversial theology introduced, ib.; asperity in its disputants, how alleviated, ib.; three periods to be distinguished in the history of this church, 459; disputes in the first period, ib.; in the second, 461; form of doctrine projected, 465; this church loses ground in some places, 579; attempts made toward a union with the reformed church, 580; declaration of the synod of Charanton, ib.; prosperous events, 583; progress in learning, ib.; state of philosophy, ib.; most eminent writers in xvii. cent. 586; external and internal state of the church in question in xviii. cent. 648; it receives a considerable accession, but is oppressed at home, ib.; various contests and divisions, 649; its state in Prussia, 718; in the north of Europe, 718, 744; in Germany, 256, 745.

———, reformed, its history, 469; constitution, 470; its progress in Switzerland, 471; controversy between the Lutherans and reformed, with regard to the eucharist, 472; dispute about predestination, 473; the chief founder of this church, 474; its progress in Germany and France, 476; its state in the Netherlands, 481; in Poland, 482; difference between its doctrines and those of Luther, 484; its form of government, 485; state of discipline, 486; learning, ib.; interpreters of Scripture, ib.; theological doctrines, 487; state of morality, ib.; persons of eminent genius in this church, 490; its history in xvii. cent. 600; limits extended, ib.; decline in France, ib.; in the Palatinate, 602; controversies, 604; its state in xviii. cent. 650, 717; its great extent, and who may account themselves members of it, 651 projects of re-union between the reformed and the Lutherans, 651, 718; Church actual union in some instances, 745.

Church, reformed, in France, disposed to favour Arminianism, 606 blamed for making concessions of moment to popery, and this point examined, ib.; controversy raised by the hypothetical universalists, ib.; Cameron's attempt, and Amyrault's form of reconciliation, ib.

——— Romish, great schism of, in xiv. cent. 343; plan for reforming it, in xvi. cent. 410; zealous in appointing an infinite number of missionaries, 424; character of its commentators, 434; state of practical religion among its members, 435; moral writers divided into three classes, ib.; character of its polemic divines, ib.; its internal state examined, ib.; its principal subjects of dispute, reduced to six, and explained, 436; vain attempts to unite the Russian church to this, 448; little success attends the labours of the missionaries among the Eastern sects, 449; how far it was considered a true church by the commissioners of queen Elizabeth, 452; its history and popes in xvii. cent. 537; its attempts to ruin the protestants, unsuccessful, 538; writers on both sides, 539; it loses ground in the East, with two striking instances of it, 547; general decline of the papal authority, 548; French maxim concerning it, embraced by most princes and states of Europe, ib.; its doctrine very corrupt in xvii. cent. 559; all prospect of reconciling the protestants with the members of the Romish communion quite removed in xviii. cent. 646; intestine divisions in this church, ib.; controversy between the Jesuits and Jansenists, ib.; debates occasioned by the New Testament of Quesnel, with the bull of Clement XI. in condemnation of it, 647; commotions raised by this bull in France, 647; pretended miracles by the remains of the abbé Paris refuted, and visions of the Jansenists considered, and success of their cause, 648; ruin of the church in France, 714; its restoration, 714, 738.

———, rulers, how called in i. cent. 21; their character and office, ib.

———, Russian, its history in xvii. cent. 575; change introduced into it by Peter I., ib.; its state in xviii. cent. 648, 716; in xix. cent. 742.

Churches, Eastern, separated from the Greeks and Latins, 444; comprehended under two classes, ib.; their state in xviii. cent. 648.

———, if the first Christians had any, considered, 27; splendid erections in iv. cent. 97.

———, more ancient, history of, 19.

———, modern, an account of, 451.

Cimbrians, converted to Christianity in ix. cent. 179.

Circumcelliones, in Africa, their rise and ravages, 100; severe proceedings against them, 101.

Cistertian monks, their rise in xi. cent. 245; their discipline, ib.; their opulence and credit in xii. cent. due to St. Bernard, 276.

Clarendon, constitutions of, 274.

Clarke, Dr. Samuel, charged with altering the orthodox doctrine of the Trinity, 653; his method of inquiring into that subject, and his doctrine of it, 654.

Claude, John, opinions of, 574.

Claudius, bishop of Turin, his exposition and chronology, 190; his laudable zeal against images and their worship, 195.

Clemangis, Nicolas de, his great character, 372.

Clemens, bishop of Rome, the most eminent writer in i. cent. 23.

——— Alexandrinus, his great character, 42.

Clement III., pope, remarkably zealous for crusades, 276.

——— IV. favours the French, 306.

——— V. a mere creature of the French court, 341.

——— VI. his character and ambition, 343.

——— VII. his character, 398.

——— VIII. an account of, 537.

——— IX. character of, 587, 588; peace of, 566.

——— XI. decides the controversy relating to the Chinese rites against the Jesuits, 644; issues the bull Unigenitus, 647 704; his character, 705.

——— XII. character of, 646, 707.

——— XIII. conduct and misfortunes of, 708, 710.

——— XIV. dissolves the order of Jesuits, 710; his character, ib.

Clergy, a perfect equality among them in i. cent. 22; their vices in iii. cent. 63; in iv. cent. 88; their excessive pride in v. cent. 115; source of their vices, ib.; their vices not to be restrained by the legislature in viii. cent. 166; veneration for them greater in the West than in the East, ib.; increase of their revenues, ib.; their temporal dignities, 167; their vices in ix. cent. 185; zealous in the cause of superstition, 190; their vices in x. cent. principally imputable to the examples of the pontiffs of Rome, 212; decay of piety and discipline among them in xi. cent. 230; their infamous lives in xiii. cent. 301; complaints against them in xiv. cent. 340; the great decline of the Christian church in xv. cent. through their neglect and vices, 362, the objects

of universal contempt in xvi. cent. 387; the doctrines they chiefly inculcated, 389.
Clergy of Rome, their state in xvi. cent. 428; obtain considerable advantages at the expense of the pontiffs, ib.; manners of the superior clergy, and cause of their great corruption, ib.; their state in xvii. cent. v. 553.
Clerks, apostolic, account of that order, and its abolition, 350.
———, regular, their rise in xvi. cent. 430.
Clovis, king of the Franks, converted to Christianity, 109; the influence of his conversion on the minds of the Franks, ib.; the miracles to be performed at his baptism, a fiction, ib.
Clugni, monks of, incorporated by Odo, 215; their discipline soon adopted in all the European convents, ib.; their great prosperity, 244.
Cocceius, John, his sentiments followed by the Dutch divines in xvii. cent. 587; his method of interpreting Scripture, 603; his chimerical system, 619.
Cœlestius, doctrine of, 129.
Cœnobites, an order of monks in iv. cent. 94.
College de propaganda fide, founded at Rome in xvii. cent. 513; another by Urban VIII. ib.; some of the same nature in France, ib; altercations of their missionaries with those of the Jesuits, 514.
Colleges for study and education, 268.
Collegiants, a Socinian sect, their rise in xvii. cent. 640; their customs and tenets, 641.
Collins, the freethinker, 645.
Columban, an account of, 137, 138, 146.
Commentaries, chains of, in ix. cent. 193.
Commentators, pervert the natural expressions of Scripture, 91; their divisions into two classes, 139; their character in different centuries, 218, 249, 282, 352, 375.
Commission-court, high account of, 479; its exorbitant power, ib.
Commodus, the emperor, state of the Christians under him, 37.
Comnenus, the emperor, maintains a controversy with the Manichæans, 257.
———, Emanuel, his character and works, 285.
Conception, immaculate, of the Virgin Mary, a subject of dispute in xii. cent. 286; controversy about it in xvii. cent. between the Franciscans and Dominicans, 569.
Concord, form of, 451, 467; produces much disturbance, 467; suppressed in Brandenburg, 580; disputes in Switzerland concerning it, 622; abrogated at Basil and Geneva, ib.
Concordat, forcibly imposed on his subjects by Francis I. of France, 386; a new one, settled by Napoleon, 736; another 737.
Conferences, religious, at Ratisbon, Leipsic, Thorn, and Cassel, 543, 581, 582.
Confessional, some groundless remarks in it answered, 675.
Confessors, who are entitled to this name, 15.
Confucius, assertion concerning him, 520; religious worship paid to him by the Chinese, ib.
Congal, abbot, propagates the monastic discipline in Great Britain, 137.
Congregations, various, at Rome, 422, 440.
———, of the Holy Sacrament in France, 514.
Conrad, of Marpurg, the first German inquisitor, 328; his barbarity and fate, ib.
Constance, the famous council of, 363; limits the authority of the pope, ib.; condemns John Huss to death, 364; issues a decree against the writings and ashes of Wickliffe, 366; deprives the laity of the cup in the holy sacrament, ib.
Constantine the Great, grants the Christians power to live according to their own laws and institutions, 78; is converted to Christianity, 79; the sincerity of his faith proved, ib.; he models the ecclesiastical government according to the civil, 86.
———, Copronymus, his zeal against image-worship, 177.
———, Porphyrogeneta, his zeal for reviving learning among the Greeks, 210.
Constantinople, the first council at, 105; another, 141; others, 194, 195.
———, patriarch of, his jurisdiction in iv. cent. 88; contends with the pope for supremacy in v. cent. 113; his power augmented by Leo in viii. cent. 170; disputes about pre-eminence in ix. cent. 199; by whom elected in modern times, 442; his extensive power and revenues, ib.
Controversial writers, employed in explaining the terms of salvation and acceptance in i. cent. 26; their merit and demerit in ii. cent. 44; the rules of the ancient sophists esteemed by them as the best method of confuting error, 119; their works destitute of moderation and prudence, in vi. cent. 140; how far they may be considered as worthy of an attentive perusal in vii. cent. 154; few engaged in essential points of religion in viii. cent. but confined to the disputes about image-worship, 175; prevented in ix. cent. by intestine divisions, from opposing the common enemies of their faith, 194; scholastic method of disputing introduced among them in xi. cent. 250; and flourishes in xii. cent. 285; they are more numerous than respectable, in xiii. cent. 324; few worthy of notice in xiv. cent. 353; many eminent among them in xv. cent. 376; and in xvi. cent. 435.
Controversies, private, in xvi. cent. 597.
Controversy concerning the Millennium, 68; the baptism of heretics, ib.; Meletian, 95; Ærian, ib · Arian, 102; between Jerome and Vigilantius, 120; concerning the three chapters, 141; about the derivation of the Holy Ghost, 177; concerning images among the Greeks, 194; and among the Latins, 195; upon the eucharist, 196; predestination and grace, 197; the words *Trina Deitas*, 198; the birth of Christ, 199; universal ideas, 211; the immaculate conception of the Virgin Mary, 286; the worship of Christ's blood, 376; the presence of Christ's body and blood in the sacrament, 399; good works, 462 the proper mode of conducting missions, 518; the mixture of divine grace, 562; the use of reason in religion, 620; the kingdom of Christ, 724; the right of free inquiry, 722.
Conversions, in iv. and v. cent. the causes of, considered, 83, 110; in ix. cent. the nature of, and views, 181; Jesuitical modes of conversion, 515.
Convocation, in England, an inefficient assembly from the time of George I., 725.
Copiatæ, their office in the church, 64.
Copts, their aversion to the church of Rome, 424; state of their church in xviii. cent. 717.
Cosmas, bishop of Jerusalem, a composer of hymns, 172.
Council, general, one very much desired in xvi. cent. 408; why retarded by pope Clement VII., ib.; his successor proposes to assemble one at Mantua, which is protested against by the reformers, who draw up the articles of Smalcald, 409.
Councils, if any in i. cent. 22; their origin among the Greeks, 41.
———, œcumenical, when first established, 86; declared to be superior in authority to the pope, 363.
Courayer, Dr. a defender of the church of England, 652.
Cranmer, an eminent prelate, 490.
Crellius protects the Crypto-Calvinists, 468; suffers death, 469.
Crescens, his virulent efforts against Christianity, 37.
Cromwell, state of the church under him, 615.
Cross, the miraculous, perhaps a dream, 79, 80.
Crusades, See Wars, Holy.
Cyprian, bishops of Carthage, opposes the re-admission of the lapsed, 59; suffers martyrdom under Valerian, 60; a character of his works, 65.
Cyran, abbot of St., a well-meaning fanatic, 567.
Cyril, bishop of Alexandria, his character, 116; he anathematises Nestorius twelve times, 124; presides at the council of Ephesus, ib.; condemns Nestorius, ib.; anathematised at Ephesus by John of Antioch, 125.
———, patriarch of Constantinople, his character, 274.
Damanscenus, John, his concise yet comprehensive view of Aristotle's doctrine, 165; his character, 172; systematic works, 175; polemic writings, ib.
Damianists, a sect in vi. cent. 145.
Damianus, character of, 248, 250.
Dancers, a sect in xiv. cent. 357.
Daniel, Gabriel, defends the Jesuits, 437.
Davides, Francis, propagates Socinianism, 509.
Davidists, a ridiculous sect in xvi. cent. 501.
Deaconesses, in the primitive church, 22.
Deacons, of the church at Jerusalem, 21.
Decius, the dreadful persecution under him, and consequences, 59.
Decretals, forged, procured by the pontiffs to establish their supremacy, 188; genuine ones, 301.
Deists, promote their principles with impunity under Cromwell, 615; account of them in xviii. cent.; their notions, and principal writers, 645.
Delft, assembly of the Dutch clergy at, 619.
Demiurge, of the Eastern philosophers, 18.
Denmark, the people of, converted to Christianity in ix. cent. 180; and confirmed in it in x. cent. 207; the rise and progress of the Reformation in xvi. cent. 404; modern state of the Danish church, 719, 744.
D'Espence, an eminent expositor, in xv. cent. 434.
Devay, Matthias, introduces the doctrine of the Swiss churches into Hungary and Transylvania, 482.
Deurhoff, William, notions and works of, 653.
Diadochus, a moral writer in v. cent. his works, 119
Dialecticians, or sophists, 228, 270, 376.
Didymus attacks the whole body of heretics, 92.
Dinant, David of, a great admirer and disciple of Amalric: his fundamental principle, 332.
Diocesses, origin of, 22.
Diocletian, persecution under, 77.
Dionysius, bishop of Alexandria, the Great, 65.
———, the Areopagite, a Greek fanatic, 93.
———, pretended Areopagite, works of, 140; panegyrics on him, 194.
———, the Little, works of, 138, 140.
———, chief of the Mystics, an account of, 376.
Dioscorus, account of, 126.
Dippelius, fanaticism of, 594; character of him and his writings, 595.
Disciples, LXX., authority and office of, 20.
Discord between Greeks and Latins; seeds sown in vii. cent. 154.
Dissenters, are tolerated in England, 617; their state in xviii. cent. 724 in xix. cent. 749.

Dissidents, Polish, toleration of, 722.
Divines, Belgic, oppose the form of concord, 467; adopt the sentiments of Voet, 618.
———, biblical, their state in xiv. cent. 352.
———, didactic, in xiv. cent. both Greek and Latin, adopt the rules of the Aristotelian philosophy in their writings, 352.
———, Mystic, in xiv. cent. account of, 353.
———, Polemic. See Controversial Writers.
———, Saxon, draw up a new creed, 589.
Divinity, systematic, not to be met with in ii. cent. 43.
Doctors, Christian, divided into two classes in xii. cent. 283.
———, Lutheran, corrupted by the stratagems of the Jesuits, 457; never attempted to give a regular system of morality, 458.
———, Swiss, strive to reduce all churches under one form of ecclesiastical government, 470; endeavour to reconcile the puritans and church of England, 489.
Doctrine, secret, among the ancient Christians, 25.
———, Fathers of the Christian, 430.
Dodwell, Henry, zeal and works of, 617.
Dominic, his zeal in extirpating error, and destroying heretics, 309; he founds a monastic order, ib.
Dominicans, an order of monks founded in xiii. cent. 309; the vow of absolute poverty is imposed on them by their founder, ib.; some are sent into England, and called Black Friars, 310; styled Jacobins in France, ib.; esteemed by the popes, with the eminent services done to the latter, ib.; dispute between them and the university of Paris, 311; they erect their first court of inquisition at Toulouse, 328; deprived of their ancient honours, and how long, 354; the cruel and impious fraud practised by them at Bern, 388; they are greatly instrumental in obtaining the condemnation of Luther, 289.
Domitian, a persecutor of the Christians, 16.
Donatists, rise of the controversy with, 991; they are repeatedly condemned by councils, 100; their state under Julian and Gratian, 101; the two causes of their decline, ib.; ruin, 122, 143.
Dorotheus, a moral writer, 154.
Dort, or Dordrecht, synod of, in which the doctrine of Arminius is condemned, 609, 625.
Dositheus, a Samaritan impostor, 30.
Doxopatrius, eminent for his knowledge in ecclesiastical polity, 247.
Dudith, his character, 506.
Dulcinus, leader of the sect of the apostles, 333.
Dungal, an Irishman, his great character, 185.
Dunstan, abbot of Glastonbury, 367.
Dureus, John, great character of, 581; some of his tenets, 582.
Durand, William, account of, 320.
———, of St. Portian, a polemic divine, 322.
Dursians, Druses, or Duruzians, a sect inhabiting Mount Libanus, 447, 715.
Dutch, their schemes for propagating Christianity in the East Indies, 522; zeal for spreading the Gospel in the American provinces, how obstructed, 525; sects among them in xvii. cent. 621.
Duytz, Rupert of, an eminent expositor of the Scriptures, 279.
Easter, disputes in ii. cent. about the time of keeping it, 48; the celebration made the same through all Christian churches, 49.
Ebionites, a sect of heretics in ii. cent. 50.
Eccard, Henry, a famous brother of the Free Spirit, 356.
Eckius, one of the first adversaries of Luther, 394.
Eclectic philosophers, their order established at Alexandria, 5; how different from those philosophers of this name in the time of Ammonius, 39.
———, philosophers so called in xvii. cent. 536; the most famous among them, ib.
Ecthesis, a remarkable edict, 157.
Eginhard, character of, 184; author of the life of Charlemagne, 190.
Elfric, archbishop of Canturbury, character of, 216.
Eligius, or Eloi, bishop of Limoges, his works, 152; his character of a good Christian, 153.
Elipand, archbishop of Toledo, his heretical tenets, 174.
Elizabeth, of Schonauge, the prophetess in xii. cent. 281.
———, queen of England, her character, and religious establishment, 414; her rigorous treatment of the puritans, 478; her opinions concerning church government, 480, 485.
———, princes Palatine, shows favour to the Labadists, 642; her taste for fanaticism, ib.
Elliot, John, his success in converting the North Americans, 524.
Elxai, and his followers, an account of, 50.
Emperors, Christian, their severity against Paganism in iv. cent.; why levelled against the multitude, 82.
Empire, Roman, its state at Christ's birth, 1; the nature of its government considered, ib.; its extent advantageous to Christianity, ib.; enjoys peace at the time of Christ's appearance; the necessity for such a tranquillity to the success of the Gospel, ib.
———, eastern, its decline in viii. cent. through intestine divisions and invasive hostilities, 163.
England, its advantages for literature in vii. cent. due to Theodore of Tarsus, 150; learning promoted in ix. cent. by Alfred, 184; the study of the sciences encouraged by William the Conqueror, 227; it renounces the opinions of Calvin, relative to the divine decrees, 470; court of Rome fails in its attempts against it, 542; enemies of Christianity here in xviii. cent. with some mistakes rectified, 645, 646, 725.
English send missionaries into America, in xvi. cent. 419; firmly reject the plan of Geneva, 485; disensions, and two parties thereupon, ib.; this schism prevented from extending to the reformed abroad, ib.; new missions in America, 522.
Ennodius, bishop of Ticinum, his adulatory apology for pope Symmachus, and its consequences, 136.
Eon, a fanatic in xii. cent. 292.
Ephesus, third general council of, condemns Nestorius, 124; the doctrine concerning Christ established at this council commonly received among Christians, 125.
———, council of, why called the assembly of robbers, 126.
Ephraim, the Syrian, his character, 89.
Epictetus, an ornament to the Stoics, 38.
Epicureans, their principal doctrines, 4.
Epiphanius, his character and works, 89.
Episcopacy acquires strength from the councils, 41; triumphs in England under James I., 609.
Episcopius, Simon, a leading man among the Arminians, 625.
Erasmus attacks the superstitions of the clergy and court of Rome in his writings, 385; ably interprets the Scriptures, 434.
Ernest, Justinian, his plan for propagating the Gospel abroad, how prevented, 522.
——— of Hesse, changes his religion, 546.
——— of Saxe-Gotha, a pious prince, 577.
Essenes, a Jewish sect, 7.
Ethelbert, the first Christian king among the Anglo-Saxons, 131.
Evagrius, an account of his ecclesiastical history, 137.
Evangelists, to whom this title is due, 20, 661.
Eucharists, controversy in ix. cent. concerning Christ's presence, 196; no fixed opinion concerning this doctrine in the Latin churches, 197; how explained in x. cent. 217; doctrine of transubstantiation established in xiii. cent. 325; rites instituted in relation to it, ib.; the *opus operatum* in it, 438; frequent celebration of it, a subject of debate in the Romish church, ib.
Eucharius, a moral writer, 116, 119.
Eugenius III., pope, his good character, and the troubles he underwent, 273.
Eugenius IV. calls the council of Basil, 367; attempts in vain to dissolve it, 368; is deposed, ib.
Eugippus, a writer of the lives of the saints, 140.
Eulogius, a polemic writer, 137.
Eusebius, bishop of Cæsarea, his character, 88.
Eustathian troubles, 95.
Eustathius, bishop of Thessalonica, his commentaries on Homer, 267.
Eustratius, his works and character, iii. 279.
Eutyches, his sentiments concerning Christ, and supposed tenets, 279; he is excommunicated and deposed, ib.; is acquainted, ib.
Eutychian sect, its rise, 126; its state in the vi. cent. 143.
Eutychius, bishop of Alexandria, 216.
Excommunication, necessary in the infancy of the Christian church, 26; the nature and extent of it in viii. cent. 167; warm contest about it in xvi. cent. 495.
Exorcists, duty of, 64.
Fanatics, many infect the Greeks in xii. cent. 287; disputes between some and Luther, 459; they excite tumults, ib.
Farnovians, a sect of Socinians in xvi. cent. 506, 510.
Farnovius, (Farnesius,) founder of a sect, 512; his tenets and eminent disciples, ib.; he separates from the Unitarians, ib.
Fasting, when introduced into the Christian church, 28; considered as a security against the power of demons, 70; the manner of observing this custom in iv. cent. 98.
Fathers, of the church, general character of, 24; the merit of their moral writings examined, 44; remarkable veneration paid to them, and to all theological writers of the first six centuries, 174.
Felix II., bishop of Rome, deprives Acacius of the see of Constantinople, 128.
——, bishop of Urgel, broaches heretical doctrine, 179.
Felix V. (duke of Savoy) elected bishop of Rome by the council of Basil, 368; resigns, 369.
Fenelon, archbishop of Cambray, defends Madame Guyon against Bossuet, 571.
Ferrara, council of, in xv. cent. 368.
Festivals, the increase of, in iv. cent. with the cause, 98; their number in vi. cent. 142; one instituted in remembrance of all departed souls, 219.
Ficinus, Marsilius, an ornament to the Platonists in xv. cent. 376.
Fifth-monarchy men, their rise and character, 615.
Finlanders, converted to Christianity in xii. cent. 260.
Firmin propagates the Gospel in viii. cent. 162.
Fisher, Samuel, assists Fox in reducing Quakerism to a kind of regular form, 630.
Flacius, Matthias, excites divisions in the Lutheran church, 463.

Flagellantes, rise and account of, 321; their impious tenets, ib.; a new sect of them, 379; the sum of their doctrine, ib.
Flavianus, bishop of Constantinople, beaten to death in the second council of Ephesus, 126.
Florence, council at, summoned by Eugenius IV., 368.
Fludd, Robert, defends the philosophy of Paracelsus, 456; refuted by Gassendi, 532.
Forbes, William, his pacific counsels and character, 545.
Fortunatus, his character, 138.
Fox, George. See Quakers.
France, the flourishing state of learning there in xi. cent. 227; spiritual libertines get footing there in xvi. cent. 488.
Francfort, a council assembled by Charlemagne, 177; the worship of images unanimously condemned, ib.
Francis, founder of the Franciscans—his extraordinary change of life and manners, 310.
Francis I. king of France, abrogates the Pragmatic Sanction, and institutes the Concordat, 386.
Franciscans, an order of friars, their rise in xiii. cent. 309; their services to the popes, 310; the miseries which the rigid Franciscans undergo, 315; quarrel of the whole order with pope John XXII., 348; peace concluded, 349; a division of this fraternity, 350.
Franks, conversion of, 109.
Fratricelli, their origin in xiii. cent. 316; how they differed from the Spiritual Franciscans, ib.; enormities among them in xiv. cent. 346; their suppression ordered by John XXII., 347; many of them are burned for opposing his orders, ib.; persecuted again in xv. cent. 371.
Frauds, pious, 46, 91.
Frederic I. (Barbarossa,) emperor, determines to restrain the authority of the church, 273; enacts a law to prevent transferring fiefs without the consent of their superior lords, ib.; supports the election of Calixtus III. in opposition to Alexander III., 274; concludes a treaty with the latter, ib.
Frederic II. is excommunicated, 294; takes possession of Jerusalem, ib.; charged with impiety, 297; zealous in promoting literature, 298.
——— the Wise, elector of Saxony, espouses the cause of Luther, 392, 397.
——— III. elector Palatine, patronises the Calvinists, 476; his son restores Lutheranism, ib.
Frumentius, the success of his ministry among the Abyssinians in iv. cent. 83.
Fulbert, bishop of Chartres, his character, 248.
Fulgentius attacks the Pelagians and Arians with great warmth, 138.
Gal, St. propagates the Gospel among the Suevi and Helvetii, 146.
Galenists, a sect of the Waterlandians, 638.
Galerius, Maximian, persecutes the Christians, 78.
Galileo the astronomer, his fame, 530.
Gallic pontiffs, diminution of papal power under them, 341; their schemes to acquire wealth, ib.
Gassendi, an eminent philosopher in xvii. cent. 532; attacks Aristotle and his followers, ib; his wise method of philosophical investigation, 533; why the chief adversary of Des-Cartes, ib.
Gaul, conversion of the inhabitants of, 33, 83, 109.
Geneva, church of, 485; a college founded in that city by Calvin, 486.
Genghiz-Khan, great success of, 266.
Gennadius, writes against the Latins in xv. cent. his good character, 372.
Gentilli, council at, 177.
George, David, founder of the Davidists in xvi. cent. 501; his character and tenets, ib.
Georgians, converted to Christianity by a captive, 83; their religious state, 444.
Gerard's impious doctrine, 162.
———, a leader of fanatics at Munster, 493.
Germans, are partly christianized in ii. cent. 33; wholly converted in viii. cent. 161.
Germans, a sect of Anabaptists, 496.
Gerson, John, a zealous opposer of papal despotism, 372; labours to reform the schoolmen, 375.
Ghost, Holy, controversy concerning its derivation, 196.
Gilbert, bishop of London, extensive erudition of, 282.
Glassius, his sacred philology, 587.
Gnostics, a sect in the time of the apostles, 29; their impious opinions about Christ, and moral doctrines, 30; dissensions among them, ib.; their principles revived in iv. cent. 105.
Godeschale, begins a controversy concerning predestination and grace, 197; his doctrine is twice condemned, ib.
Godfrey, duke of Lorrain, engages in the first crusade in xi. cent. 223; his great character, ib.
Gomar, Francis, opposes Arminius, 605, 623.
Gospel, promulgation of, 11.
Goths, their conversion to Christianity, 58, 83; their cruelty to the Christians in Gaul, 111.
Grace, various controversies concerning, in v. cent. 130; Augustin's opinion concerning it, ib.; disputes about it in ix. cent. and its unhappy consequences, 197; a subject of controversy in xvi. cent. 437; contests about it in xvii. cent. and hence the terms Sublapsarians and Supralapsarians, 604.
Gras, Louisa le, founds the Virgins of Love, 556.
Gratian composes an epitome of the canon law, 269, 280.
Greece, the state of learning there in i. cent. 19; Romish missions, 574.
Greek and Latin churches, schism between them unhappily revived in xi. cent. 251; many attempts for a reconciliation in xiii. cent. ineffectual, 324, 325; similar attempts in xviii. cent. 715.
Greeks, empire ruined, 359; religious and political state of the Greeks, 441 to 444.
Gregory, Thaumaturgus, conduct and works of, 47, 65.
——— the Enlightener, converts the Armenians, 83.
——— Nazianzen, and of Nyssa, account of them and their works, 89.
——— the Great, sends Augustine with many Benedictines into Britain, 131; the success of his labours in the west, 132; his literary character, 138; moral and religious character, 139; expositions, ib.; canon of the mass, 142.
——— of Tours, his character as a writer, 138.
——— II., pope, deposes Leo the Isaurian, 176; his zeal for images, ib.
——— III. also zealous for image worship, 176.
——— VII. (Hildebrand,) his election unanimously approved, 235; his extraordinary character, ib.; he aims at universal empire in the church and state, ib.; enacts decrees against simony and concubinage among the clergy, 237, 238; is sainted, 243; his moderate and and candid behaviour to Berenger, 253; his real sentiments of the eucharist, 254.
——— IX. excommunicates the emperor Frederic II. 304.
——— X. acts arbitrarily, 306.
——— XI. his character, 343.
——— XII. (Angelo Corrario,) anti-pope, 362; resigns, 363.
——— XV. founds the college *de propagandâ fide* at Rome, 513; his character, 537.
Gribaldi, Matthew, his doctrine, 504.
Grisons, doctrine of Claudius propagated among them, 502.
Groningenists, a sect of the refined Anabaptists, 637.
Grotius, Hugo, endeavours to reconcile the church of Rome and the Protestants, 545; a philosophical reformer, particularly of the Peripatetics, 584; his hypothesis concerning the prophets, 603; a favourer of the Arminians, 623; rupture between him and prince Maurice, 624.
Gruet opposes Calvin, 488; his impious tenets, and fate, ib.
Guelphs and Guibellines, seditious factions in Italy in xiii. cent. 305.
Gunpowder Plot, an account of, 542.
Gustavus Vasa, king of Sweden, zealous in promoting the Reformation, 403.
——— Adolphus, maintains the cause of Germanic liberty against the emperor Ferdinand, 540; falls at the battle of Lutzen, ib.
Guthebald, an English priest, successful in his mission among the Norwegians, 207.
Guy, Juvenal, attempts a reformation among the monks in xv. cent. 370.
Guyon, Madame, a patron of Quietism in France, 571; her writings refuted by Bossuet, ib.
Haan, Galen Abraham, founder of the Galenists, and character, 638; his opinions, and by whom opposed, ib.
Hales, Alexander, the Irrefragable Doctor, 300.
——, a chief leader of the Latitudinarians, in xvii. cent. his great character, 616.
Halitgarius, his system of morality, 193.
Hampton-court, famous conference at, 609.
Harald propagates and establishes Christianity among the Danes in ix. cent. 207.
Hardouin, character of, 558.
Harmenopulus, a polemic writer, 279, 285.
Harphius, Henry, a mystic writer, 394, 376.
Hattemists, a Dutch sect, 621; a chief maxim among them, 622.
Haymo, bishop of Halberstadt, 190.
Heidegger, Henry, form of concord drawn up by him, and its fate, 622
Heidelberg, catechism of, adopted by the Calvinists, 476.
Helmont, a Rosecrucian, 532.
Hemerobaptists, a sect among the Jews, 446.
Hemmingius, Nicolas, his character, 483.
Henoticon, published by Zeno, 128; produces new contests among the Eutychians, ib.
Henricians, a sect in xii. cent. 289.
Henry, archbishop of Upsal, founder of the church of the Finlanders, 260; is murdered and sainted, 261.
——— IV., emperor, refuses to resign his right of investiture, 241; assembles a council at Worms, and accuses pope Gregory VII. of flagitious practices, 242; is excommunicated and deposed by Gregory, ib.; his pusillanimous conduct at Canusium, ib.; breaks his convention and renews the war against the pope, ib.; dies in misery, 271.
——— V. imprisons the pope, 271.
——— II. of England, his dispute with pope Alexander III., 274; reasons to think he did not consent to the murder of Becket, 275.
——— VIII. of England, renounces the papal supremacy, 410.

Henry IV. of France, renounces the reformed religion with views of policy, 477.
Heraclian's book against the Manichæans, 143.
Heraclius, emperor, persecutes the Jews, and compels them to embrace Christianity, in vii. cent. 147; his edict in favour of the Monothelites, 156.
Herbert, of Cherbury, lord, account of, 527; instance of his fanaticism, ib.
Heresies, ancient, revive in v. cent. and cause new troubles, 122; remains of them in vi. cent. 142, 143; continue in x. cent. 220.
Heretics spring up occasionally, 28, 50, 71, 99, &c.
Heric, a celebrated monk of Auxerre, 185.
Hermits, their rise in iii. cent. 66.
Hermogenes, tenets of, 55.
Herrenhutters, rise of that sect in xviii. cent. 649; Dr. Mosheim's vague description of it censured, with its character by Dr. Maclaine, ib.; farther account of it, 719.
Hervey, a learned Benedictine monk, 282.
Hevelius, a German philosopher, 530.
Heyling, pious labours of, in Ethiopia, 576.
Hierax, the founder of a sect, 73.
High-churchmen, principles of the English, 618.
Hilary, bishop of Poictiers, 352.
Hildebert, archbishop of Tours, his excellent system of divinity, 250.
Hildebrand, pope. See Gregory VII.
Hildegard, a pretended prophetess in xii. cent. 281.
Hilduin, author of the Areopagitica, 190.
Hincmar, archbishop of Rheims, his character, 190.
Hippolytus, works of, 67.
History of the church, the method of treating it in the xvi. cent.; why changed from that of the preceding centuries, 383; its division into two heads, ib.; of the Reformation, 385; its improvements in xvii. cent. 530; innumerable advantages of it, ib.; a short view of it in xviii. cent. 644; a more copious account, 703; in xix. cent. 736.
Hoadly, bishop of Winchester, excites a controversy, 724.
Hobbes, a daring and artful opposer of Christianity, 525.
Hoburg, Christian, a petulant writer against the Lutherans, 599.
Hoe, Matthew, his defence of the Protestants, 539; his perfidy, ib.
Hoffman, disputes between that divine and his colleagues, 456; his tenets, ib.
Hohenlohe, the prince, a fanatic, 746.
Holidays, their number diminished by an edict of Urban VIII., 572.
Holstenius, Lucas, attempts to reconcile the Greek and Latin churches, 574.
Homilies, their origin in viii. cent. 174.
Honorius I., pope, embellishes churches in vii. cent. 155; favours the doctrine of one will in Christ, 156.
Hospitalers, Knights, origin and nature of their office, 264; deviate from the design of their original institution, and commence warriors, ib.; settle in Malta, ib.
Huber, his controversy concerning predestination, 469.
Huet, bishop of Avranches, his works, 536.
Huguenots, persecuted, 478, 542, 601.
Humbert, cardinal, an eminent polemic writer among the Greeks, 248.
Hume, his censure of Luther's opposition to indulgences, and other popish superstitions, refuted, 391; his charge against the Reformers examined and refuted, Appendix, 670; his character, 728.
Hungary, Christianity established in that realm, 206; reformation introduced and settled, 482; state of Protestantism in that country in xviii. cent. 722.
Huss, John, his character, 363; he declaims vehemently against the corruptions of the clergy and court of Rome, 364; is condemned by the council of Constance, and burned alive, ib.; the true cause of his sufferings, 365.
Hussites, commotions excited by them, 373; their unwillingness to administer the sacrament in one kind only, ib.; many put to cruel deaths, 374; war carried on, and shocking cruelties committed by them and their opponents, ib.
Hutchinsonians, an account of, 725.
Hyrcania, the Gospel propagated there in viii. cent. 161.
Jablonski's plan of ecclesiastical discipline and public worship, 718.
Jacobites, a sect of the Monophysites, 144.
Jagellon, duke of Lithuania, by what means converted, 335.
Jamblichus, of Chalcis, an account of this philosopher and his successors, 85.
James I. king of Great-Britain, attempts the reconciliation of the Lutheran and Reformed churches, 580; his seeming attachment to the Puritans, 609; his change of conduct after his accession to the crown, ib.; his pliability and inconsistency, 610.
——— II., imprudence of, 543; why obliged to abdicate the throne, ib.; tolerates the Quakers, and from what motives, 630.
Jansenism, its rise, and the contests it produced, 563; Jansenius' book, ib.; attacked by the Jesuits, 564; who procure its condemnation at Rome, ib.; revival of the contest, 704, 708.
Jansenists, their contest with the Jesuits described, and how both parties were balanced, 564; methods and arguments employed by both parties in this controversy, and miracles pretended by the Jansenists, 564, 565; persecuted, and by whom, 566; their austere piety examined, 567; deservedly denominated Rigorists, ib.; revival of the contest, 704, 708.
Japan, state of Christianity in that empire, 521; prejudices of the natives, and divisions among the missionaries, ib.; its downfall and extirpation, how effected, ib.
Jaqueline, the abbess, character of, 568.
Jasidians, or Jezdæans, a sect, 447; their opinion about the evil genius, ib.
Iconoclasts, origin of, 176.
Iconoduli, or Iconolatræ, 176.
Ideas, universal, controversy about, 211.
Jerome, of Palestine, his character, 89.
Jerusalem, the seat of the first Christian church, 12; famous council holden there in xvii. cent. 574.
——— knights of St. John of, 246.
Jesuates, or apostolic clerks, their rise in xiv. cent. 350; their order abolished, ib.
Jesuiabas, Nestorian pontiff, his treaty with Mohammed and Omar in viii. cent. 155.
Jesuits, order of, 418; the methods by which they propagated Christianity considered, ib.; the nature and division of this society into three classes, 426; their zeal for the interest of the Roman pontiffs, and the true motives of their missions, ib.; their notions of divine grace and original sin, 437; doctrine about the motives to moral actions, ib.; about the sacraments, ib.; make use of the intricate sophistry of the schoolmen to puzzle the Protestants, 455; their stratagems corrupt the Lutheran doctors, 457; accused of sinister views by the other orders, 514; and of malpractices in China, 518; principal charge against them, 519; their influence in France considered, 552; multitude of their adversaries, 556; some of their pernicious maxims, 560; their disputes with the Jansenists, 563, 704, 708; their temporalry success, 709; they at length excite such odium, that the king of France suppresses their order, 710; they are banished from Portugal and Spain, 709; and the pope annihilates their fraternity, 710; but another pontiff re-instates the order, 737.
Jesus, fathers of the oratory of the Holy, 555.
Jews, their civil and religious state under Herod, 6; after his death, ib.; their sufferings, ib.; their religion corrupted among all ranks, ib; their principal sects, ib.; variously interpret the doctrine of future rewards and punishments, 7; the moral doctrine of their sects, 8; corrupt the external worship of God, by rites from the Gentiles, ib.; their state out of Palestine, an evident proof of a providence in human affairs, 9; they persecute the Christians in Palestine and foreign countries, 13; their pretexts for this procedure, and the punishments inflicted upon them, 14; the state of their philosophy, 19; their sedition under Barcochebas, and its melancholy consequences to them, with its advantages to Christianity, 35; their fruitless attempt to rebuild their temple in iv. cent. 81; many converted in vi. cent. and by what means, 132; many writers against them, in xii. cent. 285; the crimes charged upon them, and the forced conversion of many of them in xiv. cent. 336; their state in xix. cent. 747.
Ignatius, bishop of Antioch, his epistles, 24; he is exposed by Trajan to wild beasts, 24, 35.
———, patriarch of Constantinople, deposed by the emperor Michael, 199; re-instated, ib.
Ignatius, Loyola, founder of the order of Jesuits, 418, 426.
Ildefonso, archbishop of Toledo, 154.
Illuminati, societies of, 721.
Images, worship of, its rise, 90; great progress in v. cent. 117; dispute concerning it in the eastern and western churches, and consequences, 175; the cause of a civil war in the reign of the emperor Leo, 176; zealously defended by Gregory II. and III. ib,; new controversies concerning it in the east, 194; where it is established, 195; disputes among the Latins concerning it, and a middle course taken, ib.; the use of them in churches allowed, but their worship prohibited, ib.
Impanation, or consubstantiation, 475.
Independents claim the honour of carrying the Gospel into America, 524; charged with promoting dissensions in England, 612; Rapin's account of them examined and corrected, 613; whether chargeable with the death of Charles I., ib.; remarks on Dr. Mosheim's defence of them, ib.; their difference from the Presbyterians, ib.; their moderation commended, and how more commendable than the Brownists, 614; their prosperity under Cromwell, 615; their union with the Presbyterians, ib.; new independents, 735.
India, Christianity propagated there in xvii. cent. 515.
Indulgences, the power of granting them first assumed by the bishops in xii. cent. 281; monopolised by the popes, ib.; their nature and extent explained, ib.; supererogation invented and taught by St. Thomas to justify them, ib.; this doctrine refuted, ib.
Infidelity, progress of, in xvi. cent. 419; in xvii. cent. 525; in xviii. cent. 728.
Innocent II., pope, exempts the Cistertians from paying tithes, 277.
——— III., tyrannises over several princes and kingdoms, 303; augments the papal wealth and power, ib.; introduces transubstantiation and auricular confession, 321.

Innocent IV., a turbulent pontiff, 305.
——— VI., a respectable ruler of the church, 343.
——— X., condemns the indulgence shown by the Jesuits toward the Chinese superstitions, 519; his vile character and illicit commerce with Donna Olympia, 537; endeavours to obstruct the peace of Westphalia, 541.
——— XI., high character of, 538; contest with Louis XIV. 551.
——— XII., character of, 538.
——— XIII., a respectable pontiff, 646, 705.
Inquisition, its origin in Gaul in xiii. cent. 327; its form settled, ib.; absurd and iniquitous proceedings of this court, 328; privileges granted to it by various princes, ib.; violently opposed by the public, ib.; its severity in xiv. cent. 355; congregation of, instituted by Paul III. 422.
Instruction, form of, adopted by the Calvinists, by whom composed, and for what use, 476.
Interim, an edict of Charles V. 412; troubles excited by it, ib.
Investitures, tumults in xi. cent. through the law about them, 239; custom by the ring and crosier, 240; methods used by the clergy to deprive the emperors of their right, ib.; and by the emperors to retain it, ib.; origin of this custom, 241; offence given to the pontiffs, ib.; war declared thereon, ib.; Rodolph revolts against Henry III. 242; and is chosen emperor, ib.; the terrible war that follows upon his election continues till the death of Gregory VII. 243; tumults under Urban II. ib.; disputes renewed in xii. cent. 271; a treaty concluded at Worms on that subject, 272.
Joachim, abbot of Flora, an account of the everlasting Gospel attributed to him, 313; his character and works, 320; his predictions the cause of many sects, 333.
Joan, pope, story of, 186.
John, the forerunner of the Messiah; his character, and success of his ministry, 10.
——, bishop of Jerusalem, a zealous advocate for Origen, 96.
—— of Constantinople, or the Faster, assumes the title of Universal Bishop, 135.
—— IV., pope, condemns the Monothelites, 157.
——, surnamed Carpathius, his character, 175.
—— of Capua, a monkish historian, 211.
—— X., his infamous character, 212; he is imprisoned and put to death, 213.
—— XI., an account of him and his death, and character of his mother Marozia, 213.
—— XII., implores the assistance of Otho the Great, with a promise of the purple, 213; breaks his oath of allegiance to Otho—is degraded—reassumes the pontificate, and dies miserably, ib.
—— XIII., raised to the popedom by Otho the Great, 213.
—— XIV., pontificate of, 214.
—— XV., his administration peaceable, 214; enrolls the first saint, 218.
—— the Sophist, the head of the Nominalists, 230.
——, of Salisbury, a distinguished English ecclesiastic, 280.
—— king of England, is excommunicated and deposed by Innocent III; 304; procures absolution by swearing fealty to the pope, ib.
—— of Parma, a famous ecclesiastic in xiii. cent. 312.
—— XXII., pope, a zealous advocate for crusades, 335; engages in a contest with Louis duke of Bavaria, 342; who deposes him, ib.; his severity to the Fratricelli, 347.
—— XXIII., anti-pope, his infamous character, 363; he assembles a council at Constance, but is deposed by it, ib.
——, elector of Saxony, establishes a church in his dominions entirely different from the church of Rome, 400.
Jonas, bishop of Orleans, his system of morality, 193.
Irenæus, bishop of Lyons, his great character, and use of his works, 42.
Irene, the profligate empress, 177.
Irish converted to Christianity in v. cent, 110; eminent for their learning in viii. cent. 174; illustrate Christian doctrine by philosophical principles, ib.; the rise of the Reformation among them, 415.
Isbraniki (Roskolniki,) sect in Russia, its rise in xvii. cent. 575; they excite commotions by some of their tenets, ib.; methods taken to conquer their obstinacy fruitless, ib.; farther account of them, 716.
Isidore, of Pelusium, his character, 116.
——— of Seville, a scriptural commentator, 139.
Jubilee year, when first instituted, 326; its pretended antiquity contradicted and refuted, ib.; altered in xiv. cent. 354.
Julian, the emperor, attempts to destroy Christianity, 81; his consummate dexterity, and ruinous projects, how prevented, ib.; his character, ib.
———, bishop of Halicarnassus, his doctrine of the body of Christ, 144.
Juliana, her extravagant conceits, 326.
Julius Africanus, his character and works, 65.
—— II., pope, character of, 386; miserable state of the church under him, ib.
—— III., his vile character, 428.
Ivo, bishop of Chartres, zealous in maintaining the rights of the church, 248.
Justin, the martyr, writes two apologies for the Christians, 36, 42; remarks on his works, 43, 44.
Justinian, emperor, his edict against Origen, 140; his Pandect found in xii. cent. at Amalphi, 268.
Juvenal, bishop of Ælia, his ambition, 113; assumes the dignity of patriarch of all Palestine, ib.
Kabbala, or the Jewish science, 19.
Kang-hi, Chinese emperor, a friend to Christianity, 518; great character, and munificence to the Jesuits, ib.; a change in his sentiments, 645.
Keith, George a regulator of Quakerism, 631.
Kempis, Thomas à, his character, 373, 376.
Knighthood, orders of, instituted in xii. cent. 264.
Knights, sword-bearers, an order founded to convert the Livonians, 261
Knox, John, the reformer, 414, 477.
Knutzen, founder of a transient sect, 528.
Kodde, (Vander) three brothers, founders of the Collegiants, 641.
Krudener, the baroness, an enthusiast, 745.
Labadie, John, his singular tenets, 642; character of some of the members of his sect, 643.
Lactantius, an excellent writer among the Latins, 89.
Lanfranc, archbishop of Canterbury, 229, 248.
Langton, an English primate, 303, 320.
Languages, Greek, Oriental, &c., studied in xii. cent. 299; progress o. that study in xvii. cent. 531; advantageous to the cause of religion, ib
Latins, learning encouraged among them by Charlemagne, 165; state of philosophy among them in x. cent. wretched, 211; complaints of infidelity and atheism among them in xiii. cent. 296; great schism among them in xiv. cent. 343; the multiplicity of ceremonies they had in xv. cent. 377.
Latitudinarians, their rise in England, 616; doctrine and chief leaders, ib.
Laud, archbishop, introduces Arminianism into England, 605; his mixed character and arbitrary proceedings, 611; his unhappy fate, 612.
Law, Roman, its study happily restored in xii. cent. 268; opinion about substituting it in the place of all others, ib.; canon, admitted to the same privilege, 269; civil and canon, much studied in xiii. cent. 301
Learning, when first introduced to support the cause of Christianity, 42; advantageous to the Reformation, and one great cause of it, 385. See Letters.
Legion, story of the thundering, 34.
Leibnitz, his philosophy retards the progress of Arminianism in Germany, 628; some of his principles are favourable to Calvinism, 629.
Leipsic, conference at, for reconciling the Lutheran and reformed churches, 580.
Leo I., the Great, a vigorous asserter of the power of the Roman see, 115; his character, 116; his epistle to Flavianus received as a rule of faith, 127.
—— the Isaurian, his contest with the pope, 170; zeal against image-worship, 176; he is excommunicated, ib.
—— IV., emperor, endeavours to suppress the practice of image-worship, 177.
—— the Wise, an account of, 183.
—— VI., emperor, writes against the Saracens, 194.
—— the Philosopher, promotes learning among the Greeks, 210; his fourth marriage occasions violent disputes in the Greek churches, 218.
—— V., pope, dethroned and imprisoned, 212.
—— IX., aims at universal dominion, 230; grants to the Normans their conquered and usurped countries, 231; his character, ib.
—— X., his bad character, 386; his famous edict for granting indulgences, with their extent, 391, 392.
—— XII., a bigoted pontiff, 739; celebrates a jubilee, ib.
Leszynski, his impiety and fate, 528.
Letters flourish under Trajan, 38; their decay, 62; dispute concerning their utility in iii. cent. ib.; their state in iv. cent. 85; encouraged by Constantine and by succeeding emperors, ib.; their excellence acknowledged in v. cent. 112; found only among the monks and bishops in vi. cent. 134; their state in vii. cent. 149; decline among the Greeks in viii. cent. 183; they revive among the Latins under Charlemagne, ib.; controversies with the Latins cause them to flourish among the Greeks in ix. cent. ib.; impediments to their progress in the West, 184; encouraged in Greece, 210; their state among the Saracens, 210; their deplorable fate among the Latins in x. cent. 211; restored by pope Sylvester II. ib.; the entire decay of the sciences how prevented among the Greeks in xi. cent. 227; and their principal writers, ib.; revive in the West, ib.; are studied among the Latins with the greatest assiduity, in xii. cent. 267; their great progress in the West in xiii. cent. 294; many learned men among the Greeks in xiv. cent. 338; state of learning among the Latins, 338, 360; what branches of it were cultivated in Italy, 360; its reduced state, 389; its revival, 419; its state in xvii. cent. 557.
Lucopetrus, founder of a fanatical sect, 287.
Leutard, troubles excited by him in x. cent. 220
Leutheric, archbishop of Sens, his notion that none but good men can receive the body of Christ, 252.
Libertines, spiritual brethren and sisters, their tenets, 488.
Licinius, persecution of the Christians under him, 80; his turbulence, defeat, and death, ib.

L'Isle, Alan de, an eminent logician in xiii. cent. 293.
Lithuanians, partly converted by the Teutonic knights in xiii. cent. 295; their conversion completed in xiv. cent. 335.
Liturgy of the church of England, a plan for introducing it into Prussia and the Hanoverian electorate, 718.
Livonians, compelled to embrace the Gospel by the greatest cruelty and oppression, 261.
Locke, John, the philosopher, 535.
Logic, the study of, much admired and followed in xi. cent. 228; the most eminent logicians, ib.
Lollard, Walter, not founder of the Lollards, 356.
Lollards, account of, 350, 356.
Lombard, Peter, an eminent theologian, 280, 282; his book of sentences in greater repute than the Bible, 284.
London, the Royal Society founded at, 530.
Lord's Supper, its celebration in ii. cent. 49; in iii. cent. 70; its symbols adored, 99.
Love, Family of, an anabaptist sect, 501.
——, Virgins of, an order in the Romish church, 556.
Louis, the Debonnaire, a patron of the arts and sciences, 183; his edict in behalf of the pope's election, spurious, 186; his zeal in suppressing the vices of the monks, 189; he encourages Mysticism, 194.
—— IX., of France, afterwards sainted, his two crusades and their success, 295; his famous edict, called the Pragmatic Sanction, 302.
——, duke of Bavaria, his contest with John XXII., 342; he patronises the Franciscans, 349.
——, elector Palatine, restores Lutheranism in Germany, 476.
—— XIV., of France, his solemn ambassy to the king of Siam, 516; great patron of the arts and sciences, 530; contest with two of the popes, 550; he persecutes the Jansenists, 567; revokes the edict of Nantes, 601.
Low-Churchmen in xvii. cent. 617.
Lucar, Cyrillus, opposes the union of the Greek and Latin churches, 574; is put to death, ib.
Lucas, a follower of Spinosa, 531.
Luciferians, a sect, 95.
Ludolph, his learned labours, 577.
Lully, Raymond, a philosopher, 339; different opions about him, ib.
Lupus, Servatus, great abilities and works of, 185, 190.
Luther, Martin, character of, 390; he warmly opposes Tetzel's preaching of indulgences, and hence the rise of the Reformation is to be dated, 391; his motives vindicated, ib.; he is violently opposed, 392; his fruitless conference with Caietan, ib.; his dispute with Eckius, 394; he is excommunicated by Leo X., 396; separates himself from the church of Rome, ib.; offers submission to the determination of a general council lawfully assembled, ib.; is unjustly banished, 397; his doctrine of the eucharist, 399; draws up the Articles of Torgau, 403; his catechisms, 451; form of concord, ib.; explications of Scripture, 487; he suppresses the Antinomians, 461; publishes his confession of faith, 472.
Lutherans, esteemed by the Spaniards as better subjects than the Calvinists, 481; their ecclesiastical laws and polity, 586; the state of theology and moral science among them, 587, 588; state of their church in xviii. cent. 717; in xix. cent. 744.
Lutkeman, Joachim, his singular opinions, 597.
Lyons, a council at, in xiii. cent. 306; a famous decree concerning the cardinals, during the vacancy of the pontificate, ib.
Lyranus, Nicolas, great character of, 352.
Mabillon, a Learned Benedictine, 554.
Macarius, character of, as a moralist, 92.
————, of Ireland, his gross error, 185.
Maccovius, introduces subtilties into theology, 487; followed by others, ib.
Macedonius, a heretic in iv. cent. 105.
Madura, account of that successful mission, and its author, 515; the singular method used, ib.
Magnus, Albertus, a philosophical divine, 320.
Magus, Simon, a blasphemous sectary, 31.
Mahomet. See Mohammed.
Malebranche, the philosopher, 535.
Mandeville, an infidel, 645.
Manes, Manichæus, account of him, 71; his doctrine of two principles, ib.; various reports about his death, ib.; his summary concerning man, Christ, and the Holy Ghost, ib.; his opinions of the Old und New Testaments, 72; his rule of life austere, ib.
Manichæans, their general assembly, 73; their state in vi. cent. 143; continue in xv. cent. 377.
Marca, Peter de, writes against the papal claims, 550.
Marcellus, of Ancyra, a sectary, 105.
Marcion, founder of a sect in Asia, 51.
Margaret of Navarre, favours the Reformation in France, 405.
Mark, the hermit, his works and character, 119.
Maronites, whence so called, 158; retain the opinions of the Monothelites till xii. cent. ib.; their subjection to Rome in xvi. cent. 449.
Mayronius, Francis, a scholastic divine, 352.
Marpurg, conference at, 402.
Marriage allowed to the clergy, 64.
Martial, the bishop, declared an apostle, 256.
Martin, bishop of Tours, converts the Gauls in iv. cent. 83; erects the first monasteries in Gaul, 93.
——, bishop of Braga, his summary of a virtuous life, 140.
——, pope, anathematises the Monothelites and their patrons, 157; is banished for one year, ib.
—— Raymond, a distinguished author, 299, 324.
—— IV., his character and insolence, 306.
—— V., assembles a council at Basil, which attempts the reformation of the church, but in vain, 367.
Martyr, Peter, zealous in propagating Calvinism in England, 477; a writer of common-place divinity, 487.
Martyrs, sufferings of, 15, 16, &c.
Mary, queen, restores popery in England, 414.
——, Virgin, when first worshipped, 107; her image introduced into churches in v. cent. 121; veneration for her increased in x. cent. 219; institution of the Rosary and Crown in honour of her, ib.; controversy concerning her immaculate conception, 286, 569.
Massalians, (Euchites,) their antiquity, 106; their tenets, ib.; a general name for Eastern heretics and enthusiasts in xii. cent. 287.
Mass, Canon of, 142; solitary masses, when supposed to be introduced, 178.
Materialism, doctrine of, 731.
Mathematical sect, rise of, 534; its progress, 535.
Matilda, duchess of Tuscany, her donation to the see of Rome, 225.
Matthias, John, his pacific attempts, 582.
Matthison, John, ringleader of the fanatics of Munster, 493.
Maty, Paul, his notions of the Trinity, and consequent controversy, 653.
Maur, St., congregation of, 554; select number of learned members, and their adversaries, ib.; many and admirable productions, ib.
Maurice, elector of Saxony, promotes the famous treaty of Passan, 413.
———— landgrave of Hesse, embraces Calvinism, 379; harasses the Lutherans, ib.
———— stadt-holder, seemingly inclined to favour the Arminians, 623; declares against them, with his ambitious views, 624; his violent proceedings against them, 625.
Maximin, persecution under that emperor, 59.
Maxims, two very dangerous, adopted in iv. cent. 94.
Maximus, Julian's master, a Platonist, 85.
———— of Turin, an account of his homilies, 116.
————, a Greek monk, account of him and his works, 153.
Mayer, Michael, a leader of the Rosecrusians, 532.
Mayhew, a Puritan missionary in America, 524.
Mazen, Nicolas de, very zealous in reforming the monks of Germany, 370.
Medici, the zeal of this family in cultivating learning, 360.
Medici, Cosmo de, a zealous patron of the Platonic philosophy, 361.
Melancthon, Philip, character of, 394; he prepares the famous confession of Augsburg, 403; confutes Faber's objections to it, 407; his dispute with Eckius at Worms, 410; his sentiments of the edict called *Interim*, 412; the cause of a schism among the Lutherans, ib.; the method of philosophy adopted by him, 420; his unsuccessful attempt to unite the Greeks with the Protestants, 443; his writings in philosophy, 455; his explanations of the Scriptures, 456; he is placed at the head of the Lutheran church, 461; compared with Luther, ib.; accused of apostasy by the Lutherans, 462; desirous of an union between the reformed and the Lutherans, 472; which is facilitated by Calvin, ib.; but meets with obstacles, ib.
Melancthonians, a philosophical sect, 455.
Melchites, oriental Christians, 156.
Meletian controversy, the true causes of, 95; continued till v. cent. ib.
Melito, bishop of Sardis, his works, 44.
Menander, his wild and frantic notions, 31.
Mendez, patriarch of Æthiopia, his imprudent zeal and arrogance, 547; he is banished, 548.
Mendicants, their institution in xiii. cent. 308; confined to four societies only, 309; their universal fame, ib.; pride and arrogance, 311; impious wiles, ib.; they fall under a general odium, 344, 370.
Menno, Simon, account of, 494; his remarkable success in gaining proselytes, ib.; his doctrines, ib.; his rigorous laws mitigated by the Anabaptists in xvii. cent. 637.
Mennonites, their various fortunes in xvii. cent. 636; different sects of them, 637.
Mentz, Felix, his detestable character, 492.
Mercator, Marius, a warm opposer of Pelagius, 116.
Metaphysical sect, rise of, 534; improvement and propagation, 535; it falls into contempt, 584.
Meth, Ezekiel, account of that fanatic, 599.
Methodists, popish, most eminent in France, 545; divided into two classes, ib.
————, protestant, account of, 726; divisions among them, ib.; their tenets, 727; influence of the sect, 749.
Methodius, eminent for his piety, 65.
———— the Confessor, his zeal for image worship, 189.
———— (with Cyril) converts the Mœsians and other nations, 180.

Metropolitans, whether any in i. cent. 23; their rights, 41; the extent of their power in iv. cent. 86.
Mezzabarba is sent into China as papal legate, 645; unsuccessful, ib.
Micislaus, duke of Poland, converted to Christianity, 206; his zeal for the conversion of his subjects, ib.
Millennium, controversy concerning it in iii. cent. 68.
Miltitz, a Saxon knight, holds conferences with Luther, 393.
Ministry, necessity of a public one, 19.
Minucius, Felix, an able writer, 65.
Miracles, advantageous to Christianity, 13; it is denied that they had entirely ceased in iv. cent. 83; their number and reality in viii. cent. examined, 164.
Missionaries, their success in barbarous nations, and particularly Jesuits, 514; a burst of missionary zeal in xix. cent. 751, 752.
Missions, priests of, 556.
——— account of in xviii. cent. 645; protestant, and more particularly the Danish, ib.
Missionary voyages from Great Britain to the Pacific ocean, 735; a grand missionary system, 752.
Mogislaus, Peter, an eminent prelate of the Greek church, 442.
Mohammed, erroneously called Mahomet, appears in vii. century, 147; delivers the *koran* as the word of God, ib.; his success accounted for, 148; his pretended Testament, 155.
Molina, character of, 439, 440.
Molinists, controversies with them concerning predestination and liberty, 440.
Molinos, Michael de, excites new controversies in the church, 570; his book entitled the Spiritual Guide, ib.; principles whence his followers were called Quietists, ib.; he is obliged to recant, and dies in prison, ib.
Monarchy, men of the fifth, their enthusiastic notions, 615.
Monks, formed into a regular body in iv. cent. 93; different orders, 94; adopted among the clergy, ib.; claim eminent stations in the church, 115; are not subject to the patriarchal power, 116; are exempted by the pope from episcopal jurisdiction, 151; excessive veneration paid to them in ix. cent. 188; employed in civil affairs, ib.; decline of their discipline, 189; their state in xi. cent. and increase of their immunities, 244; their ignorance and corruption, ib.; great corruption gives rise to chivalry, ib.; new orders, 245; their great increase in xiii. cent. 307; a reformation attempted among them in xv. cent. 370; their corrupt state in xvi. cent. 387; much reformed, 429; new orders, 430; a partial reform, 554.
Monophysites, their tenets concerning the nature of Christ, 128; encouraged by the emperor Anastasius, 143; depressed by Justin and successive emperors, ib.; their sect restored by Baradæus, 144; divisions among them terminated, ib.; they flourish in xvi. cent. 444; their religious doctrines and rites, 445; their ignorance, ib.; in Asia, their state in xvii. cent. 576; those of Africa obstinately resist the Roman yoke, ib.; their state in xviii. cent. 648.
Monothelites, the rise of this sect in vii. cent. 156; condemned by a general council, 157; different opinions among them, ib.; their fate after the council of Constantinople, 158.
Montanus, a heretic, attempts to supply the pretended defects of the Gospel, 56; his excessive austerity, ib.; success of his doctrine, ib.
Moors, or Saracens, some converted in xv. cent. 358; banished out of Spain in xvii. cent. 541; consequences, 542.
Moralists (moral writers,) in ii. cent. 45; the double doctrine then introduced by them, ib.; its effects, ib.; the most eminent in iv. cent. with their defects, 92; their character in v. cent. 119; mystic principles adopted by them, 120; reduce practical religion to the observance of a few virtues in vii. cent. 154; imbibe many of the Aristotelian principles in viii. cent. 175; principally employed in ix. cent. in collecting the sentiments of the Fathers on morality, 193; content themselves in x. cent. with composing homilies, and writing the lives of the saints, 218; contemptible in xi. cent. 250; partly scholastic, partly mystic, in xii. cent. 284; their character in xiii. cent. 323; chiefly enployed in collecting and solving cases of conscience, and in moralizing on the nature and actions of the brute creation, in xiv. cent. 353; their character in xvi. cent. 458.
Morality, Romish, its low state in xvi. cent. 435.
Moravians, their conversion in ix. cent. 180.
Moravian brethren, an account of, 482. See United Brethren.
More, Hannah, recommends religious reform, 735.
Morinus endeavours to unite the Greek and Latin churches, 574.
Moscovy, patriarch of, when first appointed, 444.
Moses, Barcepha, a Syrian bishop, in ix. cent. 189.
——— Cretensis, an impostor, 108.
Moulin, Peter du, is employed to reconcile the Lutherans and the Reformed, 580.
Munster seized by the fanatics in xvi. cent. 459; retaken by its sovereign, ib.; peace of Germany concluded in that city, 540.
Munzer, a fanatic leader, 459, 492; is ignominiously put to death, 492; fate of his associates, ib.
Mystics, their rise in the East, 40; their increase in iv. cent. 93; their cause promoted in v. cent. 119; their pernicious influence on moral writers, 120; flourish in ix. cent. 194; their method of explaining truth adopted in xii. cent. 282; oppose the scholastics in xiii. cent. 323; many of distinguished merit among them in xv. cent. 376; the only remaining sparks of piety in xvi. cent. were in them, 390; why called Quietists, 570; their precepts embraced by the Quakers, 632.
Nagel, Paul, his reveries, 599.
Nantes, famous edict of, 477; revoked by Louis XIV. 601.
Nations, state of those not under the Romans, 1; the genius of, and liberty enjoyed by, the northern, 2; all sunk in superstition, but of different kinds, ib.
Nature, its law studied with great attention in xvii. cent. 531; the study advantageous to Christian morality, ib.
Naylor, James, a most extravagant Quaker, 630.
Nazarenes, the rise of, 50; their division into two sects, ib.
Necessity, a subject of controversy, 731.
Neri, Philip, institutes the priests of the oratory in xvi. cent. 431.
Nero persecutes the Christians, 14, 16.
Nestorianism, its rise and author, 123; its progress after the council of Ephesus, 125; its success in the East, ib.; its state in vi. cent. 143.
Nestorians, their divisions cease, 125; their doctrine, 126; they introduce Christianity among the Chinese, 146; flourish under the Saracens, 155; plant the Gospel in Tartary in x. cent. 205; two factions among them in xvi. cent. 425; their notions of the two natures and two persons in Christ explained, 446; their state in xvii. cent. 577.
Nestorius, anathematized by Cyril, bishop of Alexandria, 124; condemned to banishment by a general council at Ephesus, ib.
Newton, Sir Isaac, his estimable character, 535; the excellence of his philosophy how proved, 536; liberty of thinking restored by him and Des Cartes, ib.
Nice, the first general council at, 102; the account of it imperfect, ib.; it condemns Arius, 103; second council, 177; superstitious decrees in favour of image worship, ib; its authority and this decision acknowledged by the church of Rome, ib.
Nicephorus, a defender of image-worship, 189.
———, Callistus, his ecclesiastical history, account of, 338.
———, Gregoras, his character, 338.
Nicetas, David, account of, 189.
Nicolaitans, a sect, 32.
Nicolas, patriarch of Constantinople, deposed, 219; restored, ib.
——— II., pope, his famous decree concerning the election of the supreme pontiff, 232.
——— III., aggrandizes the papal see, 302; confirms the rigid rules of St. Francis, 314.
——— IV., his character, 306, 307.
——— V., a great patron of learning, 368.
——— Henry, founder of the Family of Love, 501.
Nicole, a Jansenist divine, 546.
Nieder, John, his works, and the use of them, 392.
Nihusius, a popish methodist, 545.
Nobili, Robert de, account of that Jesuit's mission, 515; his singular stratagems, ib.
Noetus, his doctrine of the Trinity, 73.
Nogaret, William de, seizes Boniface VIII. 340; prosecutes his accusation against that pontiff after his death, ib.
Nominalists, who, and whence so called, 185; dispute betweeen them and the Realists, 229; their chief, John the Sophist, 230; the state of their disputes in different centuries, 270, 339, 362.
Non-conformists, a name given to the Puritans, 488; their hopes frustrated under Charles II. 617; they flourish under William III. ib.; their state in England in xviii. cent. 652.
Non-jurors, (high churchmen,) their rise, 617; their notions, 618.
Norbert, founder of the order of Premontré, 278.
Normans, their invasions in ix. cent. 182; form settlements, ib.; the sufferings of the Christians under them, ib; many were converted in x. cent. with Rollo, ib.; flourishing state of learning among them in xi. cent. 227.
Norway, people of, converted by Guthbald, 227.
Novatian disturbs the peace of the church in iii. cent. 74.
Nuremberg, diet at, 398; peace between Charles V. and the Protestants at a second diet, 408; the terms, ib.; the effects, ib.
Occam, William, a strenuous defender of the Nominalists, 339; his didactic writings, 352.
Ochino, Bernardino, his opinions, 489.
Odensee, edict at, 404.
Odilo, of Clugni, his works, 216.
Odo, abbot of Clugni, attempts to reform the monks, 215; his character, 216.
Œcolampadius resumes the dispute concerning the eucharist with Luther, 471; his expositions of Scripture, 486.
Œcumenical council, first established in iv. cent. 86.
Œcumenius, his chain, 216.
Oliva, or d'Olive, Pierre Jean, a famous Franciscan, excites dissensions in the order, 314; his fanaticism, ib.
Olympia, Donna, the mistress of pope Innocent X. 537.
Olympiodorus, a Platonic philosopher, 85.
Ophites, a sect of ridiculous heretics in ii. cent. 55.
Oratory, priests of the, 431, 558.
Orders, ecclesiastical, their great vices in xii. cent. 276.

Orders, religious, new, in xiv. cent. 350; new, in xv. cent. 378.
—— monastic, their state in xvii. cent. 553; reformations made, and hence two classes, 554.
Origen, character of, 64; his erroneous method of explaining Christian truths by the Platonic philosophy, 66; his Stromata and principles, 67; moral works, ib.; rigorous measures are taken by two councils against him, 69; he confutes the Arabian philosophers, 74; controversies concerning him in iv. cent. 96; troubles in the East on account of his writings, ib.; his doctrine ordered to be suppressed, 97; condemned with his followers in a general council, 141; his doctrine adopted by the Quakers, 632.
Orosius obviates many objections against Christianity, 111, 116.
Osiander, Andrew, excites disputes in xvi. cent. 464.
Ostreg, synods at, 482.
Otho the Great, his zeal for Christianity, 207; excessive liberality to the clergy, and its unhappy effects, ib.; he is saluted with the title of emperor by pope John XII. 213; calls a council, and degrades the perjured pontiff, ib.; his death and miserable consequences, 213, 214; his authoritative edict, 214.
Otho, bishop of Bamberg, converts the Pomeranians in xii. cent. 260.
—— IV., emperor, deposed and excommunicated by pope Innocent III. 303.
Pacific age, that time so denominated when Christ came into the world, 1;
Paganism, state of, 2; great variety of religions among the Pagans, ib.; their idolatry, ib.; their mysteries, 3; remains of Paganism in iv. cent. although zealously opposed by the Christian emperors, 82; some remains in vi. cent. even among the learned, 132.
Pajon, Claude, attempts to modify the doctrine of the reformed church, 608.
Palamas, Gregory, supports the doctrine of the Quietists, 355; his notions concerning the divine operation, ib.
Palatinate, decline of the Protestant cause in that part of Germany, 602.
Palestine, its two religions, the Jewish and Samaritan, much corrupted among the people at our Saviour's coming in the world, 6; the decline of the Christian cause in that country in xii. cent. 262.
Palladius, works and character of, 116.
Pantheists, account of this impious sect, 529; most eminent members among them, ib.
Papal power saved from ruin by the force of the secular arm, and by imperial edicts, in xvi. cent. 406.
Papin, Isaac, propagates the doctrine of Pajon, 608, 609.
Paracelsists, eminent in xvi. cent. 455.
Paracelsus, Theophrastus, founds the sect of Theosophists, 421.
Paris, frequented in xii. cent. for its eminent divines, 282; the first European university founded in that city in xiii. cent. 298; severe discipline in it, 299; Parisian academy of sciences, in xvii. cent. 530; grand council in that city, 714.
——, Matthew, the historian, 299.
——, William of, a metaphysical divine, 320.
——, John of, his great character, ib.
——, Abbé de, pretended miracles wrought at his tomb, 565.
Pasaginians (circumcised,) a sect in xii. cent. 292.
Pascal II., pope, renews the disputes concerning investitures, 271; is condemned by a council at Rome, ib.
——, author of the Provincial Letters, 560.
Passau, treaty of, 413.
Paterinus, a common name given to all heretics in xi. cent. 238.
Patriarchs, the nature of their office explained, 41; bishop of Rome their reputed chief, 87; inconveniences arising from the patriarchal government, 114; contests with each other, and melancholy effects, ib.
Patrick converts the Irish in v. cent. 110.
Patripassians, who, and why so called, 55.
Patronage, origin of the right of, 97.
Paul, the apostle, extraordinary character of, 12.
——, the first hermit, 66.
—— of Samosata, founder of a sect, 74.
——, the Deacon, his fame in viii. cent. 174.
—— II., pope, his mixed character, 369.
—— III., proposes a reformation, 410; dispute about his real character, 427.
—— IV., founder of the Theatins, 428, 430.
—— V., his character, 537; contest with the Venetians, 537, 549.
—— Sarpi, commonly called Father Paul, 549.
——, Vincent de, founder of the priests of the mission, in xvii. cent. 556.
Paulicians, controversy of the Greeks with them, 155; a sect in ix. cent. 202; persecuted by the Greek emperors, ib.; meet with protection from the Saracens, ib.; whether Manichæans or not, considered, 203; their opinions in six articles, ib.; miserable state under the Greeks in xi. cent. 257; their first assembly at Orleans, 258; their calamitous fate, ib.
Paulinus of Aquileia, his character and works, 172.
——, bishop of Nola, his works, 90.
Peasants, their horrid war in xvi. cent. 399; their claims made religious by Munzer, ib.; they are defeated at Mulhausen, 400.
Pelagianism, rise of, 129; it is suppressed by Augustin's writings, ib.
Penance, which had been long neglected, is restored in vii. cent. 154.
Penitential discipline, 46, 121.
Penn, William, settles the Quakers in Pennsylvania, 631; his character, ib.; his writings, 632.
Pennafort, Raymond de, his decretals, 301; his polemic works against the Jews and Saracens, 324.
People, their right of choosing their rulers and teachers in the primitive church, 21; their remarkable ignorance in xvi. cent. 390.
Pepin, usurps the crown of France in viii. cent. 168; is supported by pope Zachary, ib.; anointed and crowned by Stephen, ib.; his donation to the see of Rome, 169.
Perald, William, literary fame of, 320.
Peripatetics flourish in xvii. cent. 532; meet with formidable adversaries in Des Cartes and Gassendi, 583, 584.
Perrault, account of his book on the morality of the Jesuits, 560.
Persia, three persecutions in that country against the Christians, 84.
Peter Fullo (the Fuller,) founder of the sect called Theopaschites, 127.
—— the hermit, his superstitious zeal for a war to the Holy Land, 222.
—— the Great, emperor of Russia, introduces a change into the Russian church, 575; grants liberty of conscience, ib.
Petersen, John William, his inventions and reveries, 595.
Petit, doctrine of, concerning the lawfulness of putting a tyrant to death, 366.
Petrarch zealous in reviving the study of the learned languages, 338.
Petrobrussians, a sect in xii. cent. 289.
Peucer attempts to reform Lutheranism, 466; his character and sufferings, ib.
Peyrere, Isaac la, his strange doctrine, 571.
Pezelius, his catechism favourable to the sentiments of Calvin, 467.
Pfaff, Matthew, zealous in projecting a union between the Lutherans and the reformed, 651, 652; opposed by the Lutherans, ib.
Pharisees, their tenets, 7.
Philadelphian society, founded in xvii. cent. 643.
Philip, father and son, emperors, supposed to be Christians, 57.
—— the Solitary, an eminent moral writer, 284.
——, the Fair, king of France, vigorously opposes the papal power, 340; charges pope Boniface VIII. with enormous vices, ib.; and hastens the death of that pontiff, ib.
Philippicus, Bardanes, emperor of the Greeks, espouses the cause of the Monothelites, 175; is excommunicated and deposed, 176.
Philosophers obscure the truth, 5; Oriental, their first principles, 17; their opinions concerning the Deity, 18; of the origin of the world, ib.; some converted to Christianity, and their conversion if advantageous, considered, 35; their efforts in iv. cent. against Christianity, 82; two great sects of them in xvii. cent. 531.
Philosophical sin, the doctrine of, 437.
Philosophy, two kinds prevailed at Christ's birth, 4; the Eastern not much known, 17; the success of the Platonic system due to Plotinus in iii. cent. 62; promoted by Julian, 85; Aristotelian, revived in v. cent. 113; confined within the circle of the Dialectics in xi. cent. 228; encouraged among the Greeks in xii. cent. 266; three methods of teaching it in that cent. 269; astrology mixed with it in xiv. cent. and considered as magic, 339; the Platonic species in high esteem in xv. cent. 361; Aristotelian, dangerous to revealed religion, ib.; its state in xvi. cent. 420, 432; progress of, in xvii. cent. 583.
Photinus, author of an heretical sect in iv. cent. 105; dies in exile, ib.
Photius, patriarch of Constantinople, 183, 189; first controversy between the Greeks and Latins on his account, 199; mutual excommunications, ib.; the second contest, in which he is degraded, ib.; he engages the bishops to espouse his cause, as a public cause of the church, ib.; is restored to his see, 200; is again degraded, ib.
Pictet, a French writer, 604.
Pietism, rise of, 591; Spener's private meetings for its promotion, ib.; the name of Pietists to whom applied, 592; their extravagant fanaticism, ib.; two objects of debate, 593; the third object on which the Pietists insisted, 594; their state in xviii. cent. 721.
Pin, Dr. du, exposes the injustice of the papal claims, 550; account of the correspondence carried on between him and archbishop Wake, 679.
Pisa, council of, 362; another, 386.
Piscator, John, his doctrine concerning the obedience of Christ, 606.
Pius II., pope, obtains the abrogation of the Pragmatic Sanction, 369; his impudent retraction of former opinions, ib.
—— IV., account of, 428.
—— V., eminent for his austerity, and sainted, 428.
—— VI., (Braschi,) government of, 711; his visit to the emperor, 712; he is attacked by many princes, 713; dies in confinement, 714.
—— VII., adjusts a *concordat* with the first consul of France, 736; crowns Napoleon, ib.; is deprived of his power, and imprisoned, 737; restored, ib.; dies at a great age, 739.
Place, M. de la, his opinions concerning original sin, and contests occasioned by it, 607.
Placette, La, his moral works, 604.
Planudes, Maximus, his character, 336.
Plato, his notions concerning the Deity, 5; his opinions adopted by many in xii. cent. 267.
Platonics or Platonists, their tenets, 5; their schools more frequented than those of the Stoics, 38; new, their rise in Egypt in ii. cent. ib.;

whence styled Eclectics, ib.; the principles of their philosophy, as improved by Ammonius, 39; they flourish in iii. cent. ib.; their state in iv. cent. 85; in v. cent. 112; their suppression, 135.
Plotinus, his doctrine widely propagated in iii. cent. 62.
Plutarch renews the celebrated academy at Athens in iii. cent. 62.
Poiret, Peter, a follower of Bourignon, 643.
Poland, commotions excited there by Stancarus, 465; progress of the Reformation in xvi. cent. 482.
Polanders, conversion of, 205, 206.
Polycarp, a martyr, 36.
Pomeranians converted to Christianity, 260.
Pomerius, Julian, his confutation of the Jews, and other works, 152.
Pongilup, Armannus, his fame and piety, 316.
Pontius, of Nola, his good character and works, 116.
Popes, (Roman pontiffs,) when first distinguished by a certain pre-eminence over other bishops, 63; in what sense this superiority must be understood, ib.; their power in iv. cent. whence, 87; the double election, and its melancholy consequence, ib.; the limits of their authority, ib.; steps laid for their future despotism, ib.; they contend with the bishop of Constantinople for unlimited supremacy, 135; are subject to the control of the Gothic princes, 136; obtain the title of Universal Bishops, 151; are raised to the dignity of temporal princes, 169; the nature of their jurisdiction under Charlemagne, 170; their opinions opposed in councils assembled by the Franks and Germans, 172; their power augmented by the divisions of the empire in ix. cent. 187; they diminish the power of councils and the bishops, ib.; frauds and forgeries to support their claims, ib.; their supreme legislative authority, though opposed, gains ground, 214; their motives for encouraging the first crusade, 224; assume the designation of Pope, or Universal Father, in xi. cent. 230; accessions to their power by the zeal of pope Gregory VII. 237; violent dissensions between them and the emperors concerning extent of power, in xii. cent. 270; they deprive bishops of the right of canonization, 275; and of the power to grant indulgences, 281; aim at universal dominion, 301; their arrogant claims opposed by civil and ecclesiastical powers, 302; great accessions of power due to Innocent III. and Nicolas III., 303; the advantage they derived from the orders of Mendicants, and their returns for these favours, 310; their authority diminished under the Gallic pontiffs, 341; their power declared, by the councils of Constance and Basil, to be inferior to that of general councils, 363, 367; deprived of their expectances, reservations, and provisions, 367; their zeal for propagating Christianity in xvi. cent. examined, 418; what distinction must be made between their authority and the court of Rome, 423; debates concerning their power, ib.; they find zealous advocates for their authority in the Jesuits, 427; their infallibility and unlimited supremacy not universally acknowledged by the church of Rome, 435; restrictions upon their power in various countries, 739, 740.
Porphyry, a more virulent than formidable enemy of Christianity, 60.
Porrée, Gilbert de la, charged with blasphemy, 284; his errors the consequence of an excessive subtlety and a metaphysical method of explaining the Christian doctrine, ib.
Porretta, Margaret, fate of, 356.
Port-Royal, convent of, described, 568; sanctity of the religous in it, and its fame, ib.; its ruin, 569.
Portugal, contest of its court with Rome in xvii. cent. 549.
Positivi, Christian doctors in xii. cent. 283.
Prætorius, an advocate of vital religion, 597.
Prague, Jerome of, condemned to the flames, 365.
Praxeas, his notions concerning the Trinity, 55; his followers called Monarchians, ib.
Predestinarians, whence their rise in v. cent. 130; their doctrine, ib.; opposed by Augustin, ib.
Predestination and Grace, controversy concerning, in ix. cent. 197; also in xvii. cent. 604.
Premontrè, an order of monks founded by Norbert in xii. cent. 278; their universal fame, ib.; excessive poverty at first, and subsequent opulence, ib.
Presbyters of the church, 21.
Presbyterians flourish under Cromwell, 615.
Prescription, how pleaded against error in iii. cent. 68; polemics rest upon it in xvii. cent. 546.
Prester, John, account of, 205; his successor deprived of his kingdom by Genghiz Khan, 266; the effect of his death on the affairs of the Christians in Tartary, ib.
Priesthood, an artful parallel between the Jewish and Christian, 41.
Priestley a sectarian philosopher, 731.
Printing, this art discovered in xv. cent. 360; by whom invented, ib.
Priscillian revives the Gnostic heresy in iv. 105; condemned to death, 106.
Priscillianists, tenets of, ib.
Proclus, a modern Platonist, 112.
Prophets of the New Testament, 21.
Prosper, of Aquitaine, an eminent writer, 116.
Protestants, whence this name, 401; deliberate about forming a league, 402; dissension among them about the eucharist, ib.; present a confession of their faith at Augsburg, 406; attempt to propagate the Gospel in foreign parts, 419; their missions in Asia, 522; in America, 524; persecuted by the Romanists in xvii. cent. 541; milder methods used by their enemies, 543; public and private conferences take place between the doctors of both churches; but the breach is widened, ib.; methods of reconciliation by the Romanists ineffectual, 544.
————, French, a great variety in their religious sentiments, 476; join in communion with the church of Geneva, ib.; peace-makers among them in xvii. cent. 544; their state in xviii. cent. 711, 721; in xix. cent. 745.
Prussia, Frederic, king of, an open infidel, 721.
Prussians are compelled to receive Christianity, 295.
Psellus, Michael, great character of, 227, 247.
Ptolemaites, a Valentinian sect, 54.
Purgatory, its analogy to pagan superstition, 117; the success of this doctrine in x. cent. 216.
Puritans, (Nonconformists,) their rise in xvi. cent. 477; their doctrine, 478; their principles respecting church government and worship, 479; divided into a variety of sects, 480; controversy between them and the church of England, 489; contest about doctrinal points, 490; their missons to America, 524; their state under James and Charles I., 610, 611.
Quadrivium, meaning of, 228.
Quakers, rise of, 629; tumults and proceedings against them, ib.; their first attempts under Cromwell, 630; strange instances of most extravagant fanaticism, ib.; they assume a regular form of discipline, ib.; their settlement in America, 631; intestine disputes and contests among them, ib.; their religion considered in a general point of view, 632; account of Barclay's works, particularly his catechism, ib.; their fundemental doctrine, the same with that of the ancient mystics, ib.; their moral doctrine comprehended in two precepts, 634; their singular customs, ib.; a farther account of them, 749.
————, their vindication, made by direction and in behalf of a meeting representing the society in the states of Pennsylvania, New Jersey, &c. held in Philadelphia, 11mo. 22, 1799, extracted from the Philadelphia edition of that year, and now re-published at the request of a number of the society of Friends in New York, 635.
Quesnel, author of the celebrated New Testament, 561, 704.
Quietism, controversies occasioned by its doctrine in xvii. cent. 570.
Quietists (Hesychasts,) their rise in the East, 354; their notions of a celestial light within them, 355.
Quinisextum, council of Constantinople in vii. cent. 155, 158.
Rabanus, Maurus, archbishop of Mentz, called the Light of France and Germany, 184, 189; his commentaries, 193.
Rabelais, the French wit, 419.
Racow, catechism of, 508.
Radbert, account of, 190, 196.
Ramus, Peter, an esteemed philosopher, 420.
Rasa, Procopius, the head of the Hussites, 374.
Ratheir, bishop of Verona, his works and character, 216.
Rathman, Herman, controversy occasioned by his writings, 596.
Ratisbon, conference at, 410.
Raymond, earl of Toulouse, opposes the pretended heretics, 329; his son attacks and defends them by turns, ib.
Realists, who so called, 185; schoolmen chiefly such in xiii. cent. 322; their disputes with the Nominalists in xiv. cent. 339.
Reformation, its history in xvi. cent. 385; its foundation laid on the revival of letters, ib.; how the people were in some measure prepared to receive it, 387; its origin in Germany, 394; its rise and progress in Sweden, 403; in Denmark, 404; in France, 405; and in other European states, 406; its history from the Augsburg confession till the war consequent upon the Smalcald league, ib.; from the Smalcald war till the peace of Religion at Augsburg, 411; a judgment of it, and the means used for producing it, 417; it civilized many nations, 421; its rise in England, 409; how promoted by Edward VI. and his character, 414; takes place in Scotland, ib.; its success in Ireland, 416; its progress in the United Provinces, ib.; conduct of the nobility and people at this time, considered and explained, ib.; the religion of Switzerland established there, ib.; in Italy, its progress, ib.
Reformers, the first, vindicated, 670; state of the reformed religion in modern times, 675 to 679.
Refugees, French, their character, 470.
Regale, a right enjoyed by the French kings, and opposed by Innocent XI. 551.
Reinboth, singularity of his opinions, 597.
Reineccius, a Lutheran historian, 454.
Relics, excessive veneration for them in ix. cent. 192; by what arts collected, ib.
Religion, early method of teaching it in the Christian church, 24; corrupted by the principles of modern Platonism, 65; its state in iv. cent. 90; degenerate into superstition, ib.; pious frauds, whence, 91; method of explaining Scripture on Origen's plan, ib.; its doctrines determined with more accuracy in v. cent. 117; practical, how explained in vi. cent. and methods used for advancing it, 139; its deplorable state in vii. cent. 152; its decline in viii. cent. 172; the ignorance and superstition of ix. cent., and the causes, 190; its state in x. cent. 216;

made to consist in the observance of external rites in xi. cent. 248; its melancholy state in xii. cent. 280; a deplorable account of it in xiii. cent. 320; corrupted in xiv. cent. and hence the number of sectaries increased, 352; many defenders engage to prevent its total decay in xv. cent. 373; reduced to mere external pomp and show, 377; its state upon the continent in modern times, 708, 712, 713, 718, 736; in Great Britain, 723, 748.
Religious errors, their punishment by civil penalties, when introduced, 94.
Remi, the apostle of the Gauls, 131.
Remonstrants. See Arminians.
Reservation, ecclesiastical, stipulated by Charles V. for the Roman Catholics in xvi. cent. 453.
Restitution, edict issued in Germany, 540; how put in execution, ib.
Reuchlin restores learning among the Germans in xv. cent. 360.
Revolution, French, unfavourable to religion, 713.
Rheims, William of, his works adapted to promote practical religion, 280.
Rhodes, Alexander of, his mission to Siam, &c. 516.
Ricci, Matthew, a zealous missionary in xvi. cent. 419.
Richelieu, cardinal, attempts to reclaim the Protestants, 544; his despotic maxim, 610.
Richer, Edmund, opposes the pontifical authority over the Gallican church, 434.
Rigorists, Jansenists so denominated, 567.
Rites. See Ceremonies.
Rivier propagates the philosophy of Paracelsus at Paris, 456.
Robert, of Arbriselles, founder of the Fontevraud order of monks in xii. cent. 277; his singular discipline and rules, how defended, 278.
———, de Sorbonne, founder of a college for the study of divinity in xiii. cent. 299.
Robinson, John, founder of the Independent sect, 299.
Rochelle, city of, granted to the reformed in France, 600; taken from them by Louis XIII. and terrible consequences of it to the reformed, 601.
Roderic, Christopher, a famous Jesuit, 424.
Roell, Herman Alexander, controversy set on foot by him about the use of reason in religion, 620; his notions about divine decrees, &c. ib.
Rollo, the pirate, is converted, 205.
Romanis, Humbert de, attempts to reform the monks in xiii. cent. 320; his Spiritual Institutes, 324.
Roman empire, its extent advantageous to Christianity, 1; its state in v. cent. 108.
——— Catholic faith, derived from two sources, 432; uncertainty about its real doctrine, ib.; difference of opinion about determining doctrines and controversies, ib.
——————— religion, its principal heads, 432, 433.
Romans imposed the names of their own deities on those of other nations, and hence the perplexities in the history of the ancient superstitions, 2; why they persecuted the Christians, 14; state of learning and philosophical sects among them, 19; they introduced letters and philosophy into the conquered countries, ib.
Rome, its bishops. See Popes.
———, the decline of this church, and whence dated, 423; its internal constitution strengthened in various ways, 426; its contest with Portugal in xvii. cent. 549; with Louis XIV. 550; peace concluded on inglorious terms for the pope, ib.; a second contest, ib.; an assembly of bishops drew up four propositions, opposed by the pope publicly and privately, 551; another contest, ib.; an accommodation, 552; whether the papal authority gained ground in this cent. ib.; history of this church in xviii. cent. 703; in xix. cent. 736.
———, its state of learning in xvii. cent. 557; improved by the French, ib.; philosophy much changed in France, and those most distinguished in it, ib.; ill treatment of them, ib.; the French example followed in Italy, &c. ib.; Jesuits improve learning most, and are followed by the Benedictines, 558; decline of learning among the Jesuits ever since, ib.; emulation of the priests of the Oratory, and the most distinguished among them, ib.; principal authors of the Romish communion, 159; its doctrine more corrupt than in the former ages, ib.; Jesuits, why supported by the popes, ib.; they sap the foundations of morality by several pernicious maxims, 560; are condemned by Alexander VII. and VIII., yet their moral tenets not suppressed, 561; why the great made them their confessors, ib.; their maxims and practices not adopted by all the fraternity, ib.; state of exegetic theology among the Romanists, in xvii. cent. ib.; Scripture how obscured, ib.; state of didactic, moral, and polemic theology at this time, 562; contest between the Jesuits and Dominicans, about grace, ib.; contest occasioned by the rise and progress of Jansenism, 563.
Roscellinus, controversy relative to the Trinity, begun by him in xi. cent. 259.
Rosecrucians inveigh against the Peripatetics, 532; most eminent among them, with their followers, ib.; attacked by Gassendi, ib.
Rufinas of Aquileia, character of, 90.
Rupert of Duytz, a great controversialist, 286.
Russians converted in ix. cent. and by what prudent means, 181; their conversion misrepresented by Le Quien, ib.; they adopted the doctrine and discipline of the Greeks, 444; state of their church in xvii. cent. 575; in xviii. cent. 716; in xix. cent. 742.
Saads, a sect in India, 743.
Sabeans, a sect of Christians, near the Persian gulf, whose tenets and practices are borrowed from the Jews and Mohammedans, 743.
Sabellius, his notions of the Trinity, 73.
Sacrament, festival of, its origin in xiii. cent. 266.
Sadducees, their tenets, 7.
Sagarelli, Gerard, founder of the sect of Apostles in xii. cent. 333; is committed to the flames, ib.
Saints, veneration paid to them, 326; their number considerably augmented in v. cent. 117; their sepulchres frequented, ib.; their prayers thought to be victorious at the throne of God, 136; a confidence in their merits thought necessary to salvation in viii. cent. 173; tutelar their origin, 191; their lives, ib.
Salisbury, John of, his just and severe censure of the Nominalists, Realists, and Formalists, 270.
Salvian, his book on divine government, 111; character, 116; moral writings excellent, 119.
Samaritans, their notions, 9; a sect of that denomination in England, 751.
Sanchez, a philosopher, 536.
Sancroft, archbishop of Canterbury, is deprived with seven other prelates of his ecclesiastical dignity, 617.
Sanction, Pragmatic, instituted for retrenching papal power, 369; when, and by whom made, ib.; it is abrogated in part by Louis XI. of France, ib.; its total abrogation obtained from Francis I. 386.
Sandeman, a sectarian writer, 726.
Sandius, an eminent writer among the Arians, 640.
Saracens, their successful incursions in the east in viii. cent. 163; their usurpations in the west, ib.; their progress toward universal empire in ix. cent. 181; the progress of their arms more injurious to the gospel in the east than in the west, ib.; the Ottoman empire established on the ruin of their power, 208; state of learning among them, 210; expeditions formed against them, 222; history of this holy war, 223; reasons for and against these wars, 224; with their unhappy consequences, ib.
Sardis, council of, its fourth canon supposed to have been the chief step to the sovereignty of the pope, 87.
Savanarola, Jerome, his great character, 372; his unhappy fate, ib.
Saurin, James, his opinion concerning the lawfulness of violating the truth, and controversy thereon, 653.
Saxony, divines of, attempt a new reformation, 466.
Sceptics, their method, and most eminent among them in xvii. cent. 534; in xviii. cent. 645, 725, 728.
Schade, John Caspar, his character, 595; his imprudent zeal excites commotions in the Lutheran church, ib.
Schism, the great western, in xiv. cent., an account of, 343; proposals for terminating it, 344; fomented and continued in xv. cent. 362; healed by the prudence of Nicolas V. 368; between the Greeks and Latins, 376; why not healed, ib.
Schmidt, Erasmus, a learned expositor of Scripture, 587.
——— Sebastian, an interpreter of Scripture, ib.
——— Laurent, the Wertheim interpreter, 650.
Scholastic theology, rise of, 65.
Scholastics, properly so called, in xii. cent. 282; are opposed from different quarters, 283; and principally by St. Bernard, 284; are chiefly Realists in xiii. cent. 322; their dangerous tenets, 323; hated and opposed in xv. cent. 375; and principally by the restorers of polite literature, ib.
Schoolmen, or the cultivators of scholastic theology, 65; chiefly employed in collecting the ancient interpretations of the Fathers in xiii. cent. 322; contentions among them in xiv. cent. 323.
Schools, established for Christian philosophy, 25; very serviceable to Christianity, 85; cathedral and monastic schools, 165; new schools, 228
Schurman, Anna Maria, character of, 642.
Schwenkfeld, George, his debates with Luther, 460.
Sciences, their sad state in vii. cent. 150; a new division of them, and their number increased in xii. cent. 268; their improvement in xvii. cent. 529; their distinguished promoters, and advantages hence arising to society and religion, 530; their state among the Lutherans, 583.
Scientific societies at London and Paris, 530.
Scioppius employed to write against the Protestants, 539.
Scalvonians, converted by Waldemar, king of Denmark, in xii. cent. 260; their conversion completed by the zeal of Henry the Lion, 261.
Scotists, followers of Duns Scotus, 353.
Scotland, whether Christian in iii. cent. 58; church of, its founder, 477; how far it adopts the system established at Geneva, ib.; a remarkable declaration of James I. respecting the kirk, 610; sects in Scotland, 726, 735.
Scotus, Johannes Erigena, an eminent philosopher, 184; blends the Mystic theology with the Scholastic, ib.; his notions and great modesty, 185; high character, 190.
——— Marianus, his works, 248.
——— John Duns, eminent for the acuteness and subtlety of his genius, 351.

Scriptures, canon of, supposed to be settled before the middle of ii. cent. 23; early method of interpreting them, 24; the New Testament translated into several languages, 34; versions of both Testaments, 91· zeal for them in ii. cent. 43; the zeal of many for their diffusion in iii. cent. and advantages hence arising to Christianity, 58; interpreters of the Scriptures censured, and why, 67; versions in iv. cent. not well executed, 91; the most eminent commentators in v. cent. 118; Origen's method adopted by many, ib.; logical discussions deemed better tests of truth than the Scriptures, ib.; expositors in vii. cent. few, and very unlearned, 153; the study of them much promoted by Charlemagne, 173; allegorical interpreters of, in ix. cent., and their fundamental principle, 193; explained in xii. cent. chiefly according to the rules of Mysticism, 129; which prevailed much in xiii. cent. 171; absurd modes of interpretation in xvi. cent. 434; also in xvii. cent. 603.
Sectarian philosophers, why so called in xvii. cent. 584.
Sects formed in the times of the apostles, 28; those which arose from the oriental philosophy, very detrimental to Christianity, 50; illiterate, which prevailed in ii. cent. 55; remains of the ancient in iii. cent. 71; and in iv. cent. 99; Manichæans most prevalent, ib.; ancient, flourish in vii. cent. 155; and recover strength in viii. cent. from the divisions in the Grecian empire, 170; and subsists in xi. cent. 257; numerous among the Latins in xii. cent. and the abuses which gave rise to them, 288; multiplied in xiii. cent. 327; unanimous in opposing superstition, and the papal power, ib.; among the Dutch in xvii. cent. 621; of inferior note in that cent.; an account of them, 641; sects in Great Britain in xviii. cent. 652, 725, &c. in xix. cent. 749; in the United States of America, 753.
Sefis, a sect in Persia, resembling our Quakers, 743.
Seidel, Martin, extravagant notions of, 599.
Selina, countess dowager of Huntingdon, patronises the Calvinistic Methodists, 727.
Semi-Arians, tenets of, 104.
Semi-Pelagians, five leading principles of, 130; strongly opposed by the disciples of St. Augustin, yet support themselves, and make rapid progress, ib.
Sendomir, synod of, 482.
Sens, Bernardine of, a celebrated mystic writer in xv. cent. 373.
Servetus, Michael, character and writings of, 503; he is accused by Calvin of blasphemy, ib.; condemned to the flames, ib.; doctrine of the Trinity, ib.
Servitas observe several rules peculiar to themselves, 308.
Severian, character of his moral writings, 119.
Severus, Septimius, persecutes the Christians, 37.
———, Alexander, shows favour to the Christians, 57
———, Sulpitius, an eminent historian, 90.
———, the Monophysite, made patriarch of Antioch, 143; is deposed, ib.; his doctrine concerning the body of Christ, 144.
Sfondrati, Celestine, his doctrine of predestination, 572.
Shaftesbury, earl of, the free-thinker, 526.
Shakers, account of, 733.
Sharrock, the great advantages derived to religion from his moral works, 604.
Siam, fruitless attempts to convert the king and people of that country, 517.
Sidonius Apollinaris, a Christian writer, 17.
Sigismund, John, elector of Brandenburg, embraces the communion of the reformed church, 579; but leaves his subjects free as to their religious sentiments, ib.; the effects of this liberty, ib.; controversy and civil commotions that ensued, 580; the form of concord hereupon suppressed, ib.
Simeon, head of the Stylites, 119.
———, of Constantinople, styled the Metaphrast, 216.
Sin, original, doctrine of, disputed by La Place, 607; denied by Le Cene, 609.
Smalcald league, how formed by the confederate princes, 408; its articles, 451.
Socinians, their origin, 502; they spread their doctrine in Poland, 505; their progress and different classes, ib.; their summary of religion, 506; account of their catechism, ib.; their divisions and intestine controversies, 511; their flourishing state in xvii. cent. 638; their extensive views, ib.; their decline and sufferings in Poland, 639; banished thence for ever with the utmost severity, ib.; fate of the exiles, ib.; many of them embrace the communion of other sects, 640; account of the English Socinians in xviii. cent. 731.
Socinus, Lælius, adopts the Helvetic confession of faith, 502; his nephew Faustus changes the ancient Unitarian religion, 508.
Sohner, Ernest, a learned Peripatetic, and advocate for Socinianism, 639.
Sophronius opposes the Monothelites, 152.
Sorbonne, doctors of, their college founded for the study of divinity in xiii. cent. 299.
Southcott, Joanna, an English devotee, 734; her death, 751.
Spanheim, breach between him and Vander-Wayen, 618.
Spener, his method of teaching theology, and success, 587; he sets on foot the controversy on Pietism, 591.
Spinosa, an account of, 528; his works, and the tenets therein, ib.; he was seduced into his system by the philosophy of Rene Des-Cartes, ib.; account of his followers, 529.
Spire, diet at, 400; its issue favourable to Luther and the reformers 401; a second diet, in which the resolutions of the former diet are revoked, ib.; the decree of this diet considered as iniquitous and intolerable by several princes, who protest against it, ib.; See Protestants.
Spirituals, a rigid branch of the Franciscans, 312, 314, 315, 346.
Stancarus, debates excited by, 456.
Stephen I. bishop of Rome, his insolent behaviour to the Asiatic Christians on account of the baptism of heretics, 69; vigorously opposed by Cyprian, ib.
———— II., anoints and crowns the usurper Pepin, 168; hence he is made a temporal prince, 169.
————, establishes Christianity among the Hungarians, in x. cent. 206.
———— de Muret, founds the monastic order of Grandmontains in xi. cent. 245; enjoins great austerity, 246; contentions for superiority among some of his order, and consequences, ib.; rigorous discipline enjoined by him gradually mitigated, ib.
Stereoma, a celebrated work published by the Crypto-Calvinists, and on what account, 466.
Stiefel, Isaiah, his absurdities, 599.
Stockius, Simon, the monstrous fiction relative to him, 311.
Stoics, their explication of the divine nature and the human soul, 5.
Strabo, Walafridus, an eminent author, 190, 200.
Strigelius, Victor, his contest with Flacius, 463.
Stylites, a superstitious sect of pillar saints in v. cent. 119; their singular and extravagant fancies, ib.; not suppressed before xii. cent. 120.
Sub-deacons, the nature of their office, 64.
Sublapsarians, their doctrince, and why so called, 604.
Sulpitius, Severus, the most eminent historian in iv. cent. 90.
Supererogation, doctrine of, its foundation laid in xiii. cent. 321.
Superstition, its great increase in v. cent. 117; in vi. cent. 138; this accounted for, and exemplified by the doctrines then taught, 139; insinuates itself into the transactions of civil life in ix. cent. and whence, 201; how nourished by many idle opinions in x. cent. 217; particularly that of an immediate and final judgment, ib.; effects of this opinion beneficial to the church, ib.; reigns among the people in xii. cent. 280; connexion between it and fanaticism considered, Appendix, 670.
Supralapsarians, who so called, and why, 604.
Swedenborgians, a remarkable sect, 732.
Swedes embrace Christianity in ix. cent. 180; convert many in Finland in xii. cent. and by what means, 261; reformation established among them in xvi. cent. 403; state of their church in xviii. cent. 719.
Switzerland, origin of the Reformation by Zuingle, 395; progress of it, ib.; receives the doctrine of Carlostadt, 460; adopts the opinions of Zuingle, 470; disputes about the form of concord, 622, 653; state of the church, 740, 746.
Sylvester II., pope, gives the signal for the first crusade, 208; he restores learning, 211; the success of his zeal for literature, ib.; his high character, 216.
Symmachus, violent dispute between him and Laurentius, 136.
Syncellus endeavours to raise the credit of Mysticism, 194.
Syncretistical (Calixtine) controversies, their rise in xvii. cent. 588, the share which Buscher had in them, 588, 589; the animated opposition of Calixtus to his Saxon accusers, 589; continuation of these debates by Calovius and other able divines, ib.
Syncretists, Platonic, their rise in xv. cent. 361.
Synergists, their doctrine, 463; strongly opposed by the Lutherans, 1·
Synods, their origin in ii. cent. 41.
Systems, ancient religious, 4.
Taborites, in Bohemia, their rise, 223; extravagant demands for a tota reformation, 224; the cruelties they were guilty of, and their principles, ib.; the reformation that took place among them, ib.
Taio, bishop of Saragossa, composer of a system of divinity, 154, 250
Tanquelin, horrid blasphemy of, 290; his fate, ib.
Tartary, Christianity embraced there in x. cent. 205; propagated in xi. cent. by the Nestorians, 220; embassies, and missions from Rome in xiii. cent. 293.
Tatian's character and opinions, 52.
Templars, origin of their knights, and names of their founders, 264; the order extirpated by the council of Vienne, 357; the impiety imputed to some not justly to be charged upon all, ib.
Temples, to the saints, multiplied in vi. cent. and superstitious opinions adopted about them, 142.
Tertiaries, an order of Franciscans, 317.
Tertullian, a learned defender of Christianity, 42, 44.
Testament, New, when brought into use, 23; its translations how useful, and the principal among them, 34; the zeal of Christians in spreading abroad these versions, and the benefits hence arising to the cause of religion, in iii. cent. 322.
Tests, religious, observations upon, 724.
Tetzel, John, his matchless impudence in preaching up the impious doctrine of indulgences in xvi. cent. 391.

Teutonic knights, their office, 265; formed into a fraternity in Germany, ib.
Theatins, a monastic order, 307.
Theodore, Lascaris, a Greek theological writer, 319.
Theodore, of Mopsuestia, his character, 116, 118.
———, of Tarsus, archbishop of Canterbury, promotes learning in England, 150; restores penance in vii. cent. 154; account of his new Penitential, ib.
Theodoret, an eminent writer, 116, 118.
Theodosius, the Great, his zeal against Paganism in iv. cent. 82.
———, the Younger, discovers an ardent zeal for promoting Christianity, and extirpating idolatry, 108.
———, bishop of Alexandria, revives the sect of the Monophysites, 143.
Theodotus, his erroneous notions about Christ, 55.
Theology, controversial. See Controversial Writers.
———, didactic, its simplicity in the infant state of Christiantiy, 25; gradually loses its simplicity in ii. cent. 42; corrupted by introducing Platonic tenets into the Christian system in iii. cent. 65; its most eminent writers in iv. cent. 91; its deplorable state in v. cent. 118; its writers in vii. cent. deserve no commendation, 153; state in viii. cent. 174; also in xii. cent. 282; different sects of didactic divines at Paris, ib.; a principal object of study in xiii. cent. 322; greatly improved in xvi. cent. 421.
———, explanatory, its state in vi. cent. 139; in viii. cent. 173; entirely neglected by the Greeks and Latins in x. cent. 218; its state in xi. cent. 249; undertaken by few men of judgment and penetration in xii. cent. 282; the mystic method much adopted in xiii. cent. 322; modeled after the sentiments of the fathers of the church, in xiv. cent. 352; its state in xv. cent. 375; much freedom used in stating points of doctrine, in xvi. cent. 389; its state in the church of Rome, 433.
———, mystic, its rise in iii. cent. 65.
———, polemic, badly handled in vi. cent. 140; its state in vii. cent. 154; the defence of Christianity against the Jews neglected through intestine divisions in ix. cent. 194; wretched writers in xii. cent. 285; writers more numerous than respectable in xiii. cent. 324.
———, positive, whence derived, 139.
———, scholastic, whence its origin in iii. cent. 65; admired in xi. cent. 249; why so called, 250; the modest views of the first Scholastics, ib; the system declines into captious philosophy, 280.
———, its deplorable state, 389; its improvement, 421.
Theopaschites, a sect, 127.
Theophanes, bishop of Nice, his works and character, 351, 353.
———, a distinguished Russian prelate, 716.
Theophilus, bishop of Antioch, his works, 42.
———, bishop of Alexandria, 116.
———, the emperor, his zeal against image-worship, 195.
Theophylact, patriarch of Greece, his infamous character, 212.
———, of Bulgaria, the most eminent expositor among the Greeks in xi. cent. 248.
Theosophists, rise and character of, 421.
Therapeutæ, a sect among the Jews, 7.
Theresa, a Spanish lady, reforms the Carmelites, 430.
Thesilonica, Simeon of, account of his works, 372.
Thomasius, vehemently attacks the Peripatetics in xvii. cent. 584; success of his philosophy, ib.
Thomists, the followers of Thomas Aquinas, 353.
Thorn, charitable conference at, 543; a scene of Jesuitical cruelty, 706.
Tilloch, Dr. Alexander, a sectarian philosopher, 751.
Timotheus, his confutation of the various heresies in vii. cent. 154.
———, the Nestorian pontiff, propagates the Gospel with great success in Hyrcania and Tartary, 161.
Timour, the Tartar, zealous for the extirpation of Christianity, 336; his religion doubtful, ib.
Tindal, hypothesis of, 646.
Toland, John, his character and works, 527, 529.
Toleration, the act in favour of the Nonconformists in England under William III., 617.
Torgaw, articles of, 403; convocation of, 466.
Tostatus, Alphonsus, his works and character, 372, 375.
Tournon, cardinal, carries into China the severe edict of Clement XI. against the use of Chinese rites, 645; dies in prison, 704.
Trajan suffers the Christians to be persecuted, 35.
Transubstantiation, doctrine of, sanctioned by the pope, 321, 325; adopted by the Greek church in xvii. cent. 574; attacked by John Claude, with Arnaud's defence of its antiquity, ib.
Trappe, La, an austere monastic order, 555; character of its founder, ib.
Trent, objects of the council of, 432; its decrees how far acknowledged by the members of the church of Rome, ib.; afford no clear and perfect knowledge of the Romish faith, 433.
Trinity, disputes concerning it arise in iv. cent. 101; Origen's opinion of it embraced by many Christians, 102; what that is, ib.; and its dangerous tendency in the hands of unskilful judges, ib.; revival of this controversy in xviii. cent. 653.
Trinity, fraternity of, 308.
Tritheists, their tenets, and rise in vi. cent. 144; their division into the Philoponists and Cononites, 145.
Trithemius restores learning in Germany, 360.
Trivium, a term invented to express the three sciences first learned in the schools, 166.
Turks, progress of, 208, 359; they subvert the Greek empire, 359.
Turlupins, or brethren of the free spirit, 330.
Turrecremata, John de, an eminent scholastic writer, 373.
Type, or Formulary, published by Constans the emperor, 157.
Udalric, bishop of Augsburg, the first person solemnly sainted by the pope, 191.
Uke Walles, founder of the Ukewallists, 637; customs of the sect, 638.
Uladislaus IV., king of Poland, his scheme of religious union unsuccessful, 581.
Ulphilas, bishop of the Goths, the eminent service he did to Christianity and his country in iv. cent. 83.
Understanding, men of, a sect in xv. cent. 378.
Uniformity, act of, issued by queen Elizabeth, 478; another by Charles II. more rigorous, 617.
Unigenitus, famous bull of Clement XI. so called, and consequence of it, 647, 704.
Union of the Lutheran and reformed churches, in various parts of Germany, 745.
Unitarians, their religious principles changed by Socinus, 508; those of Great Britain differ from Socinus, 731; relief granted to them, 750; a new association, ib.
United Provinces, whence they became united, 416; zealous in the cause of the Reformation, ib.; how, and when, delivered from the Spanish yoke, ib.; an universal toleration of religious sentiments permitted, ib.
United Brethren, or the Moravian sect, 649, 719, 727.
Universalists, hypothetical, controversy excited by them, and summary of their doctrine, 606; other universalists, 734.
Universities founded by the Lutherans and Calvinists in xvi. cent. 454.
Urban II., pope, his character, 243; lays the foundation of a new crusade, ib.; forbids the clergy to take oaths of allegiance to their sovereigns, ib.
——— IV., institutes the festival of the body of Christ, 306.
——— VI., his odious character, 343.
——— VIII., his character and works, 537; he attempts to unite the Greek and Latin churches, 574.
Ursinus, his form of instruction, or the Catechism of Heidelberg, 476.
Ursulines, nunnery of, 431.
Val-Ombroso, a congregation of Benedictine monks founded there in xi. cent. 245.
Valentine, the founder of a powerful sect in ii. cent. 53; his principles, 54; idle dreams, ib.
Valerian's persecution of the Christians, 60.
Valla, Laurentius, a tolerable annotator on the New Testament, 375.
Vandals, in Africa, raged against the Christians in v. cent. 122; the miracles said to be performed at this time, examined, 123.
Vanini, impious treatises and fate of, 527.
Venice, secret assemblies of Socinians held there, 504; rupture of its inhabitants with the pope Paul V., 549; consequences of it, ib.
Veron, the Jesuit, one of the Popish Methodists, 545; his method of managing controversy, ib.
Verschorists, a Dutch sect, 621.
Victor, bishop of Rome, sends an imperious letter to the churches of Asia, 49; his orders are rejected by them, ib.
———, Hugh of St., distinguished by his great genius, 279.
———, Richard of St., an eminent mystic, 279.
Vigilantius attacks the superstition of the fifth cent. 120; his controversy with Jerome unsuccessful, ib.
Vigilius, bishop of Rome, often changes sides in his determinations about the three chapters, 141.
Villa Nova, Arnold of, his extensive knowledge, 301.
Vincent of Lerins, his treaties against the sects, 117.
Vindication of the Quakers, 635.
Viret, an eminent writer among the Reformed, 490.
Vitriaco, Jacobus de, his character, 299.
Voet, founder of a sect of philosophers, 618.
Volusius, a theologist of Mentz, his reconciling attempt, 544.
Vulgate, account of that Latin Bible, 433; solemnly adopted by the council of Trent, and why, ib.
Wake, archbishop of Canterbury, writes a learned answer to Bossuet's exposition of the Romish faith, 544; he promotes a union between the English and Gallican churches, 652; a circumstantial account of the correspondence carried on between him and certain French doctors, relative to the union, 679, 698.
Waldemar I., king of Denmark, his zeal for propagating Christianity in vii. cent. 260.
Waldenses, or Vaudois, their origin, various names, and history, 290; their doctrine, discipline, and views, 291; they adopt the three orders of bishops, priests, and deacons, ib.; increase in xiv. cent. 352; their state and settlement in xv. cent. 377; account of their reformation in xvi. cent. 482; persecuted by the dukes of Savoy, 541, 720; their state in xix. cent. 747.
Walter, head of the Beghards in xiv. cent. 356.

Wansleb, John Michael, is sent into Abyssinia, 577; neglects his mission, and turns Romanist, ib.
Warburton, bishop of Glocester, an eminent controversialist, 728.
Wars, holy, the first plan laid for them in x. cent. 208; and renewed in xi. cent. 223; history of the first, ib.; the melancholy consequences arising from them, and their legality examined, 224; their unhappy effects on religion, 225; the unfortunate issue of the second of them, 263; and cause, ib.; history of the third, 263, 264; promoted by the popes, and why, 293; new wars of this kind, 294, 295; attempts to renew them in xiv. cent. unsuccessful, 335.
Warsaw, terrible law against the Socinians there, and how executed, 639.
Waterland, Dr., opposes Dr. Clarke's sentiments concerning the Trinity, 654; censured as a Semi-Tritheist, ib.
Waterlandians, a sect of Anabaptists in xvi. cent. 496; publish a summary of their doctrine, 497; their respect for learning, 499; abandon the severe discipline and opinions of Menno, 638; divided into two sects, ib.; account of their ecclesiastical government, ib.
Wayen, John Vander, flaming dissension between him and Frederic Spanheim, with the occasion, 618.
Wesley, John and Charles, founders of Methodism in England, 726.
Wessel, John, called the light of the word, 372.
Westphal, Joachim, renews the controversy on the eucharist, 472; is answered by Calvin, ib.
Westphalia involved in calamities by the fanatics in xvi. cent. 459; famous peace of, 540.
Whiston, William, defends the doctrine of the Arians, 653.
Whitby, Dr., account of his dissertation on the manner of interpreting the Scriptures, 603.
White, Thomas, his notions and works, 571.
Whitefield, George, his ministerial labours and great views, 652; his tenets, 727.
Whitehead, a distinguished writer among the Quakers, 632.
Wickliff, John, attacks the monks and papal authority, 345; exhorts the people to study the Scriptures, ib.; leaves many followers, who are persecuted by the churchmen, ib.
Wilberforce, William, an advocate for vital Christianity, 735.
Wilhelmina, ..avagant notions of, 333.
William the Conqueror, refuses to be subservient to the see of Rome, 243.
——— III., king of England, tolerates the Nonconformists, 617; deprives eight prelates of their sees, for refusing to take the oath of allegiance to him, ib.
Willibrod, an Anglo-Saxon missionary, 146.
Witnesses of the Truth, those so called, who attempted a reformation of religion in ix. cent. 248; their opposition to the superstitions of the church more vehement than prudent, 249.
Wlodomir, the first Christian sovereign of Russia, 206.
Wolff, his philosophy and that of Leibnitz detrimental to Arminianism 628; applied to the illustration of the Scriptures by some German divines, 629; he reduces metaphysics to a scientific order, 650; his philosophy promotes scepticism, 721.
Worms, treaty of, concerning investitures, 272; the edict passed against Luther at a diet in that city, 397.
Worship, the first places of, 27; its form in i. cent. ib.; in iv. cent. 98; in vi. cent. 142; variety of liturgies used in it, 210; it consisted of little more than a pompous round of external ceremonies in xvi. cent. 389.
Writers, Greek, chief in iii. cent. 64; in iv. cent. 88; in v. cent. 116; in vi. cent. 139; in vii. cent. 152; in viii. cent. 172; in ix. cent. 189; in x. cent. 210, 216; in xi. cent. 247; in xii. cent. 279; in xiii. cent. 319; in xiv. cent. 351; in xv. cent. 372.
———, Latin, in iii. cent. 65; in iv. cent. 89; in v. cent. 116; in vi. cent. 138; in vii. cent. 152; in viii. cent. 172; in ix. cent. 193; in x. cent. 211, 216; in xi. cent. 248; in xii. cent. 279; in xiii. cent. 320; in xiv. cent. 352; in xv. cent. 392.
———, Oriental, in iii. cent. 64; in vi. cent. 107; in viii. cent. 172.
———, Lutheran, their character in xvi. cent. 470; most eminent in xvii. cent. 586.
———, Romish, in xvii. cent. 559.
Xavier, Francis, his character, 418; his zeal and success in propagating the Gospel in India and Japan, ib.
Xenaias, of Hierapolis, his hypothesis concerning the body of Christ, 144.
Zarchary, pope, deposes Childeric, and gives the crown of France to Pepin, 168.
Zeno, the emperor, publishes a decree of union, 128.
Zinzendorff, count, founds the sect of the United Brethren in xviii. cent. 649; his notions, ib.
Ziska, the general of the Hussites, 373.
Zonaras, John, his character and works, 267, 279.
Zosimus, the historian, an enemy to the Christians, 111.
———, pope, first protects, and then condemns, Pelagius, 129.
Zuinglius or Zuingle, Ulric, begins the reformation in Switzerland 395; his resolution and success against Samson the monk, ib.; his blemishes considered, 396; his doctrine of the eucharist, 399; clears himself from accusations of heresy, 402; becomes founder of the reformed church, 470; his doctrine and discipline corrected by Calvin in three points, 474.
Zurich, a war in that canton between the protestants and the Roman catholics, 471; its church attached to Zuingle's doctrines, 472; a remarkable case of fanaticism in that community, 746.

THE END.

Deacidified using the Bookkeeper process.
Neutralizing agent: Magnesium Oxide
Treatment Date: April 2005

PreservationTechnologies
A WORLD LEADER IN PAPER PRESERVATION
111 Thomson Park Drive
Cranberry Township, PA 16066
(724) 779-2111